
ICANN77 | PF – ccNSO: Policy Development Update
Thursday, June 15 2023 – 09:00 to 10:15 DCA

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO policy development session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleagues Bart Boswinkel and Kimberly Carlson, 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 form, as I have noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the moderator or chair of this session. Interpretation for this session will include Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this 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. 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

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.

using your full name. For example, a first name and a last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Kenny Huang. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you. And good morning, everyone. Good afternoon, good evening to anyone who have joined us remotely. This is the policy section specifically regarding to ccPDP4 Working Group. My name is Kenny Huang, and I'm the chair of ccPDP4 Working Group. And this group specializes in working on the selection and deselection of IDN ccTLD. So we have a periodical report and giving the update to the community during the ICANN meeting. I think this meeting was particularly special because we try to finalize our initial work for the full working group.

So I'd like to, before we proceed to give some introduction regarding to ccPDP4 Working Group, I'd like to hand over to latest update from ccPDP3. And can I invite Stephen, the chair of ccPDP3, giving the latest update?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you. I can bore you with statistics, but I won't. I just briefly want to point out that we took over three years and had under 100 meetings, but not much under 100 meetings, it seems. As you know, it went to a vote of the community. We had tremendous turnout. We had 60% participate. And we had nearly unanimous approval of the community for the proposed policy. And I thank you for that. Next steps, council will

hopefully adopt it this afternoon at their meeting, the board report. And at that point, we kick it up formally to the board for its consideration. In terms of credits, I want to thank all the working group members, the observers, and our subject experts, which we had several. I'd also like to thank the working group personally for having their confidence in me to herd the cats, so to speak. I would be remiss if I did not thank our incredible support staff, Kimberly, Joke, and Bart. And of course, our incredible wordsmith, Bernie, of course. And I think that's it for me. I thank you all for the community's patience as the policy was developed. And I also thank you for your trust in the work product of the working group as expressed in the tremendous vote that we had for it. So thank you all. And with that, I'll turn it back to Kenny.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Stephen.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Kenny. This is Alejandra Reynoso for The Record. I just wanted to thank the ccPDP3 working group for all their hard work, especially to Stephen Deerhake, to Eberhard Lisse, to Nigel Roberts, to Bernie Turcotte, and of course, to the rest of the ICANN staff and all the participants for your very hard work. And I would like to encourage the community to give you a hand now, because I think it's incredible work that you've done. Lots of years, lots of hours. Thank you so much.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you. Okay, thank you for the contribution by the ccPDP3 working group, especially for Stephen. So starting from today's official session and starting from how we're going to introduce the ccPDP4. And next slide, please. Next slide. Actually, we have a very long-term experience running the IDN under ccPDP. And starting from 2013, we have fast-track process. Due to the help through the fast-track process, we eventually have IDN-ccTLD policy proposal and policy IDN-ccTLD levels in operation since 2013.

But however, the fast-track process is not really a policy. It's just an agreeable measure. So we need to officially try to develop the official policy proposal, which identifies the selection of IDN-ccTLD string and also include the selection of IDN-ccTLD string. And also inclusion of IDN-ccTLD in the ccNSO and try to make everything not only a fast-track process and try to make everything formalized to be a policy. Next slide, please.

So that's the roadmap we have reached so far. And due to ccPDP2, we have evaluation of fast-track process and also conduct a gap analysis for overall IDN-ccTLD policy, which was incomplete in June 2019. And after that, we have achieved two very critical milestones. The first milestone will be the by-law change process to allow IDN-ccTLD in ccNSO, which was approved by ICANN Board and effectively starting from 2nd of June 2022. And the second milestone will be the ccPDP4 that we have given the issue report adopted by ccNSO Council in May 2020. Next slide, please.

So here is the overall of the activity and progress up to date, and including some open action. For example, we have basic policy

document need to be updated that reflect to the result stress testing. And also include some introduction and also conduct comparison with GNSO IDN-EPDP in itself. And regarding to the progress of the full working group, and the full working group has complete the variant management that was complete in January 2023. And also, we have a need to coordination with GNSO IDN-EPDP working group as well.

And we also complete the review decision that was complete in February 2023, and that include applicability ccPDP3 review mechanism. Stephen just complete the task. And to retirement of IDN-ccTLD due to the selection procedure. And also, [inaudible] from ICANN reconsideration and independent review process. The full working group also complete the confusing similarity that was done in May 2023. And also, the full working group have complete the stress testing that was done in June 2023. Next slide, please.

So, some of the issue to be addressed. Next slide. So, from the August 2020 in the issue report that cover, there are various issue with respect to the recommended policy for selection of IDN-ccTLD string. And that's identified by preliminary review teams and include variant management. And that's also request by the ICANN board. And we start with coordination with GNSO-EPDP working group as well. And we need to define an event which could cause the retirement of IDN-ccTLD through the policy as developed under the ccNSO policy development process pertaining to the retirement of ccTLD. So, as a request by ccNSO council, we develop a view on applicability of the ccNSO policy and on review mechanism and whether ICANN independent review process and reconsideration process should be available. Okay, next slide.

I'd like to move over to Bart to continue the policy proposal discussion.
I'm going to hand over to Bart. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Kenny. So, this is the order of topics of the proposals I want to discuss with you. The stress testing will be a new if you will be here in time. And this provides effectively if you—maybe you inferred this on what Kenny already said, the working group has effectively completed its work on the topics. And so, this is a global overview of what you may expect in the initial report and going forward that will be proposed. Next slide, please.

So, next slide. So, we start with a general overview. And is throughout this presentation, I'll refer and use this general overview. It's an illustration of how the various steps under this policy, starting with the selection of IDN-ccTLD string to validation of the selected string and its variants, and then to delegation, transfer and revocation. And finally, the selection retirement of IDN-ccTLD string and the final part is the review mechanism. So, in other words, part A, part B, say the core of the selection procedure or the selection process, part C, so the delegation transfer revocation is building on already existing policies. And the final part is building on the recent policies on retirement and review mechanisms. So, that's the way and throughout the presentation, you'll go back to this overview so you know where we are in the process. Next slide, please.

So, starting with the principles or design criteria, you have seen them very often. Keep them in mind. The purpose of these design criteria is really to set the parameters out for the policy itself. So, we started, the

group started with these design criteria and they go back to, I would say, 2007. These are more or less the same design principles as for the Fast-Track process at the time. And there was no need to update them. So, they're very stable and solid in that respect. And they drive the development of the policy. And at the end, the policy has to meet these design criteria as well. Otherwise, the working group has not done its work properly. Next slide, please.

So, these are the design principles. We'll now go into the selection criteria of variants, etc. So, really the first part of the policy, and this is something that happens in territory by the parties in the territory. So, and we talk about the general criteria, support by the significantly interested parties and also the criteria around variant management, variants and similarity and the technical criteria. Next slide, please.

Next slide. So, the basic core criteria for the IDN-ccTLD string is, it needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of a territory in a designated language and related scripts. The goal is and has always been a relation between the name of the IDN-ccTLD string and a representative of the territories as included in the ISO 3116 standard. So, and if you look at it, the ccTLDs as we know them, so the country codes, the definition is they are a visual association between the name of a territory in English or French and sometimes in other language and their corresponding code elements and the code elements are the two characters as we know them. So, it is about a visual association and this driving principle has been used and that resulted in the meaningful representation of the name of a territory in a designated language. The designated language, in other words, it's also known as the official language and the related script refers to the script in which the

language is expressed. So, that limits the number of scripts as well. And the reason for limiting the number of languages, yesterday, I think, [Abdalmonem] gave a presentation where you could see it. If you start talking about IDNs, it is very difficult to define the number of languages. Depending on the standard, you may end up with 7,000 languages spoken across the world or have been used across the world. So, it is really, there was a criteria necessary to limit the number of languages. You can't just do the languages. So, refer to languages as such. So, therefore, designated language in other standards, or in standards, it's sometimes called the official language, but some countries do have official language and others don't. So, we came up with the idea of designated language. So, the principle of association should be maintained. Next slide, please.

Other criteria around the selection is IDN TLDs, in general, must comply with the IDNA suite of standards and with the root zone LGR, we touch upon this later on. Only one IDN ccTLD string per designated language. Again, this is in line with the basic principle of only one ccTLD per country or one cc per country. This is also the criteria from, or the standard from, or principle, however you want to call it, from the fast track process. And the selected string must be non-contentious within the territory. Whether or not an outsider, and this is a reflection of the sovereignty principle. The string is selected in country. It's only the significantly interested parties in country who determine the string. And the significantly interested parties include the government. And that definition is, as you can see, significantly interested parties is derived from RFC 1591 and as interpreted by the FOI, the Framework of Interpretation. So, Next slide, please.

Now we go into variants. This is another set of criteria relevant for the people in territory when they select a IDN ccTLD string. Due to the nature of some script, there will be variants. I think in The Hague, we had this extensive session about variants. This is really to show you and share with you how the working group looked at this in its final deliberations and final consensus. So, the starting point is, if you look at variants, depending a bit on the script, a word could have loads of variants or a lot of variants. Throughout the exit, so, throughout the work of the working group, we use the word Pakistan in Arabic. Pakistan in Arabic has around, to give you an idea of the scope of the issue, Pakistan in Arabic has a little bit more than 1,200 variants. So, what you can see what happened, if, for example, Pakistan would select Pakistan in Arabic, all of a sudden, 1,200 variants are available. And of these 1,200 variants, there are some variants which are very useful and they need to be dealt with to avoid user confusion. So, that's one of the reasons why this whole discussion in the past started around variant and variant management, how to deal with this situation.

So, the starting point is there is clearly a legitimate need for variants of IDN-ccTLDs or IDN-TLDs in general to avoid user confusion. This was the core, one of the core parts of IDN-EPDP as well, so, from the GNSO. That's one part of the equation. The other side of the equation is the stability and security of the DNS. Again, this was one of the driving principles. You can imagine if you just have Pakistan or .pakistan in Arabic with 1,200 variants, not all of them are allowable, by the way, but just as a kind of thought experiment. If you would have just .pakistan in Arabic with 1,200, variants, you have other, and just using Arabic as, again, as a example. I think there was another example of Abu Dhabi.

Abu Dhabi in Arabic has 60 variants. So, all of a sudden, if you would allow them all, it would have a huge impact on the DNS and on the root server system, if you would allow all these variants to be used. So, there was a clear need to balance these two interests or these two concepts against each other. So, the general responsibility for the security and stability of DNS, but also the legitimate use of variants. Next slide, please.

So, first of all, start with what is a variant. Again, this is all derived from the root zone label generation rules and the panels around it and the mechanism as developed by the script communities, etc. I will not go into details. You can see it. This definition is similar to the one that is used by the GNSO under its EPDP. So, there is consistency, and that was one of the requests from the board with respect to these. So, you have blocked variants and allocatable variants. Again, going back to my example of .pakistan, I think of the 1,200 plus variants, 1,200 are blocked. So, effectively, there are only six allocatable of these. So, that reduces the space already considerably, but it also avoids, say, that's what was one way to avoid user confusion. One of the, say, blocked variants can never be used in TLD or as a string or in a string.

So, as a consequence and the implication is that all selected IDN-ccTLD strings must be processed using the root zone LGR. They may not contain any blocked characters, only allocatable characters. So, you can read it yourself. Can we go to the next slide, please?

KENNY HUANG:

So, again, a little bit about the root zone LGR. We've discussed this about a year ago, so I'll not go into details here anymore. Next one,

please. So you saw how variants are derived and what they mean. There is, however, one additional requirement, and this is an exception on the, I would say, the general policy for ccTLDs, but not just a general policy. Once a variant is selected or is calculated through the, because of the selection of an IDN-ccTLD, and there is a request to delegate it, it always has to be delegated to one and the same entity to avoid any, again, any issues. This is a clear requirement, again, keeping the stability of the DNS in mind. Because by definition, and that's more a policy definition than anything else, but by definition, variants of a selected string are considered the same as the selected string itself. And therefore, they can't be delegated to different entities. You can't have the same string delegated twice. That's one of the, I think, standard rules. So that's why the variant management at this level, all allocatable variants, and they will be more limited, the set of allocatable variants will be more limited. But whatever is delegated as variants has to be delegated to the one and the same ccTLD manager. And also transferred, and also revoked, and also retired, as you will see throughout the presentation.

And secondly, going back to the calculation, as you can see in the final bullets, 1,206 allocatable, to reduce the number of allocatable variants and delegation even more, and to avoid potential gaming, etc. the working group decided that only meaningful representations of the territory, of the name of the territory in the designated language, even if it's a variant, are eligible for delegation. So the variant itself needs to be a meaningful representation as well. So if it's not a meaningful representation, it is not eligible and not valid and can't be delegated.

So that's, again, a criteria, additional criteria, to limit the scope of potential delegatable variants. Next slide, please.

So are there any questions today? And if you want to participate, please go to the Mentimeter and Menti.com, as you can see on top, and there will be more questions. So please log into the Mentimeter, menti.com, and use the code 33667340. So if you have any questions on these basic criteria for the selection, you can use this, or, of course, you can type in the chat, or raise your hand in the Zoom. Yeah, go ahead, please.

[JOHN:]

Yeah, thank you. My name is [John] from .ID Registry, Indonesia. So it's interesting that you said that it's meaningful representation of the territory, and one IDN per ccTLD. So you know that Indonesia is an island country, actually. We have 718 local languages, so many. So each of them is quite a really different language, actually. And I think maybe, yes, not all the local languages can be meaningful or represented, I mean, to do some preservation. But I think at least 10 or 15 local languages, we still accommodate to be the IDN. So the term of one IDN per ccTLD, I think, should be considered again. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

If you go back to the criteria—Kim, I don't know if you can find this slide. The criteria itself is a meaningful representation in a designated language, and then only one. Now, the designated language is, I don't know if all 700 are designated languages, so official languages. And this goes back to what I said before, there are around 7,000 living languages in the world, depending on the standard you use. So that's one. So it

has to be a designated or official language of Indonesia. So that's the first step. The second one is, and if it's one, it's only one ccTLD per language. The second step is the language needs to be expressed in a, I would say, non-Latin script. So let me take an example. Dutch is very clearly a language from the country where I'm from. But it is expressed in a Latin script, or in ASCII. And although Dutch is the formal and national language, and therefore a designated language, you can go to court and speak in Dutch and everything else, the Netherlands is not eligible because the designated language is not expressed in a IDN script. So it doesn't contain, so Latin or ASCII does not contain IDN characters. I hope that clarifies. And maybe that might be the case with some of the IDNs you're referring to, or, say, languages you're referring to. Some of them will be expressed maybe in Arabic, maybe in another script. But some of them will be expressed, so written, in Latin script. And that's the limitation. If it's written in Latin script, this policy doesn't apply. It's not valid under this policy because it's not an IDN.

[JOHN]:

Yeah. In the case of one designated language, I mean, let's say Bahasa Indonesia is our designated language. Bahasa Indonesia is used Latin language, actually. But I think, as we understand, there is some major local language. Let's say, as you said in your presentation, the meaningful, let's say, take the example for Bali. Let's say Bali has also local language and also local script. So it's similarly to the Sanskrit language, yeah. So we have an effort to do some Unicode and standardization. I think I'd like to have some opinion about that. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. May I ask you a question? Is Balinese an official language for Indonesia?

[JOHN]: Official in terms of local language?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, but official for Indonesia?

[JOHN:]: No, of course. We have only one Bahasa.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I think, and that's the choice. That's the local choice. If Balinese would be a designated language, one way or the other, so meets the definition, then it would be eligible. And that's a local choice at the end of the day.

[JOHN:]: [Okay, for a while.] Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: See, is it correct to say if a country or territory had four languages with four different non-Latin scripts, it could have four different IDNs? Assuming, again, on this question, if all four are designated languages,

yes, it could. And I think, Anil is not present, but India is probably the best example right now, even under the fast track and the criteria was used in the fast track. I think India has around 20 or 21 IDNs. And because they're all designated languages and non-Latin, so therefore they have these 21 different IDNs. Thanks. Next slide, please.

Anybody else? Sorry, go ahead.

JOY LIDDICOAT:

Yes, thank you Bart. Just a question, not to labor the point, and perhaps you've already answered it, but in New Zealand, for example, we have two official languages, English and the indigenous language. And the indigenous language is represented in a Latin script, which includes macrons over vowels. And the macrons themselves, we have already provided the IDN for, so in other words, they are already recognized in our TLD and in our zone. Would this policy apply to that? Or even though it's a Latin script, but it has a macron that's not available in the English language?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think now we're going into the details, but one of the criteria is the string itself, the selected string needs to include an IDN, so a non-Latin character. That's the basic core of it, and it's almost a technical criteria. Any more questions from the audience? Yeah, go ahead, [Paul.]

[PAUL]: Thank you, [inaudible] from Malawi. I had a similar question. Does that mean now this policy will include mixed ASCII and non-ASCII characters?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think the way to look at it is not ASCII is a subset of Latin. And within Latin and other scripts, you may have IDNs, so decorated Latin, I think that's the term. As long as they are from one end of the script, so ASCII, because it's a subset, it dilutes the discussion. In the policy itself, at the end of the day, we try to avoid ASCII as a term and go back to one of the ISO standards around it. But if the selected string is expressed in the same script, and it includes a non- or a decorated Latin character, so an IDN, then it could be eligible, to put it that way. But it's really a corner case, so be careful. Kim, I saw there was an online question.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: There's two comments. Actually, one reminder to speak directly into the mic, if possible. And then the comment from Zoom is, in the Spanish language, due to the characteristics of the language itself, some words that can potentially be used as IDN, I believe that universal acceptance can be used as a reference to define as a possible form of management. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. And with respect to the universal acceptance as a form of management, we'll check the working group and ask the working group. They haven't discussed it from that perspective. And so an initial

thought about it, universal acceptance is not directly related with these criteria, but it follows. Once you have it selected, you hope it works. And universal acceptance is about working of the IDNs. So if I don't see any further hands, because this is the basic, these are the basic criteria we just discussed. There are a few more we'll touch upon, so the technical criteria and confusing similarity.

So this is the technical criteria. Again, you saw it. Root zone LGR, RFC, the various RFC. And there is the criterion that at least the domain or the selected string must contain at least one IDN character. Next one, please. Now, this is your first polling. You saw the technical requirements around—they are on top of the regular requirements for ccTLDs or for TLDs in general, the technical criteria. You can go to the Mentimeter. And this question is, do you support the additional technical requirements? And this is temperature of the room, nothing else. But please check. Keep it open for a few seconds. Okay. Few more seconds. Still coming in. Okay, we stopped. Thanks, Kim. I think what my takeaway, at least, Kenny, is that we need to explain in the policy document the other criteria as well. But at least there is no objection to it. So that's a good sign. Next slide, please.

Now we're going into an area that's just recently been concluded by the working group. This is about confusing similarity. And if you select an IDN string, you need to take into account the issue around and the criteria around confusing similarity. So the way it's discussed and will be discussed, there are two parts to it. So first the criteria, which are part of the selection process itself. And secondly, there is a whole process procedures around validation, the confusing similarity validation. To check whether a selected string and its variance is not

confusingly similar with others. So let's go first to the goal of confusing similarity. Why is it introduced? And it is the goal, and it's always been the goal, again, since the fast track process itself, is the risk of the stability and security of the DNS due to user confusions. By exploiting potential visual confusing similarity between domain names, effectively you talk about DNS abuse in some cases. And this is really, say, another way of dealing with DNS abuse. And this is really DNS abuse. And now you can see the examples. So the examples, BE in Latin script versus, I don't know how to pronounce it, BE in Cyrillic.

And again, note the risk of visual confusing similarity is not a technical DNS issue. But it may have adversely impact on the DNS. It's a policy issue. And so therefore it needs to be resolved at the policy level. It can't be resolved technically, but it may have technical impact. That's the reason why it's needed. And there's another reason, say, which is very important to keep in the back of your mind when we talk about confusing similarity.

There are, and this is being identified or used by and introduced by the SSAC, if you look at confusing similarity but also in other areas, effectively two ways that which may cause risk. One is misconnection. And the second one is no connection. And there is really a major difference. A no connection is, for example, if you type something in your browser and you end up on a blank page because it doesn't exist, that's no connection. And, yeah, it's a nuisance. But there is no harm. There's no risk involved. You end up on a page. It is like a typo. And some confusing similarity may lead to something like a no connection. But is that bad? Yeah, it's a nuisance. But it's not harmful.

Misconnection, on the other hand, is you end up on a webpage or somewhere you don't want to go or you were not aware. So it allows for, first of all, exploitation. So by harm of the user confusion. But it could also cause other things. You share some information you didn't want to share and et cetera. So that's really the issue around misconnection. Misconnection is associated with harm. Because you read something and it is exploitable or you share information you didn't want to share.

So the working group focused on the area of misconnection, not on no connection. In their view, no connection is just a nuisance. So it's a little bit like a typo. So this will set the criteria, etc. And this is what, please keep this in the back of your mind when looking at the criteria and validation processes of confusing similarity. Next slide, please.

So the standard for visual similarity validation. So when is something considered visual similar to another string? You can read it. I don't want to read it out aloud. Maybe a little bit of background. This has evolved over time and is now used under the fast track process. This was the result of the second review of the fast track process. So it is an existing standard and it proved to work reasonably well. So the fast track process. And this is so the standard. So this is just, okay, when is something considered visual similar? Next slide, please.

Now, imagine that you have selected a string and it needs to be compared with something. And this is so the two sides of it is called the base for comparison. And also keep in mind and factor in the number of variants of a string. Use Pakistan again. 1,200 variants. Then the question is you ask somebody to check against 1,200 variant or 1,200

strings whether something is confusingly similar. And for your information, basically it has to be done manually. So there was a need to limit the scope, the base of comparison. So the result of that discussion you can read on the slide.

So there is a basic rule, a primary rule, which is the first couple of bullet points. And then the working group came to the conclusion that it might under circumstances be too limited. Then the similarity evaluation panel, so the panel that does the first evaluation, may determine to add additional variants to the equation. So include in the comparison set. So that could be blocked variants in the end and it could be allocatable variants of already delegated gTLDs and ccTLDs. So again, they need to determine it and they need to provide a rationale of their choice. Also of their choice not to include it. So there is transparency around this choice. So that's the discussion around the base for comparison. As you will see in the initial report. Next slide, please.

So again, any questions around confusing similarity? Or raise your hand. Or type in chat. Give you a few seconds. I don't see any. None? Okay. Let's go to the next slide. And as you can expect, temperature of the room. Do you support the confusingly similarity criteria? Thank you. Thank you again. I think the trend is very clear. Again, as temperature of the room. In the current report there is already a lot of information around this discussion included. So you will have plenty of time when we read it. And there is no objection. So that's good. Let me go to the next slide, please.

So back to the overall. We ran through the selection of the IDN. And particularly which criteria do apply. You can see the support. The

variant management. And the similarity criteria. We touched upon it. Now we go into the second phase. Which is, I would say, on the ICANN side of it. So after the parties in territory have selected the string, it needs to be submitted. And then the validation process starts. Next slide, please. So validation of IDN. Next slide, please.

So in validation. I would say there are two procedures. One is an administrative validation which is conducted by ICANN Org which is truly looking at the documents. Checking if all the documents are available. So this is really almost a checklist type of validation. And this is done before the second phase of that validation starts. And that's the validation of the requested string by independent panels. First, the technical validation and secondly around the confusing similarity validation. Again, this is built upon the experience of the fast track process. Next slide, please.

Technical validation procedure. Again, external independent panels. The details. And that's important to note. Both on the technical and the root zone LGR validation. Are considered a matter of implementation. So there needs to be a bit of leeway. And to find an optimal solution to make it work. So the working group proposes a basic criteria and sets basic parameters around the technical validation procedures. Next slide, please.

The confusing similarity validation process is building upon the current procedures under the fast track process. The first step is the similarity evaluation procedure by the similarity evaluation panel. This is a panel of independent panelists and comparable to the DNS stability panel under the fast track process. And one additional requirement that came

through is that the panel—so there is an assumption that it will be a more person panel—should at least include one member who is familiar with the script. It is not a requirement on the fast track process. Fast track process does not allow variants. However, as soon as you start talking about the variants, I hope that is clear from the presentation, you may want somebody who has an intimate knowledge of the script itself to be on the panel. So, and there is a suggestion, not more than a suggestion, to include somebody who was active in one of the relevant script panel or script panels. So, that's really working on the root zone LGR itself. So, that's the first step.

The second step is the similarity review procedure. Again, an independent panel now known as the, so it's now the extended, or the EPSRP, the extended process review similarity panel, something like this. So, the fast track, it was included at the time to use a different method of evaluation or reviewing. And this method was more based on characteristics of how people perceive characters and how they read. So, it's very much driven by cognitive sciences, etc. So, that's the similarity review panel. And again, it is using, in other terms, it's using another lens looking at strings and comparing strings. And the similarity, the first step is really, I would say, a broad look at it and the similarity review procedure will have a more focused look using a different method. So, that's how they build up on each other. The reason for calling it a review procedure, it clearly reviews the results of the previous panel. And this is important going forward as well.

And then the final step, again, this was developed under the fast track process. So, assume a string is considered similar, confusingly similar to another string or labels. There are possible methods and measures

that can be taken to reduce the risk, which are less, I would say, it's less intrusive for the parties who selected the string than just cancelling it or making it non-valid. If they are willing to take these measures and ensure they are appropriate and will be maintained, then that might be a way forward. Again, this has proven its value under the fast track process. So, therefore, it's included. Next slide, please.

So, what is the outcome of the validations, the technical and the confusingly similarity validation? If the string, as a result of these validations, either the technical or the confusingly similarity string does not meet the requirements, then it is considered non-valid or is invalid and not eligible. So, that was the end of it. One of the things, and I see some people with probably some experience in the GNSO space, and this is one of the differences between this policy, our proposed policy, and the proposals by the GNSO EPDP effort. This process, as you could have seen in the design criteria, is ongoing. So, like the fast track process, there is no time slot or there is no slot to submit anything. If you want to request and work on a selected string, you can do it now, you can do it in five years, or you can do it in three years, whatever you want. And that's the reason. So, even if it's invalid, you can go back, adjust, and resubmit. Next slide, please.

Any questions on the validation process? So, this was step two, indeed. Raise your hand. I don't see anything in chat. Anything remotely? No hands, no questions. Okay, thanks. Can we go to the next slide?

Again, validation process. Do you support? Don't support, don't know? Thank you. Again, the same outcome. Now we go to the third part, and this is to show you how this proposed policy builds on the already

existing and applicable policies. So, this is about the delegation, transfer, revocation of selected ID and CCTLD strings.

One of the criteria, as you can see, is that ASCII ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs are all ccTLDs. The implication of this is effectively that IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs should be delegated, transferred, and revoked in the same manner. So, yeah, the same policy should apply to them. So, if you look at it, that is stated in this policy just to avoid any confusion, but that's what I'll illustrate. Next slide, please.

So, the applicable policies you can read. I will not go through the list. There is a bit of an exception, as I talked about when I introduced the policy. There are a few exceptions, put it this way. One, the best example is that variants always need to be delegated to one and the same ccTLD manager. So, if there is a transfer, all IDN ccTLD and all its variants have to be transferred to the other. So, there is no way that you, through transfer, could split that set of variants. And the same is true when a IDN ccTLD is retired, a selected string is retired, because the variants are derived from that string, then all IDN ccTLDs, including its variants and its variants, should be retired as well. So, it is, yeah, all for one. So, next slide, please.

So, any questions on the applicability of the policies? Any hands? Then we go to the next slide. As you can guess, there will be a poll. Keep you awake. Do you support the proposal around the applicability of ccTLD policies? I see one no support. Wait a few minutes. So, I don't know, just out of curiosity, because I think this is a learning point for the working group. If a person who does not support the general applicability of ccTLDs could speak to it or is willing to speak to it, is that person in the

room or online? So, if you don't support, because we see two who don't support this, you're willing to talk to it, speak to it? Hands up or type in chat. I can't see if the person has typed in chat. No? Okay. Then we move on. Thank you. But it's something to keep in the back of our minds.

So, now we go to the final bit, the deselection. So, a string has been delegated. An IDN ccTLD has been delegated and its variants. What will happen next and how does the review mechanism apply? So, this is the final step of the process. Next slide, please. Next slide. Deselection of IDN ccTLDs. Again, we discussed this as a general principle. The retirement policy applies and it flows from the applicability of policies as well. And if you look at policy, say the retirement policy, what this policy looks at is the trigger event in terms of the retirement policy. So, when and how does a deselection triggers the retirement policy or the retirement process in future? So, next slide, please.

The working group has identified various events that could lead to the deselection and hence retirement. One, and this is a general one, is if a name of the territory is removed from ISO 3166. So, effectively it's the line item relating to that country or to that code is removed from the list. And a recent example was, I think, and even the latest one was .an, the Netherlands Antilles. It was removed from the ISO 3166. Assume they had an IDN ccTLD, that would mean it would have to be retired as well, as was the ASCII ccTLD. So, that's the first one.

The second event that was identified, the string is no longer a meaningful representation of the name. So, a significant change of the name of the territory. Sometimes it happens. So, in that sense, the ISO list is dynamic, although very slowly. Then the language to denote the

ID and ccTLD string is no longer a designated language. It happens. There is a whole mechanism to follow and which is described in the policy. But this is considered, again, a trigger event. And the other one is the script in which it is expressed is no longer a script. In some countries, what you see is a change, for example, from Latin script to Arabic script. So, the designated language changes or could even stay the same, but the script in which it is expressed is changing. So, that would be considered a trigger event as well. And the final one, which can always happen, is that the IDN string is no longer supported by the significantly interested parties. Keep in the back of your mind, this includes a government. So, even if the registrar community or the ccTLD manager does no longer support it, the real core of it is the government needs to support it. And if the government no longer supports the selected IDN ccTLD string, then that could cause a deselection or a retirement. So, these are the trigger events identified by the working group. Next slide, please.

Again, we've done this in the past, but just to be complete. Temperature of the room. Thank you. And close the voting. Maybe, again, the question, the person who does not support, is she or he willing to speak to this? Let's see. Anybody in the chat? No? Okay, thanks. Next slide.

Now, we're into the final phase, or again, the review mechanism. And this builds on the policy developed by the PDP3, the final one. The council raised two questions to the working group. One is on the exclusion of the IRP and the reconsideration. And the second one is whether or not the review mechanism policy should and could apply to some of the decisions under the PDP4, under the proposal.

So, with respect to the exclusions, the working group advises and proposes that all claims and disputes related to IDN ccTLD selection process should be excluded from ICANN's IRP and reconsideration in line and following that all claims and disputes related to ccTLDs should be excluded from ICANN's IRP and reconsideration. So, in that sense, again, the parity between IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs. So, that's one core of it.

The PDP, the proposals build on the outcome of the review mechanism group. So, that means only for a specific deselection decision that result in action of the IFO, so retirement, and IDN ccTLD or its variants, then the proposed PDP review mechanism should apply. So, again, in line with the review mechanism policy. And these decisions have been identified.

And then finally, and that's an additional point, recall the similarity validation includes three steps. One is the evaluation panel, which is the starting point. The second one is the review panel and the review procedure. As I said, that is reviewing the policy or the outcome of the evaluation panel. But the working group considered the review procedure an independent autonomous review procedure. So, the review mechanism should not apply for this one. And the reason is, it is quite esoteric if you see what these people do. So, finding these people and building and using the general review mechanism does not make very much sense. And over time, due to the fast track process, we've all gained experience with this review mechanism. Next slide, please.

Applicability, again, already detailed. This is the details that you can read at your leisure. Next slide, please. So, again, the temperature of the

room, unless there are some questions first. Are there questions around this one, review mechanism? Nope. Nearly there. No. You can close the polling. Again, yeah, thanks for support. Next slide, please.

Back to the overview. And it's included now as a kind of summary on the policy. So, I hope I clarified the various elements of this table, starting with the design criteria, then going through the selection. So, this is really what's happening and needs to be done by parties in territory. They need to consider these criteria. Then the validation process. Again, two types. One is the administrative validation. The other one is more the validation by external and independent panels. Finally, the applicability of policies. So, around delegation, transfer, revocation of IDN ccTLDs and its variants. And then the final deselection and retirement or review mechanism. So, this is covered. I hope it provides you more in-depth insight in the proposals. Now we can go to the next slide and the final polling. is a multiple choice one. So, you may even select all five. Okay. Thanks. Close the polling, please, Kim. And there is more in the language and the stress testing on the other, on the last two ones. Next one, please.

And this And now, Anil, please go ahead.

ANIL JAIN:

Thank you, Bart. And thank you. As we have seen that the whole working group has gone through the various process of defining the criteria, selection of a string, looking at the various aspects which cover up the possibility of deselection or removing the script. A very innovative method of testing what the policy development has done was the stress testing.

Now, here the working group might not be able to visualize the entire process or all possible outcomes which are possible from the policy. And this opened up a process to the community to understand that what are the possible impact a policy can have. So the stress test's purpose was to check the potential issues with the process of development to date. Then to understand how outlier situation play out under the policy and what will happen under the proposed policy. So next slide, please.

So we have developed into three steps. The first step was to develop the scenario. It means that a particular example, for example, the criteria, how the criteria, what we have defined is going to develop on this. And then the possible scenarios have been created by the working group members. And there were a huge number of scenarios which has come. Then every scenario was tested on the policy. So impact of the policy, how does the scenario play out under the policy and what will be the result of the scenario under the policy?

And then once we are able to understand that which scenario has impact on the policy, then what is the level of that impact? Assessment of the impact was taken out. Does the outcome of the step number two result in unwanted outcome or an unforeseen negative impact? And in case we are able to find out that there are certain reasonable impact which is going to come on the policy, then the whole working group revisited the policy, discussed and debated the policy outcome and then readjusted the policy whenever there was a requirement. Next slide, please.

So in total, 33 stress tests were conducted, focusing on all the four areas, that is the eligibility criteria, that is the test of eligibility. Then the three important things, deselection criteria, variant management criteria and the confusing similarity or the string similarity validation. So a huge amount of time was spent on this. And the basic purpose of the stress test was to ensure that in future there should not be any scenario where either the delegation of a string or the after effect of the delegation can be challenged.

So this is what we did in the stress test. And we find that this is very useful. And we have suggested to IDN gTLD EPDP process also to undertake the similar test to test their policy. So this is from my side. Thank you. Over to you, Bart.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you, Anil. And that's regarding to stress testing. And let's move to the next slide. So any question from stress testing? Okay, hearing none. Next slide. So let's final write up and next slide, please. So that's all the issue has been addressed in the ccPTP4. And that's the list I just mentioned in the previous discussion, including some various issues with respect to 2013 recommended policy and including variant management. And also under the request by ICANN Board in coordination with the GNSO EPDP working group. And also identify the trigger event that could cause the retirement of IDN-ccTLD through the policy. So I'd like to move to the next slide.

Since the working group already completed all the discussion and all the tasks. So starting from right now, we are working on the initial draft. Theoretically, the initial draft will be given by the end of June 2023. And

then we will follow the standard policy development process and put the initial draft into public comment period. And that's theoretically starting from July until September 60 day time frames. Then after that and the working group will conclude to collect all the feedback by the community and try to consolidate and integrate the feedback and into the initial report and then submit a report to the ICANN.

So now we're pretty much the rest of the PDP process from the working group. Is there any other question? Okay, hearing none. Any question from online? No. Okay, it seems that we've covered everything on our agenda. Let's conclude our session today. Thank you very much. Thank you for your participation. This session is officially adjourned. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]