
ICANN79 | CF – ccNSO: ccPDP4 Community Update Work Session
Tuesday, March 5, 2024 – 4:30 to 5:30 SJU

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hello and welcome to the ccPDP Community Update session. Claudia and I are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom onsite, participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Interpretation for the session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. Please state your name for the record and the language you wish to speak. For the behalf-- I'm sorry. On the benefit for other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Kenny Huang, chair of the ccPDP IDN Working Group.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Kenny Huang, chair of ccPDP4 working group. Welcome for joining this section, and the section actually chair by me and also will be facilitated by Bart, sit next to me.

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.

He will be able to facilitate a discussion and collective input from all of you.

Starting from today's session, actually the agendas given here starting from we are going to the final report for ccPDP4, introduction for ccPDP4. And also giving some quick update what happened after ICANN77. And also that will be a decision making especially because we're going to giving a final report for policy proposal and also advice to ccTLD manager and wrap up and the next step. Next slide, please.

So what will be the composition of the final report, including four parts. The first part will be introducing ccPDP4. Second part will be the policy recommendation that's coming from the working group, also integrate with public input. We have call for public comment and we collect a public comment, integrate in the final report. And the third part will be: advises to IDNccTLD manager. The last one will be appendix. Moving to next page, please.

So you're probably familiar with the diagram, and basically the initial for the latest concept is come from very early stage. For example, starting from 2013, actually we have Fast Track Process for IDNccTLD at that time. And so different kind of IDNccTLD policy proposal was submitted during the Fast Track Process.

As you're probably familiar with the public Fast Track Process, basically it's not a policy, it's a common agreeable measure. So most of the ccTLD manager happy to go with Fast Track Process. But to smooth the process into a more mature policy, so we define the policy select selection of IDNccTLD stream and inclusion of IDNccTLD in CNSO. Next slide, please.

So the roadmap shows how we move from the Fast Track Process moving until now. Basically the ccTLD set established ccPDP2, the close and evolution of Fast Track Process and stop get analysis overall IDNccTLD policy. It was complete in June, 2019, and after that we were replacing ccPDP2, and the two major milestones will be on the bylaw change process allow IDNccTLD in the ccNSO, that has been approved by the ICANN Board effectively date on the 2nd of June, 2022.

The other major point will be ccPDP4 Working Group is established and we try to identify from the issue report adopted by ccNSO console in May, 2020. And also, this time ICANN79 that will be given the final report for the working group. And the rest will be ccNSO decision making process starting from March until June this year. Next slide, please.

So that will be the overall activity. Basically, we have policy development has been accomplished including the final report approval by the working group that was been approved in 20th of February this year. And also review of the public comment and update the policy where necessary. That was complete in February 2024 this year. And the public comment initial report was concluded in October, 2023. And also, [inaudible – 05:15] has been identified given the comparison with the GNSO IDN EPDP initial results and that has been included in the August, 2023. We have completed variant management, and that has been completed in January, 2023.

And also, we have completed a group review in the deselection procedure. Also, we completed the Confusing Similarity, that was

completed in February, 2024, this year. And also, we conducted a string test in different stages, including the ICANN meetings as well. Okay, next slide, please.

So that will be the major issue to be addressed in ccPDP4, the Part A final report including the forum. From August, 2020 issue report, given that we have various issues with respecting to recommended policy for selection of IDNccTLD string, and that including the work delivered by ccPDP2, and that has been identified by the primary review team. And also include variant management and that request by ICANN Board director, and also we require coordination with GNSO. And consistent with GNSO IDN EPDP effort to make sure that our policy will be at least consistent with the policy identified by GNSO IDN EPDP Working Group. And also define the events which would cause the retirement of IDNccTLD through the policy. And under this policy, we identified some trigger events developed under the ccNSO Policy Development Process pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs.

So also as a request of ccNSO in August, 2022, we develop view on applicability of ccNSO policy and review mechanism and whether ICANN independent review process or reconsideration process should be available. So we also identified that kind of review mechanism, make sure under certain stage we need to apply the review mechanism in different stage. Later Bart will also break down this kind of stage to see how the review mechanism will be applied. Next slide, please.

The topics out of scope under ccPDP2, that also was part of the final report including the first part: IDNccTLD managers are expected to

publish repertoires of Unicode code points that are permitted for registration under the selected IDNccTLD string, and/or its variants. This is out of scope.

Second part will be: A Second Level Domain registered under the delegated IDNccTLD string are expected to be registered for the same entity under other dedicated variant IDNccTLD strings. And these two parts basically are out of scope for the ccPDP4 Working Group. Next slide, please. So as I mentioned, those issue has been addressed in a ccPDP4. For example, like we have resolved the various issue especially for what identified by ccPDP2, they identify recommended policy for the selection of IDNccTLD string.

Also including the variant management as I mentioned before, and that was request by ICANN Board director. Also, we need to have coordination effort with G NSO EPDP Working Group, and we make sure that will be consistent, but it's not the same, it's not truly identical. Same process, but it should be coordinate process with GNSO IDN EPDP work group.

We need to identify the event level cause the retirement of IDNccTLD through the policy as developed under ccNSO Policy Development Process pertaining to the retirement of ccTLD. The second part will be the as a request ccNSO council in August of 2022 did develop a view applicability of ccNSO policy and review mechanism, and whether ICANN independent review process and consideration process should be available. Okay, I'd like to move the rest of the discussion to Bart. Bart will lead a discussion to the group. Thank you. I'll move over to you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Kenny. And can you go to the next slide, please? My role is more to run you through the policy recommendations, give you a bit of an idea of some of the changes since the last update, but also prep you potentially for the ccNSO members vote, which is expected between now and the Kigali meeting on this policy assuming the council will approve and support the policy at this meeting. Next slide, please.

So, the policy proposal, it includes these various, I would say, chapters. We'll run quickly through them and say when I reach them, I'll go in more details, but it gives you a rough idea. Next slide, please.

And the way it's been distributed, you can see here as well, sections one and two of Part A cover the policy objective, et cetera. And the design principles or design criteria. Sections two and three and six are really about the selection of IDNccTLD strings and variants. To give you an idea, this is in a way is, say, country codes. The two letter codes are defined by ISO, and for IDNccTLDs, there is no such process. So that needed to be developed through a Policy Development Process by the ccNSO. Then the section 7 to 10, it's all about validation of the IDNccTLD string and variance, whether they meet the criteria that's been developed.

And then, of course, there is always a question about delegation, transfer revocation, and retirement. ccTLDs, that is clear, so the two letter codes, but it needs to be stated that, these rules also apply to IDNccTLDs, and that's covered in sections 11 and 12 of Part A. And then finally, section 13 is about the review mechanism and its

applicability. And there is also a section 14 with some miscellaneous suggestions, but we'll not discuss those. Next slide, please.

Principle and design criteria, I will not go into the details. You've seen them more than often, more than once. The reason why they're there, they drive the process and they drove the process of developing this PDP. So the working group started with accepting and adopting those, they were the same one that were used at the time when the fast track was developed, there was no need to adjust them, reinforce them. And I think these design criteria for the policy, they cause the difference between this policy and, for example, the GNSO IDN PDP. One of them is the ongoing process, and the criteria that a string must be associated with a territory. So they cause the difference between this process and the GNSO IDN EPDP. Next slide, please.

So I'll go a little bit into detail into the selection of IDNccTLDs and their variants. Next slide, please. The selection is yet the general criteria. Again, you've seen and heard this more than often, more than once, often enough. It is and remains, and that's the proposed IDNccTLD string. So there must be a meaningful representation of the name of a territory in a designated language and the related script.

This has been the criteria that was used in a fast track and still is in use, and the proposal is to keep this as a main, main, main selection criteria. One of the important aspects, and again, this is a different, the selection process itself is an in-country in territory matter. There's nothing for ICANN or IANA or the ccNSO itself. They set the criteria, the local or the significantly interested parties in country, they select and

they need to support this string, and that it is a meaningful and it needs to be documented. Next slide, please.

Other criteria for the selection of the strings itself is technical criteria. Only one IDNccTLD per I would say language script combination and non-contentious within the territory. So that means it needs to be supported by the significantly interested parties. Doesn't mean unanimous, but definitely the government needs to support it and the majority of the other significantly interested parties. And again, that is defined, and the definition is taken from the framework of interpretation. So there is alignment in that sense as well. Next slide, please.

So again, this is a multimeter, but I don't see that we have the code. It was in initially. Are there any questions? Kim, can you insert the code, the QR code? You can do this? But if you have any questions, this is a moment to do it. No, we don't have the code. It was on the-- I see your hand in the back. Yeah, go ahead.

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Hi, Bart. To ascertain the support from the significantly interested parties, are there any requirements or expectations about how public that process should be in the country, or that's left to the local community?

BART BOSWINKEL:

That is a local matter. The only thing is, say, as you will see and will note in the policy document, there are certain requirements about the

who should be included and who is considered part of the significantly interested parties, and that they need to document their support for the selected string. So in that sense, there is an indirect criteria that whomever wants to request the IDNccTLD string needs to get the documentation in place including from those significantly interested parties listed in the policy. Does that address your question, Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Yeah. Basically, the reason for the question is that some third party might show up later saying, how come we never knew that this application was being prepared? Besides the government, which obviously is a significantly interested party, what others are explicitly required to be consulted?

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think that depends very much on the local circumstances, and there is a limited enumeration in the policy, and it's very much dependent on the country territory you're talking about. So that makes it a little bit hard to answer that question explicitly. You should be involved and I should be involved, and maybe somebody else should be involved. Again, that's really a local matter, but the government, that's clearly one. Questions. Can we go back to where we were, Claudia? Next slide? That was the criteria one.

The next bit, and this made this policy a little bit more complicated than the PDP2 and also the fast track, is the introduction of variants of characters and variant management. It's very clear those people who not use, say, who use other script and Latin script, some of these

scripts, do know and do have a lot of variants. In the discussions, one of the examples that was used was Pakistan in Arabic, in the Arabic script, I have to be precise. And Pakistan in the Arabic script has about 1200 variants. So some of them are eligible, some are non-eligible. So there is a need to limit that number.

And the first step, if you look at, and that's why the definition of variants is so important and the work done by, say, I think it started in 2009 on variants and the root zone label generation rule is the label generation rule identifies those variants of characters which are allocatable, meaning can be used for strings and which are blocked, which are out and cannot be used. If you go back to the example of Dot Pakistan in Arabic script, I think that number was reduced from 1200 to around 10 allocatable variants. And then still you have a bit of need to say with the other criteria.

But now you see how important it is to discuss and understand the impact of variants when used. For those of you who are not familiar with variants, variants say from a linguistic, I would say user perspective are considered the same as the ordinary character. I can't recall the details, but that's my understanding at least. So that's why for the usability, variants and the introduction of variants is very important. However, as I said, there is a need to say you've got this legitimate need for variants and that needs to be balanced with general responsibilities, security, and stability of the DNS.

They say, if you all of a sudden just buy one IDNccTLD string like Dot Pakistan, which would all of a sudden introduce over 10 and maybe 1200 ccTLDs, which will not happen, and they will consider to be the

same, Imagine what would happen if you do this for 252 countries or territories. It would become an unmanageable and unsustainable system, and et cetera.

So therefore, the need for discussion around variant and variant management. Next slide, please. So if you look at the final report, you will see that the variant definition has been slightly updated in order to say after extensive discussion. Again, I can't say otherwise. I hope it's clear. I will not go into the details, you will see it and you can read it on the slide.

And next slide, please. And variant management. Again, going back to my example, so even with the number of allocatable variants, there is this, say, although they from a, I would say user perspective are the same, at the end of the day, from a technical point of view, a technical operational point of view, they are all different labels, they're all different TLDs. So they need to be delegated separately, and they will be included in the root zone, and the root zone file as separate strings or separate labels. So at the suggestion, I would say, at the following, the advice of SSAC and after extensive discussion again of the group itself.

The number of delegatable variants has been, again, limited and also to maintain the criteria of meaningful presentations of the name of the territory in the designated language to delegatable variants and a delegatable variant. So these are the delegatable IDNccTLD variants.

These are the allocatable variants, which are a meaningful representation, point one. And secondly, in the designated language. Again, using my example in Pakistan, if you would apply the criteria of

meaningful, say, of delegatable variants, you end up with two meaningful representations.

There are other allocatable variants, however, they end up to be from a different language. So to maintain the criteria of designated language, the delegatable variants is defined as it is defined. Next slide, please. Any questions on variant and variant management, a final last time? Then you can use the Mentimeter [00:25:49 - inaudible].

NABIL BENAMAR:

Nabil Benamar, for the record, from the USG. I just would like to add something about the definition of variant because it's not only about the visual similarity. It can apply not just visual appearance, but also meaning or pronunciation. You have mentioned the Sot Pakistan, it's a good example, but because the Arabic script is used in different languages as the Arabic, the Urdu, for Pakistan and Farsi for Iran, for example.

And here comes the big challenge that we have faced when we worked on the whole generation rules for the task force for the Arabic script IDNs. For the top-level domain, you have lot of similar characters, but there are some characters that are used in, for example, in Arabic, are not used in Farsi and vice versa.

The example that you mentioned is very clear, but you have the same thing in Latin script for F, for example, F in two different set of characters, you have Latin and Greek for example. So it's not only

about visual effects or similarity, but also pronunciation, meaning, et cetera. So that's a large scope of the definition of variants.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, but look, as I said, I'm not an expert and this is a summary of the summary of the discussions, and this is where the working group, after very extensive discussions and using and going back to the RZ-LGR, and some people were on some of the script communities panels, this is where the group ended up. And I thank you for the clarification because, if you're not familiar with it, it is really a [00:27:51 - inaudible], and it's fascinating, but, yeah, translating this into these type of criteria is hard work, I tell you. Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Nope. Then we move on.

The technical criteria, again, no real changes there. This goes back to, I would say, the Fast Track Process ccPDP2. What has been added is that the variants need to be calculated by the use of the roots label generation rule. So meaning whether a variant is allocatable or blocked, and then the policy sets the additional criteria of a meaningful representation in the designated language.

Next slide, please. Now into another, I would say, area for specialists, it is confusing similarity and the validation process around confusing similarity. And this is where, I would say, an area where this policy diverts in this or there is a main, not diverts, there is a difference with the GNSO IDN EPDP, and that is based on, say for two reasons.

One is regarding the review mechanisms that's been introduced and excluding the IRP and reconsideration, et cetera. So that's one reason,

and other reasons. And the validation processes, if I understand it correctly, of the GNSO IDN EPDP have been designed and developed in the EPDP or in the SubPro process.

And this one, say, for the ccNSO PPD, it builds on the experience of the Fast Track Process. So this is where you'll see difference. First of all, the difference is not so much in the definition. What is considered confuse or what is the goal of confusing similarity?

It's to avoid user confusion at the end of the day by exploiting potential visual confusion between domain names. Now you can see the example. And the real risk is not so much of no connection to a domain name so that you by mistyping, et cetera, do not connect. It is to avoid misconnection meaning that you end up on a, say, with a TLD, which was not intended. So that's misconnection.

So there will be connection, but not the one that was intended due to the visual confusion of the characters. And you can see, again, this has been extensively discussed and refers to work of SSAC in this area as well. And also the work done in the evolution of the Fast Track Process.

So next one, please. Next slide. Again, so the standard has been-- this is the same standard as in the Fast Track Process. So that's now part of the proposed policy.

Next slide, please. And we discussed it. And then the scope for assessing the confusing similarity that has been updated since the public comment period. Originally, only the requested IDNccTLD and the requested variant would be used to compare against potential

with other strings. And that set is defined as well. So that's the comparison set. However, the comparison set has two steps. One is a set already delegated, so what is available or what is in process and their variants. And the variants could be allocatable or blocked variants, but the panel who will do the first step or the first evaluation may limit or may extend the set of variants they will include in the evaluation process, sorry, based on likelihood of misconnection, so the likelihood something could happen, scalability of the evaluation itself.

Again, keep in mind the example of Pakistan, if you have to compare against two Pakistans or against 1200 Pakistan makes a lot of a difference in scope or comparison. That's why it's the scalability, and most of it is manual, it has to be done manual by the panel. So therefore, you want to limit it.

And there will also be some unforeseen or unwanted side effects. If you have to limit it too much, you can almost-- so that's a bit of a balancing factor. If you have to limit too much, you can almost guess there will be unseen or unwanted side effects. So it's up to the panel to determine the real scope of the comparison side. The change now in the final version is that this also could happen, but with respect to the request side. So if an ISN ccTLD string is requested, that will be included in the request side of the comparison. But if no variant has been requested under the original version, it would not include the variants.

Now in the new version and updated proposal, the request side or the panel may decide to include allocated and blocked variants as well.

Again, they have to provide a rationale and taking these factors into account just to avoid and to come up with a procedure question. Go ahead.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah, this is Abdalmonem Galila for the record. Actually, I see the document now for the final report. Actually, the report didn't touch anything related to normalization.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry?

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Normalization, one of the normalization. One of the forms to represent a string is normalization. There are three forms, NFC, Normalization Form Composition, NFD, Normalization Form Decomposition, and have another term I couldn't remember that have composition and decomposition. So all the string should be normalized, and it's recommended to be NFC, which is not here inside this report. So could we go for that to include that?

BART BOSWINKEL: I saw Sarm'ads hand, and this is an area even if you asked me a thousand times, I wouldn't know the answer. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, thank you, Bart. This is Sarmad. So the string, which is applied for, it's assumed that it is in an IDNA 2008 compatible form, which means that it would be normalized and only the normalized string will be applied for as part of the application. So that's, I guess, not something we can need to worry about inside this system. It's taken care of by compliance with IDNA 2008. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yep, same answer.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah, it's kind of complicated. Even the normalization doesn't always give a satisfying answer, but that's details [00:37:05 - inaudible], I think 48 for Unicode. So that's why [CROSSTALK] waiving is necessary.

BART BOSWINKEL: So in the sense just to, and say to make very clear, this is captured by referring to the relevant RCs, et cetera, that say we don't need to go into those details of normalization yet in a policy document. Yeah, answer your question.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah, actually, yes, but actually, when I select a string, it should be documented at something or any other places that I should go for normalization, which form, NFC or NFD? Where it is here? It has to be here, or it should be in by default for IDNA 2008. Which one?

BART BOSWINKEL: Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Bart. This is Sarmad. So IDNA 2008 requires that the strings applied are in NFC form, but that's part of the RFC, so it doesn't need to be here. Thank you.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Thank you.

NABIL BENAMAR: But for the record, this is maybe for the record, just one question. In one of your previous slides, you used the word must in capital letters. Is it like the RFCs, it has the meaning of an RFC? This is a policy.

BART BOSWINKEL: In some point, we try to avoid to use that word in the policy document itself. Originally, we had it and there was an intention to use it in the ROC type of-- in that sense, this is a bit of recycling of slides. As I said, this is an update and I'm only focusing on the real differences between the initial report which this document of the original slides and this one.

So don't get too much hang up about the slides themselves. If you really implicit, please read the policy document itself. This is just a summary, and it's my summary and the faults are mine as well. Anybody else? Can we go to the next slide, please, Kim? I think we've

addressed this, unless there is somebody else who has a question, comment.

Then we can move on validation processes, et cetera. So next slide, please. And I'll do this fairly quickly. If you look into the document, the policy, effectively there are two main categories of validation. One is administrative, and what the administrative validation is if a string is submitted in a special, say, according to how it's required, ICANN is expected to check whether all the requirements are met in the sense of is it the correct form, is the required documentation submitted, et cetera.

And so that's really administrative validation and it's around the criteria listed in the document itself. A second set of validations, and the real complicated area is the validation of the string itself by independent panels. And then as I-- oh, that sounds-- as I said, there will be, say, and as you recall, there are technical and criteria, and the string needs to meet the RZ-LGR criteria.

So that's one validation, that will be done by a technical panel. And then there is the confusing similarity validation, which in cases of ccTLD may be very complicated, and that's one of the things we learned from the Fast Track Process, and that's why the process itself is fairly unique in that sense. So can you go to the next slide, please?

Tactical validation, as I said again, external independent panelists, the details are a matter of implementation. Next slide, please. The confusing similarity validation procedures effectively, and that was necessary, and this is the current status under the fast track, which is confirmed in the policy is a three-step approach.

First, the general, almost broad evaluation procedure. So with the similarity evaluation panel. That was, if you would compare it with the fast track, is the DNS stability panel under the fast track. And you can see the additional requirement. Then there is a next step in case A, and this is only available to the requester at the request of the-- is only available at the request of the requester if a string is considered or deemed not to be valid. So it is considered to be or is deemed to be confusing, similar.

Then there will be a similarity review procedure, again, independent panel, and they will use a different methodology to assess the confusing similarity. If you want to know the difference between the two, I refer you to the Fast Track Process where this is extensively documented in a few of the guidelines.

And then the final step, again, this was necessary, at the end of the day, if you recall the definition of confusing similarity, it is about risks. So there is always the opportunity for requester to use risk and suggest risk mitigation measures in certain circumstances. And again, they need to be validated that they really do the work, so to avoid the risk of misconnection and the risks associated with it. So that's why you see this in the policy. In part A, you will see an extensive section on the confusing similarity validation process of procedures. Next slide, please.

So the outcome of all of the validation process itself, you can read it for yourself. At the end of the day, it is that the requested IDNccTLD string and the requested variants are eligible for delegation, and then we go into the next phase of the policy. Effectively, this is where this

policy start and builds on the- next slide, please- builds on the existing delegation transfer revocation policy, so ROC 5091 as interpreted through the framework of interpretation and including the retirement policy, by the way.

So this adds and builds on the existing policy framework. There are unfortunately a few exceptions, and that has to do with the variants. Can you go to the next slide, please? So as you can see the exception to all this is that variants, as I said, are considered to be similar or the same as the primary or the selected string. If you would and allow to delegate them to different entities, you lose that similarity. So you need to ensure this, and this is the reason why you would see in the policy, this is an exception on the, I would say, the regular policy that an IDNccTLD and its variants must be delegated. So really a shall and must be delegated to one and the same ccTLD manager.

So it's not the ASCII ccTLD and the IDNccTLD, but it's the IDNccTLD and the requested variants, they must be delegated to the same ccTLD manager. So that's an exception on the general rule that say the IDNccTLD and the ASCII ccTLD can go to different managers. Next slide, please. The selection and retirement, again, there has been no update in this area, so I'll really go quickly through it. But so be aware, this is also included.

Can you go to the next slide, please? Deselection is effectively defining the trigger event for retirement in case of IDNccTLD. And what makes it complicated is it is clear if a country code is removed, so the two-letter code is removed from the ISO 3166, that the ASCII ccTLD will be

retired, there is no basis anymore. However, with IDNccTLDs, it is a little bit different.

So in the policy, you'll see these various trigger events described. What is, and again, this is where this policy proposal builds on the retirement policy. Once a trigger event has occurred, then it will follow the retirement process as being recently adopted by the Board and is on the brink or has been implemented. Next slide, please.

So as I said, there are various trigger events, they're extensively described in the policy itself. I'll not go through them, but they all have to do with the criteria for selecting an IDNccTLD string as we discussed previously. Next slide, please. And then the final one, this is also relevant for the building on the potential and review mechanism. So again, there is a suggestion in the proposal that all disputes and claims related to the selection will be excluded from the IRP, so ICANN's Independent Review Process and Reconsideration, and as well as the delegation transfer revocation retirement is also of IDNccTLDs is excluded.

Next slide, please. And then the review mechanism, you can read for yourself. There are, again, some areas where the newly, say, the policy that's under consideration by the board should apply and should be available as well for IDNccTLDs. Next slide, please. So my final round, any questions, comments from the audience? None. Next slide, please, and I hand it over.

And again, I don't know if you can use Mentimeter, if you want to use Mentimeter. This is just to sense a little bit the temperature of the room as the council will be discussing this on Thursday to give them

an indication where you are with respect to this policy, and it's open to everybody. So this is really about the full set of recommendations. I think we can close and wait few more seconds. Okay. Thank you. I'll hand it back to you, Kenny.

KENNY HUANG:

Okay. Thank you, Bart, and also thank you for everyone being here, giving your feedback. The next step, first of all, I'd like to thank all the member and participant of the ccPDP for working for your tremendous effort, and so we deliver a final report and that was available on our website. And thank you very much, all your effort that's been passed through three year more than six months. Thank you very much. So a big round of applause to the old members and participants.

Okay, so the next step will be ccNSO vote on policy recommendation in accordance with Annex B ICANN bylaw, council vote on recommendation Part A final report, and ccNSO member also vote on the policy recommendation itself. Then it'll be ccNSO Council SubPro advice to IDNccTLD manager, expect to be implemented by March of 2024, this month. In accordance with 2022 internal rule of the ccNSO, this could be effective seven day after publication of the council resolution. So according to current Policy Development Process. Next slide, please.

So let's the timeline for vote on policy recommendation. The first action, submission of final report had been done on 23rd of February. Also, council decision, that will be made on 7th of March, this week, this Thursday, I suppose. Yes. And also, the submission of member report to all members, that will be implemented on 12th of March.

And community webinar on voting and ccPDP4, that will be done in 21st of March. Member vote, that will be starting from 27th of March and 17th of April, next month. So eventually, theoretically there will be submission to the Board report, that could be done starting from 12th of June this year.

Okay, next slide. I think that's pretty much all the-- Okay. Thank you. If you have any question or any comment, please feel free to raise your question or concern or recommendation. Thank you very much. Okay. No other question. Any question online? No. Okay. Thank you very much. That cover everything on our agenda. Thank you for your participation, and I conclude. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]