

---

COPENHAGEN – ccNSO Members Meeting - Day 1 (pt 3)

Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET

ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I think we're all about here now. So, as Eberhard said yesterday, settle down now. All right.

Thank you or coming back from all the other exciting things you've been doing today. Before we go on with this next part, I just want to get a feel from the room. How many of the people here now were in the GAC and ccNSO part this morning? Okay, that's quite a lot of you. How many were not? Eberhard doesn't count too much but there's two or three other people.

What I'm going to do is I'll run very, very quickly through what I ran through this morning. But because you all heard it before, I'm not going to concentrate on it too much and then I'm going to hand over to Bart. I beg your pardon. Okay. So, looks like we have a schedule changed. Jonathan, would you look to go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I do have some slides for me there. Okay. So, I can just do this? Oh, look at that. It's the first time the clickers work for me this entire week.

---

*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.*

---

Thanks, my name is Jonathan Zuck and I am the Chair of the AOC Mandated Review of the New gTLD Program and the degree to which it enhanced competition consumer choice and consumer trust. We were tasked also with looking at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process as well as the effectiveness of safeguards.

We have just completed a draft report that we delivered on the 7<sup>th</sup> so that cleverly no one would be able to ask me hard questions about it here at this meeting. But I do commend you to take a look at the report. We're in the middle of a comment period. We just started a comment period that goes through April 27<sup>th</sup> and we're likely to do a webinar on March 29<sup>th</sup> to answer questions that you might have.

We tried very hard to make this a data-driven effort and to break the anecdotal deadlock that ICANN often finds itself in. And the net result of that is that the conclusions are not as dramatic as people probably imagined they would be. Instead, we found that there was some incremental improvement in competition quite a bit more consumer choice. There was adoption of safeguards but we haven't been able to look at the effectiveness of those safeguards.

And really need more data to do a more thorough analysis not only of the market but of the effectiveness of safeguards. And so,

---

there's a lot of recommendations in the report about getting more data which is something I'm interested in talking to you all about.

One of the most interesting things about this is defining the market itself. So, if we're trying to do straight up and down economic competition analysis, we're looking at things like market concentration figures, etc.

And likely, health index as I'm sure you're aware, one of the ongoing discussions is whether or not ccTLDs are part of that market. Absent pricing data, it can be difficult to figure out whether or not there were price impacts to the introduction of new gTLDs. And part of how you define a market is by just seeing where there were price impacts around the market.

And so, one of the challenges was actually defining the market. And we copped out and just did the analysis on a number of different global versions of the market and left it as an exercise for the reader to decide what they thought the relevant market would be.

One of our issues here is that we found that new gTLD penetration, if we looked at just gTLDs was about half. In other words, the new sales over the past three years were half new gTLDs and half legacy. If you include ccTLDs, it conveniently

---

broke into thirds. Convenient, I doubt that that's a sustained statistic but that's what it was over the past three years.

And so, you can start to see how that interplay takes place. And I'm interested to hear from you the degree to which or how you feel this competition analysis is of interest to you and how it affects you. So that's where I'd like some of the discussion to go.

As you can see, we did some breakdown and looked at so called open ccTLDs, the ones that are used as almost like gTLDs. We'd like to do more regional analysis that require some WHOIS data, etc., to try to figure out specific competition, market definitions around regional areas where restricted ccTLDs play an even more important role.

So, if we look at some of the recommendations, one of these is to collect TLD sales on a country by country level going forward. And we make that recommendation to ICANN with an understanding that they don't necessarily know how they'll do it, how they'll perform that recommendation because some of it is not data that you're not committed to sharing data the same way that the new gTLD registries are.

And so, we would love to figure out the best way to interact with the CC community to make you a part of these economic analyses. We did get some great help from the CENTR who do a

---

report largely about the European CCs but it'd be great to be able to get more comprehensive data.

There's another one recommendation that's to create and support a partner with entities involved in the collection of TLD sales data in a country by country level to figure out how to work together with you to get this information.

And then the other thing that was a big part of our discussions is about applicants from the Global South and they were very, very few. And so, we had an applicant survey where we went out and asked questions to the people who did apply. And we also had an applicant cohort survey where we try to identify similar organizations in the Global South that look like the ones that did apply in the Global North and asked them why they didn't apply and got some interesting answers back from that as well. And those reports are available online to look at.

But in large measure, it was people wondering whether there was a market, wanting to know what the business model was for new gTLD. And, of course, it's obvious that some of the people that did apply for new gTLDs are wondering what the business model is still. But we have more information now in terms of case studies and things that seem to work.

---

But again, I think that CCs are a great partner in trying to understand what the market dynamics are at a regional level and whether or not the best thing for ICANN to do is to encourage the creation of new registries in the Global South or should be more focused on more registration, more registrants in the Global South. We're sure our efforts at increasing participation in the DNS and the Global South actually take place.

So those are some of the things that we talked about. And I welcome your feedback and participation in trying to solve. Questions, discussions, etc. I didn't want to get drawn on too much but focus on things that I thought you might be particularly interested in.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nick, if you come forward to the mic, please and say your name for everybody.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hello, it's Nick Wenban-Smith. I'm from .UK. Some of us in this room will be very familiar with the gTLD Program, some of us were applicants in it. In terms of the market share impact in our respective markets, it seems to be, how should I put this? Diplomatically profound in difference in a lot of areas.

---

And I was interested, do you feel there's a big clamor of demand for future rounds of the gTLDs in your research? Do you have a feeling that there's a pent-up demand for more releases? Because it ties in to another thing that this group is very concerned with which is the Goldilocks. Is it too hot, too cold or just right in terms of geographic protections that we've currently got in place for the first rounds and what we're going to do in the future.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks for your question. We didn't do an analysis of particularly was there market demand for new strings and instead this is a supplier-centric perspective on the world. What we were tasked to do is to determine whether or not a competition was created. And so, I think it's telling that half of the new gTLD sales are too... Sorry, it's hard to phrase that, that gTLD sales last three years, half of them were new gTLDs.

Now, it's perfectly reasonable to assume that all they did was cannibalize sales that otherwise would have gone to legacy gTLDs, that they didn't create more sales overall but the conclusion can be reached so they created some competition for the legacy gTLDs. And that was the intention of the program.

---

So, it's less about waiting to see whether the market is demanding more gTLDs and more about whether or not it's creating more of a competitive environment between them and creating more consumer choice than it is about assessing consumer demand because frankly, for the most part, our consumer survey that we ran which was about consumer trust, revealed that no one even knew there were new gTLDs. So that's not the same as saying there wasn't a demand, they just literally didn't know.

And as you know, there's universal acceptance issues that continue to play got some things like that. So, I think right now, it's premature to make an assessment about whether or not the market is hungry for these new strings.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: We have a question from a remote participant. "By looking at the number of registrations, market share or number of accredited registrars, one does not see if and how the second level domains are being used. Will the CCTRT look into usage stats?" This is the question by Peter Van Roste from CENTR.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Peter, for the question and thanks for your help with data as well. The usage is an interesting thing and we're not



---

looking at it at a particularly granular way. But it is important to note that NTLD stats, for example, reported that between 60% and 70% of the new gTLD registrations were parked in some way or another.

And it's a fairly broad definition of parked. In other words, some of them are parked in that they go to a server that serves up, ads or something like that and then many of them just didn't resolve. And so, it's not always easy to determine why something doesn't resolve. Is it speculation? Is it somebody that just didn't get around to doing something with the domain yet but they wanted to hurry up and get it.

But it is a fairly high number. And it's about 10% higher than it is in Legacy gTLDs. And this is data we just got and it's not in the report yet that it's about 10% higher. So, we are going to rerun all of our competition statistics, our market concentration statistics to see if parking the parking data has some effect on those stats.

At this point, we don't have a strong theory as to why it matters, whether something is parked or not. One theory is that if it's a parked domain, then it might be less likely to be renewed. And therefore, it's creating an artificially inflated sales figure but we don't have data to back that up yet. But we are going to look at

---

them and we're going to run the numbers to see if they have an implication on concentration.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: There's a follow-up question by Peter. "Would it be fair to say that if the stats would turn out to be significantly lower than legacy TLDs, this could be an indication of a lack of demand on a registrant level?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: If which stats turned out to be lower?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Peter is typing. Usage.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, he means the reverse. If the statistics for non-parked were significantly lower. And like I said, 10% more of them are parked. So, it's not insignificant but it's also not overwhelming the difference between the two.

And so, again, we're going to run those numbers and try to see if it cause an overestimation in the impact on competition as a result of parked data. But again, there's plenty of speculation. Number one speculated TLD to this date is still .com. So, the fact

---

that there's plenty of speculation in the gTLD space means that we can't use it in and of itself as an indictment of the new gTLDs.

NIGEL ROBERTS: More questions? Are you sure? We got him here. Thank you, Jonathan. Anything else you want to say?

JONATHAN ZUCK: And just that we'd love to work with you to understand the market dynamics better. The [inaudible] the room seems to be that you don't perceive that there's high demand for these strings. And I can see why that would be the case. Again, this issue of the Global South and participation there I think is an ongoing issue that I'm sure you all face as well. And we're very interested to hear from you if there's a different perspective on the way to look into that, and that maybe trying to convince players in the Global South to bring out new strings is not the right thing to do, that there's something else that we ought to be doing to increase participation. But there just seem to be an appetite in the ICANN community to increase participation in the domain system generally in the Global South. So, let's all work together to figure out what that should look like.

All right. And please feel free to comment officially, unofficially e-mail, anything else, we'd love to hear from you.

---

NIGEL ROBERTS:                   Okay. It looks like we have got you some more customers. Welcome, Roloff.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                 All right.

ROLOFF MEYER:                 A customer. I'm just really another customer. Thank you, Jonathan. Roloff Meyer from .NL.

Jonathan, do you think that we're going to stick to those three criteria that were defined at the beginning as the overall objective of the introduction of new gTLDs, and going to evaluate against those before we take a decision on taking a new round or even on taking a decision if this was successful because if you do a quick calculation and you divide the revenues that ICANN got from the auctions of new gTLDs, by the total number of presently registered domain names under the new gTLDs, you come at \$45 a domain name which is I'm sure more than anybody else has earned with this whole program.

So, it seems that we are pumping money in a specific direction mainly which I think makes it even more important to really judge the success of this program against those criteria.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Roloff. It's a good question. And I will say that the decision whether to move forward with what are now being referred to as subsequent procedures but to reopen the application process is considered at this moment to be the de facto choice. In other words, we're talking about how rather than if in most instances unless there's hard evidence of overwhelming downside consequences and we are looking at those as well.

One of the things that we have in the field right now is a DNS abuse report that's due back to us in June. That's why it's only an interim report that we've had it in. And so, if we see that there's a much larger DNS abuse in the new gTLDs, then that will count against the marginal increase in competition.

But the extent to which the unbalanced, there's more competition and relatively mitigated downside consequences. I think it's reasonable assume that there will be more, whether it's another round or just an ongoing process, the means for new applications because even the people that spent all that money on auctions are [champing] in a bit to come back and spend more. So, in that sense, the horses are coming on their own to the water.

---

So, anything else? Don't wait until just today. Just contact me anytime.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. If not, thanks, again, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Before we go back to the meat of this next just approximately an hour I think it's going to be, Bart has got some-

BART BOSWINKEL: Just a little bit messages around the program right now. As you see, Jonathan was scheduled a little bit later. He couldn't make it so we started with Jonathan. The PDP will not take three quarters of an hour but if necessary, can extend 15 minutes. Last Hoffman's presentation on the ccNSO review has been cancelled. The main reason is it looks like the ccNSO review will be deferred until later itself. So, it will not start on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July but probably in one year time. So that's a major relief.

And the final presentations otherwise we would have done it now but unfortunately, Sarmad who signed is not available to

---

do it right now. So, we'll end this block with a bit of track presentation by Sarmad on IDNs after the PDP.

So, we now ready for the main dish of this session at least, the PDP. Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Okay. Thank you, Bart. So, we've had a few more people come in since I started earlier. I still believe that more than half of you were here this morning so I don't want to bore those of you who were here by going into too much detail

So just a quick overview. This is about the Policy Development Process for retirement of ccTLDs and the review stroke appeal mechanism for IANA stroke ICANN actions in respect of delegations, re-delegations and eventual retirements of ccTLDs.

During the DID and the FOI group work that we did over the past seven years or so, we identified two big holes. And by any stretch of this imagination, these holes can't be dealt with by interpreting the old existing policies. No matter how creative you might be or how much you might want to try, they were either not referred to at all or they were just referred to in passing. Hence that we are faced that we have to do a proper PDP.

---

Coming to the end of an exercise to produce a charter for the PDPs and Council will be asked this week to set the way forward. And I'm going to pass over to Bart now who is going to go through the detail of how things are going to go forward.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Nigel. So, you probably seen a lot of these slides I'm going to use. But we'll spend a little bit more time per slide, so please don't fall asleep.

What I'll do is first, go on into the request of the issue report, what is contained, then the scope of the topics around the review mechanism, spend a little bit more time on these topics than we did this morning with the GAC and just before the break with the Board, then go into the PDP matters themselves which will include the recommendations and then a little bit of references, etc.

The basic idea is that at the end of each of the sessions, we open up the floor for questions in order to have a more interactive session than this morning.

Yes. So, again, I will just go over this quickly. This issue report is at the request of the Council. Although issue report is at the request of the Council, there were three questions we discussed then this morning with the GAC and just right now with the



---

Board so I will not go into them. Later on in the presentation, we will spend a little bit more time on the recommendations.

Requirements of an issue report and this is just to explain why the document is as large as it is. It's the description of the issues themselves so that's probably around three pages. It includes the opinion on the scope from the germinal council. I will look into that as well.

It's about the question one of two PDPs. It's about the question around taskforce of working group. And it includes the tentative timeline. And there is also included a required view of the anticipated Board decision. This is again, a requirement under the PDP itself in Annex B.

The final, I would say the bulk of the issue report is the two charters that have been developed by the Drafting Teams. They are included as well and they've been included say as signed off by the Drafting Teams themselves. At least that was the intention.

So, the review mechanism. We just say if you look at it and this was discussed already in Hyderabad quite extensively but still, if you look at the background of the review mechanism or why it's called the review mechanism, you can see already a couple of instances where something like a review mechanism is named.

---

The first one goes back to RFC 1591. This is about the DNS Names Review Board, the IDNB which is a committee, and you can read yourself, that has never been established by the IANA but it was already noted in some of the discussions of the FOI Working Group. There is a rove for it.

If you look at it, say the mechanism proposed in RFC 1591 is quite extensive and so the questions around who should have standing with a review mechanism. It's a very, very broad proposal. So effectively say if you look at it say all significantly interested party should be able to lodge a case with a review or under the review mechanism. So that's the RFC 1591 mechanism.

Now, you have something in the framework of interpretation working group's final report that alludes to something around a review mechanism. Again, it's listed in this document and on the slide.

And then what is an interesting aspect is more negative way of formulating it is that in the current ICANN Bylaws under the IRP, so Independent Review Process, effectively disputes related to country code top-level domains and on delegation and re-delegations – and I'm quoting from the Bylaws – are excluded until such time. And that's the next phase.

---

The ccNSO has developed a policy. That's what you should read in brackets. So, it could be and it's not included in the topic or in the issues, there need to be a Bylaw change. This is the fundamental one, by the way.

So, talking about the high-level list of issues, and again, this is a summary of the list of the issues as listed in the charter, charters of the working groups. In the charters of the working group, it is more detailed and there is an underlying document that was used by the Drafting Team of the charter which goes into even more details around this.

So, this is just a summary in the issues report of the scope of the discussions pertaining to the review mechanism. Again, it's the scope of the review mechanism, the standing of parties and who has standing at the review mechanism, what are the grounds for review and of course the rules and structure of a review mechanism if the conclusion, there needs to be a review mechanism.

I think I'll pause here for a minute to have, if there are any questions regarding this part.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yes. Thank you, Bart. It's a good thing to pause because there's a lot of information here and a lot of things that are going to affect

---

all of us considerably potentially. So, I'm hoping we're going to get some feedback and some questions right now. Our microphones are walking around. At least one of them is. Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Hi. It's Nick Wenban-Smith, UK. First, I will say this is an area of very high interest to the United Kingdom and I think you heard the United Kingdom GAC representatives specifically call out. We have a .GB. It may have been seen in the news that the United Kingdom might be on the point of breaking up. In which case, some of these review mechanisms might actually be relevant to us in the not so distant future whereas I think for most people it's hopefully an abstract and a theoretical possibility.

So, we're very grateful for the work staff and for the volunteers of the Drafting Teams have come together to try to address some of these very vexing and difficult questions which have been left unsolved for many years. And I do think that some clarity in terms of the clear set of policies and procedures for the future will hopefully put us on a more sound footing than some of the past experiences. So, I want to just say that first of all.

I know there's been a lot of debates about whether it's one PDP or two PDPs. We've got two sets of charters within the same policy process. I've got quite a lot of detailed thoughts and

---

we've had a few discussions about this already. But I wanted to first of all understand since this is a ccNSO PDP, why membership is to people outside of the ccNSO.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry, could you repeat that?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, it's a ccNSO PDP. Right?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But the working group is open to people who are not in the ccNSO. Is that right? It's open to anybody with expertise outside of the ccNSO?

BART BOSWINKEL: If you look at the charter itself for this particular... We can take it up now in this discussion. If you would look at the charter for this Review Team but also for the retirement that they are structured in a similar way, in principle, it's open for ccTLD managers. But are they member or non-member of the ccNSO?

---

These will be the members of the working group. They will be appointed by the ccNSO Council which is a regular procedure.

You will see it's open for participants say from other stakeholder groups. They will be on an invitation basis, first of all, but there is effectively no limitation to that number of participation and there is no limitation to the number of members.

So, if you look at the way the charter is drafted, it explicitly refers to at least two members from each ICANN geographic region. The reason is we've seen in the past that some regions are underrepresented. It's not so much the overrepresentation, it's the underrepresentation. And you want to ensure that there is a link between the members on the working group and what is happening in the regions and that people in the regions are aware of what's happened. Hence, the at least two members from each region.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. That was a very welcome change as the drafting of the charters went through to see that it wasn't restricted to only two people from each region which I think was the plain reading of it and I'm glad that was clarified. So, thank you very much.

And I see that other people with questions. I know obviously, Martin Boyle was part of the Drafting Team and he had some

---

outstanding queries I think at the point before the papers were handed out for the meeting. And I know you've subsequently clarified but for the benefit of everybody because I know it is quite a technical subject which I think it is very important. I just want to make sure that everybody is clear on where we've got to and why.

And I had a thought since our previous meetings actually that because although the revocation question is that one of priority, I just hold this thought whether it's still correct to do them in the order that you proposed and then circle back to revocation after the retirement question because since the policy itself is not going to be put in place until the end of the procedures, I'm not quite so sure why it's so urgent to do all that.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Let's revisit this at the end of the presentation when we talk about timeline and one or two PDPs because I think we're preempting on some of the focus discussions on that one. This is more around the subject of the review. The way it's structured is first about the topics, what's in the issue report. Then, go into the questions themselves at the later stages one or two PDPs and the structure of the working group.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Got it. All right.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Bart. Nick, just a personal comment on that. As are previous to groups on this, we want to be aggressively inclusive. We want to make sure that people participate and err on the side of getting that participation with no intention to exclude anybody. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse, .NA. I just wanted to follow-up what Nick says. The ccNSO has a long tradition of always including non-ccNSO members in particular in working groups that affects them. This particular thing will only affect ccNSO members but still your question is not so much what Bart asked that we have at least two from each region. It's open to ccTLD members whether they're part of ccNSO or not because it will be an internal mechanism if it is ccTLD members, whether they are members of the ccNSO or not may decide to use the mechanism so they should be involved in making it.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. I'm looking around the room for some more. Yes, Jörg.



---

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: So, Jörg Scheweiger with .DE. I was wondering what you mean by broader defined grounds. So, I can hardly think of anything else than whether or not we look into whether due process has been followed or not. But as this question stands, one could think of a broader definition of what we should look into. And I would just be very interested to hear what we think could be included.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Perhaps I can answer that. And maybe some of the lawyers in the audience might want to come in on this. I read this differently. I read this in a way that says are you going to simply restrict appeal to, if you will say, the technical grounds a judicial review that somebody didn't follow the procedure properly or should it be broad on things such as procedure [inaudible] and so on in a slightly broader sense, natural justice and things like that.

So, I think the debate here is and we've seen this in the IRPs on various things that ICANN has defended whereby they've argued that the courts and the IRPs should defer to ICANN's business judgment and only see whether or not the technical process was followed. So that's how I read that question.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** And maybe you can. It is. That was a result of the discussion with the Drafting Team. It is trying to strike a balance to be too restrictive and to be too broad. And ultimately, it is up to the working group – assuming this will be run by a working group – to decide whether they want to address it and how they will propose or what the outcome will be.

So, if we are too restrictive already on the onset, say it might be too restrictive for the working group and the other end – and I interpret your question that way – if you consider this to be too broad, the working group might feel a need that they need to address it anyway and you go way, way beyond what was intended.

So that’s a bit of the balance. And I think if the working group goes back and receive the public comment on the issue report they should have, and listen to the recording, for example, of this meeting, they should have a fair understanding of the direction of travel.

**NIGEL ROBERTS:** Thanks, Bart. Looks like we’ve ran out of comments on this first part. Want to carry on?

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** The next one, I'll do it in a similar manner. Hopefully, I can do it a little bit quicker. In the issue report, you will find and in the charters of the working group, you'll find again a section. It's called the context for retirement. So that's more the historical background and where we are to date.

Now, it's fairly simple. It is just a limited number of ccTLDs that have been undelegated, delegation ended. And if you look at, say this was one of Martin's questions, why use the term "undelegation". Undelegation is a broader concept than requirement. For example, the first ccTLD ever to be removed from the root is .UM which is if you would look at the IANA report, it's called undelegated. It's still on the ISO list but it's no longer a ccTLD. So that's why the term "undelegated" is refers to the terminology in delegation, redelegation were. And there is no policy.

**NIGEL ROBERTS:** Just to interject here that terminology is going to be one of the tasks for the working group if it is to be a working group to deal with because we need to be precise. And there are various ambiguities.

---

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. There you are. So, the high-level issues are effectively try to come up with consistency of terminology. If you would go – and this is very broad even on the ISO list – the terminology is not consistent. If you look at the IANA reports relating to say undelegation/retirement, there are different terms used over time. So, there needs to be a consistency of terminology to understand what is really happening. And that needs to be developed for future use as well.

So, again, one of the other questions is what triggers a retirement of IDN ccTLD. Again, if you will go back in the IANA delegation/redelegation reports which is one of the reference documents, you see some events that trigger such as retirement. In some cases, it's been used. In some cases, it hasn't.

Who triggers the retirement is another question which might be relevant. Is it IANA? Is it somebody else? Again, that's the scope of the question. And additional conditions of all retirement that this is again alluded in the charter of the retirement working group, what this is about. And this is, again, more detailed in the underlying topic paper.

And finally – and this has to do with it as well – that's the experience with some retired ccTLDs. Say in some cases, there were some conditions and then the matter is what about compliance with these conditions. So, these are, I would say, the

---

areas of attention and discussion for the Retirement Working Group. Any questions around the retirement topics? [Paolos].

NIGEL ROBERTS: Just a reminder, for the record, to say your name and affiliation please.

[PAOLOS MIRANDA]: Okay. [Paolos Miranda]. I'm from Malawi with the .MW ccTLD and also with the Africa domains organization. I wanted to ask about possible handling of extensions that have a conflict. For example, Western Sahara in Africa is a conflicted TLD. So, I don't know if the working group or the process would take care of TLDs like this.

NIGEL ROBERTS: That's a very good question. It's certainly not part of retirement so if it's not been delegated or created, then it's not part of retirement.

[PAOLOS MIRANDA]: Yes, it's not been delegated.

---

NIGEL ROBERTS: There is, however, an argument that it is part of the review mechanism because one of the possibilities for a trigger, should we say, for a review mechanism is to appeal against an action or an inaction by the IANA. So possibly, yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, no more questions. I'll move on and now into the really boring stuff around the PDP matters themselves. In order to say part of the issue report has to do around the threshold criteria for PDP as it's called in the Annex. And there are sets of questions that needed to be answered. So, the first one is what are the proposed issues raised for reconsideration.

So, you can say that is the topic list. And these topics have been raised in consultation with the ccNSO Council with the delegation, redelegation working group and by the community members who participated in the Drafting Teams. So that has been described. So, that's the topic list.

The identity of the party who raised these topics, again, as I said, the community itself, the Council and the Delegation/Redelegation Working Group. And the impact of the issues identified in my view as issue manager, and that's the assessment I made, say the review mechanism and the retirement, why is the policy needed. It is to ensure the

---

predictability and legitimacy of decisions pertaining to delegation, revocation, transfer and retirement of ccTLDs. Without a policy, there is no predictability and or legitimacy of decisions or actions around retirement.

And the same without a review mechanism, this is I would say the ultimate cornerstone of the process having for predictability, legitimacy and even accountability.

And then support for the issue to initiate the PDP, in my view, there is significant support in the ccTLD community to address the issues identified. Again, Martin, as Nick alluded, one of the questions Martin raised, he feels that the word “significant support” is too strong. In particular, because the review mechanism is not well defined so you can’t say you have significant support.

On the other hand, in my response to Martin is if you go back to the discussions we had as community in Helsinki, Hyderabad, if you look at the discussions at the ccNSO Council level, if you look at the responses, the CCWG Accountability and the CCWG Stewardship had on their proposal to include or to extend the independent review process to ccTLD’s decisions, based on this and taking this into consideration, it’s my opinion as issue manager, there is significant support to issue and to initiate the PDP. Yes. Go ahead.

---

NIGEL ROBERTS: I hear a contention there as in a proposition. Now, we will come on later to use our cards on the specific things. However, if you've got your cards ready right now, I would just like to go through and I'll take them both together rather than on each individual one. I just want to get a feel of the room please.

Does the room feel that the ccNSO should address the twin holes that there is no policy on retirement and there is, should we say, an insufficiently policy on appeals that reviewed against any adverse decisions of the IANA? Can you put up your green card please if you agree? I see your card is green. Okay. Thank you very much. I could see quite a few.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no, no.

NIGEL ROBERTS: You're going to take a picture.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For the record. I'll send it to Martin.



---

NIGEL ROBERTS:                    Okay. Are you done?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:            No.

NIGEL ROBERTS:                    Come on. Smile for the birdie. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:            Yes.

NIGEL ROBERTS:                    Thank you. Does anybody have an amber or a red card? Any at all? That's significant. Thank you very much for that. Bart, you like to continue?

BART BOSWINKEL:                Okay, let's go on. Another element and, again, I just wanted to point your attention to, bring it to your attention, the issue report includes the required opinion of ICANN's General Council. And that was necessary for two reasons. The first one is address the question whether the topics identified so the scope of the ccNSO or intended policy developments is within ICANN's mission. And the second one and that's more relevant for the CC

---

community whether it's in the scope of the Policy Development Process as defined in Annex C.

Yes. The General Council agreed that say it's in ICANN's mission and it is within the scope. Then the two other questions said the policy, if developed, has lasting value. And the implication is it is going to be an ICANN policy.

So now, we're getting into the Recommendation 1 of the issue manager. And I think you've already alluded to it a little bit say the issue manager recommends that the ccNSO Council initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process to develop policies for a review mechanism and the retirement of ccTLDs. And I think you addressed that.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think we just want to take up a flag on this one specifically. If you agree with this, please put up your green card.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Green is agreed.

BART BOSWINKEL: Green is agreed.

---

NIGEL ROBERTS: And if you have any other color, can you put it up now, please?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. I will repeat exactly the question as what Eberhard said. The question is: “Please put up your green card if you agree with what’s written on the screen.” Okay. Lots of green cards. Can you please put any other color card up if you did not put up a green card? Eberhard, is your card orange or is it red? If it was, what color would it be? Let’s carry on.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Now, we’re going to, I think, one of the questions, again, from Nick but probably also from others, is one or two PDPs and the assumptions underlying, leading up to the recommendation through one PDP and the order of the PDPs.

So, again, I said the review mechanism has to be ultimately on the decisions related to delegations, revocations, transfer and retirement. And as you can see, the review mechanism on retirement or policy is partly dependent or is on the output of the work on retirement.

---

So, initially, in Helsinki, the proposal was to start with the policy development activities on the retirement of ccTLDs and which would feed into the review mechanism because then you would have a full set that is that was the more logical approach at the time.

At the Helsinki meeting, and again, that was confirmed in Hyderabad, and there was a, I would say, the sense of the room, the temperature of the room is to start with the review mechanism first on the decisions of delegation, the revocation and transfer.

And one of the arguments was that in developing this work, you could already preempt a little bit on the outcome of the working group on retirement because there would be some, probably, it would be likely – and that’s the word to use – I think it would be likely that the mechanisms for review and there would be some decisions which would use a similar kind of mechanism as for delegation, revocation and transfer. So, you just need to pinpoint the decisions around retirement which would be eligible for this type of mechanism. I hope I explained it. That was properly.

So that was one argument to start with the review mechanism. The second argument was that say especially the review that was – a review mechanism was considered more urgent. And

---

clarity around the review mechanism was considered more urgent. This still had to do with one or two PDPs. So, if you would conclude the review mechanism first as a full PDP including the members vote and it would go up to the Board and then implement it, it would be available for the membership earlier and for the ccTLD community and others.

Now, looking into the details of it, the question is how much time would you gain if you would do it that way? And looking at it, and after discussing it, I was thinking, again, in Hyderabad and after the Council discussion around this, it became very clear that you would not gain very much by this. You would gain about half a year if you do some things in parallel. And I will show you in the schedule what you could do in parallel.

The disadvantage of doing it is say having two PDPs, especially if you would start with the review mechanism, is that you need to open up the review mechanism as a full policy process right after you've completed the other one. So, it would be, I would say, you can't request implementers to start working on a policy and implement it knowing that they need to reopen it anyway because there is the output of another PDP might change it. So that was a reason to combine them again.

So, then the question is maybe, and that's where Nick was heading, maybe the order should be reversed. I still think this

---

issue report is built under the assumption that the community support for the review mechanism first and getting more clarity around it was still the case but it's open.

So that's around the PDP. So, one or two PDPs, other arguments which are relevant is said there is more flexibility. If you take one PDP or flexibility to align review mechanism and retirement, you do not have to open up the process. There is more flexibility in the total timeline as well.

And if necessary, and you will see it's partly done, you can run working groups partly in parallel especially [inaudible] volunteers, public comment periods can open up whilst another is doing its work. And the pace is determined by the community itself.

And ultimately, and I think that's the fairest of all, ultimately, if you have one PDP, you have a total package that will be voted upon by the membership. Remember, the ccNSO PDP is, in that sense, unique. Ultimately, the ccNSO members vote on the output on the recommendation from the Council before it's been submitted. So, there is also the ability to not to vote or to vote it down. And in this case, you would vote on a total package. You won't have full clarity on what is happening.

---

So, based on this recommendation and based on the discussions to date, not including this today's one is initiate one ccNSO Policy Development Process. The initial focus need to be on the development of a review mechanism for decisions pertaining to delegations, etc. So that's the highest priority for the ccTLD community to date.

Once the review mechanism is complete, its focus should be on the retirement. And if needed, revisit the review mechanism to include decisions relating to the retirement. So, recommendation is one PDP, start with the review mechanism and then open up once you got a reasonable stable proposal. Start with retirement, and if needed, revisit the review mechanism.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yes. Thank you, Bart. When we come to start waving cards again in a couple of minutes, I think we might actually split this up into parts and see if we can get some feedback on the detail of this.

I've also got some personal comments but since I'm sitting here on the chair, I'll leave those until we've exhausted what the room has to say. Have we got any questions or comments on this part so far? Nick.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Sorry. It's just a follow-on observation really is that the current processes potential usage report is I think has a two-and-a-half-year process beginning to end minimum and has 23 steps in it. And it seems to me that if you were to put the easier of the two things, I would consider the retirement first which is [notably] comes first. And you should be able to cut out a number of those steps.

And also, you wouldn't have to circle back to the review mechanism. So, it would cut out a certain amount of work. I do think that a lot of the risk in these very long projects is in hand and the length which is the longer they're gone, people change, things change, unknown, unknowns come into play here. And I would suppose advice all Council the simplest process if it's possible in the circumstances.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Bart, go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you would look into the issue report say one of the disadvantages of doing this and it was phrased in a different way is it is more difficult to manage. I think with respect to the duration, if you would look and do two sequential PDPs, the duration would increase because you would have two members'



---

votes. You can do things in parallel. Although apparently, it looks similar. As a Council, we did some exercises.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, no. Sorry. For clarity, maybe I didn't explain it right. I do believe there should be one PDP. It's just the order of the two different working groups to take out some of the extra work.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Nick. Anybody else? Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes. Desiree with .GI. I also would be in favor of one PDP process but I would like to see clear demarcation of the separate working group working on the retirement and especially the concept of the revocation of retirement that I haven't seen in your slides. I know you're making faces.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'm just looking puzzled, that's all.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Puzzled, yes. But I think that's not something that's been maybe discussed. And on slide 10, I think you had no policy practices

---

today seem to have provide an insufficient framework but you meant probably sufficient framework.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Bart? I think Bart's going to go back to that slide. While Bart is going back to the slide, I'll just say the personal comments I was going to make echoed what Nick said. I think one PDP but a quick win would be good for us. But that's my personal view. Is that Jordan behind there?

JORDAN CARTER: Yes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Hang on a second. Let's just see if we can get this thing up from the slide.

JORDAN CARTER: I think the sentence say the common practices do not provide a framework that is sufficient. Okay.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'm sorry? What is actually the point here? I'm going to put my puzzled face on again.

---

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: No policy privacy [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: No. There's no policy in place.

NIGEL ROBERTS: It's no policy. Stop. Practices to date seem to be divide into [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: The comment should be a full stop.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Okay. Full stop.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Jörg. Jordan Carter, .NZ. I think we support the order that's proposed for the initial focus on the review mechanism. And that's the harder and more substantive thing to work out. And it's in our view the more important one because

---

retirements, not like will be a clear and present danger to any of us unless our countries vanish which doesn't happen all that often.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're not watching the news [inaudible]?

JORDAN CARTER: They might vanish literally but not politically. But at the moment, if there's a revocation or a change of manager at ccTLDs, we have no way to appeal that. And that's always seemed to me to be a gap. So that would be, doing that first would make more sense.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Jordan. There's obviously valid views on both sides of that particular thing. But fortunately, that's one of the more minor issues we've got. Have we got any more input or questions, please?

Hearing none, then I think what we'll do is we'll go for the cards on this and we'll take this piece by piece. Yes. So, first of all, please raise your green card if you believe we should do this work as one single PDP.

---

Put those down. If you do not believe that, please raise any other color card. I see one red there. So that means you think it should be two, Eberhard? Okay.

The second part of this is that the initial focus needs to be on the review stroke appeal mechanism so that is implicit that we do the large part of the work first and then the minor part on retirement second. That's the order that's proposed by Bart. Nick and I have suggested that we should do the retirement first that's a quick win and we could do it very quickly.

As written on the slide, please raise your green card if you believe we should do the large review stroke appeal mechanism first. Okay. I think we need to count these please. I see about 15 or 16.

Okay, please put those down. Please raise your green cards if you believe we should do the retirement first and I will put the quick win. Sixteen, it's pretty even. No, it's still very valuable information. Thank you very much for that.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're going to have fun as a Council.

---

**NIGEL ROBERTS:** It will be for the Council to decide this. Now that we've taken that temperature, one possibility I thought would be to rephrase this and to allow the working group the flexibility to determine this based on how the working develops. But that's a comment. Okay. There's only two, that's good. Okay. Bart, over to you again.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Okay. The final question that was asked of the issue manager was around Task Force or working group. And I just want to take you through again to explain what the working group is about and why not a taskforce because that will be the recommendation.

First of all, the taskforce is specified as the main option in the Annex. That's why it's raised. And if you do a taskforce, the Council must – and this word has been used – identify taskforce members including the two representatives from the regional organizations, formally request GAC participation, develop a charter or terms of reference that must specify the issues by taskforce, the timeline, etc. and specific instructions.

Effectively, we do it in a way but an assessment. The issue is if you look at timelines, etc. and the level of involvement of

---

community in a taskforce, it's one of the limiting factors. I'll come to this in a little bit more detail later on.

Another is if you look at taskforce to date, the ccNSO has no experience in working with them. In the previous PDP, it was explicit to use a working group because of its flexibility and that the ccNSO and the members could have more flexibility to organize their own activities. There are some steps that need to be followed. But that's one of the things. And especially if you have one PDP a taskforce or a working group is more flexible with respect to public consultations, etc.

So, if you look at other ways of organizing so that means the working group, it is expressly stated in Annex B that each regional organization must, within the time, appoint a representative or must be asked to appoint a representative. The ccNSO cannot force the regional organizations to appoint a representative but they must be asked to solicit the region's view in order to allow people who are not able to attend every meeting to provide inputs. If not, yes, the Council needs to be informed directly.

This is, again, a requirement. The Council must formally request the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion and advice. This was one of the questions that came up this morning with the Board or this afternoon how the GAC could've been involved given this is of

---

importance to governments. The topics are important to governments as well. Again, it's foreseen in the Bylaw or in Annex B. And again, it's included in the charter. And the Council may take other steps to assist the PDP. This allows for the flexibility that's needed.

So, the interaction between the Council and the working group is ensured under the working group structure. That's weird but that's the way the taskforce paragraph in the Annex is written.

So, another point that's relevant here is that the issues as we just said are intersecting or crosscutting between working group 1 and working group 2 or different working groups, say they're interdependent.

And in order to resolve this, this is easier or this could say issues around this interdependence can be easier resolved with the more flexible instrument like the working group. The ccNSO has experience in this regard if you look at the previous IDN PDP as it's called. There were working groups. One was around the overall selection mechanism. The other one was on changes that were needed in the Bylaws to include IDN ccTLDs within the ccNSO community because to date, they cannot become members. Although they're considered ccTLDs but because of the provisions of the Bylaw, IDN ccTLDs cannot be members.



---

And another main advantage, and I think we've seen the fruit of it already, is that the charters of working groups are, can be and should be and have been developed by the community itself. A taskforce charter is very explicit. The Council itself, it's a very top-down way of doing this. And with the charter of working groups, you have more flexibility. So that's another structure.

And so, the working method, schedule, definition of scope, etc. have been developed by the most implicit and affected parties. That is you. So, the recommendation will be effectively any potential benefit of appointing a taskforce is not a way by its inherent limitations, that is the lack of flexibility, the lack of engagement with non-ccNSO members and the outside community.

And therefore, the ccNSO Council is advised not to appoint a taskforce but to appoint two working groups each with its own charter, working method and schedule.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you, Bart. So, before I check the temperature of the room, any questions or comments on this third recommendation or the discussion leading up to that place? I don't see anybody jumping up and down screaming, not even Eberhard. Nobody? Are you sure?

---

The dispute is a little bit dry and dusty. It's administrative. Those of us who worked on working group in the past will probably think it's pretty obvious that we use working groups. But this taskforce thing does appear to be the other option and we just need to decide whether or not to use this. So perhaps I can take the temperature. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

This goes back to one of the questions of Martin on say the e-mail Nick and I discussed. It is that if you look at the issue report, there is something that says that according to Martin, the members of the working groups who have legal expertise, no mention about legal jurisdictions in the expertise. So that's probably for the review mechanism.

My point was and when I wrote it is if you look at the first sentence, it's about different sets of expertise and skillsets mostly required to address it to the different issues. In one legal expertise, especially around review is one of the more core skillsets that is or knowledge areas that is needed to have a fruitful discussion. It is not too limited. It's not that others are not necessary around retirement.

You have other issues. There are more operational business like skills may be required. But this is not to limit any skillset

---

necessary. And it's just to allude to some of the expertise and allude to the fact that in one area, a little bit more skills in one area is necessary than in another.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yes. Thank you for the clarification, Bart. So with the permission of the room I'm going to... Yes. We had some administrative stuff. With the permission of the room, I'm going to simplify this very simply. Can you please raise your green card if you think we should do this with the working groups? Looks like a pretty large number. Can you please put your cards down? And if you have any other card to raise that you didn't raise your green card, please raise it now. I see no other colors. So that would be unanimous.

BART BOSWINKEL:

So, let me take you quickly to the next steps. It's about the Council needs to decide on the initiation of the PDP which will happen hopefully at this meeting. So, tomorrow afternoon.

And the issue report will be published – yes, I've seen that – to seek public comments. And this is not to change the issue report. The public comments will be used and are for the benefit of the working groups to check whether there are comments on the issues identified, etc.

---

Then there will be if indeed the recommendation is followed, it depends a bit which one, and that's the open issue, which working group will be set off first. There will be a call for volunteers launched. The appointment by the members is by the ccNSO Council. This is more a procedure more than anything else. And the participants will be sought from other SOs and ACs or other stakeholders. And there is room for one or two experts including experts from PTI to ensure that they are aware of the discussion but also to provide input to the process as particularly factual input and pinpoint to reports, etc.

And then the GAC will be formally informed to seek their opinion on the issue report. In the issue report, there is a high-level timeline. Again, this is based on review mechanism first then retirement.

If you look at it and this is a very optimistic schedule. Probably you can't read it. But in this optimistic schedule, the PDP will be closed around 2013 in January. So, we have almost two years work ahead. Now, the reason why this takes so long is there are four periods of public comment included of at least six days. Six public comments, periods included of 40 days, included and a membership vote which can take four months as well.

So that's one of the reasons why it takes so long. So, you have some idle time. So, the effective duration of the working groups

---

in the most optimistic work or scenario is probably around a year. So, where you have the duration of the working group where people are requested to participate directly. The references are included as well. And we have addressed some of the questions unless you have any questions about the timeline. If not, then we will continue.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you, Bart. And we've done this in 59 minutes. We started just under an hour ago but we are now unconscious five minutes over. And the time that the IDN update was due to start. But very quick questions. One from Keith. Can I just take a queue? Anybody else after Keith? No. If not, then it's just Keith. You're on.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Keith Davidson. Just interested bystander. I think largely disinterested. I think just one thing more that might be useful in the retirement process might be for the ccNSO Council to contemplate writing to the ICANN Board asking them to suspend any potential or pending retirement until you have your policy developed.

And I think you can only do that now and you couldn't have done that before because you now have the process in place to

---

do that PDP. But pointing out to the Board that as there is no policy, they should not be making decisions in the interim. And there would be no harm done to suspend for two years potentially.

**NIGEL ROBERTS:** Very well put, Keith. Thank you very much. With that, thank you very much for your attention. It's been an intense hour. And onto the next. Thank you.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Sarmad, could you come up? Where is Sarmad?

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** Good afternoon, all. At this moment, we are going to have Sarmad Hussain who will be giving us an IDN Program update. And in particular, I'm confident that it's going to be quite useful for those of us who have a mother language that uses characters that normally are not found in the English alphabet. So, with that said, it is an honor to introduce Sarmad Hussain.

**SARMAD HUSSAIN:** Thank you. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to update you on the work which is going on with the IDN Program at

---

ICANN. I will take you through some of the projects which are currently underway.

The work at ICANN is largely focused on IDNs at the top level. And within that particular focus, we currently run a large IDN TLD Program which is focused on generating the Label Generation Ruleset which will help us determine what are valid top-level domains in various languages and scripts around the world and also determine whether any levels are variance of each other.

Also, we've been working on a toolset which will allow us to process these Label Generation Rules as these are formal specifications which are mission impossible. And then once the LGRs are developed for the various scripts, they need to be implemented within the process. So that's the third part of this program.

Of course, we continue to support the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process during the first stage of evaluation. And then we also have a couple of projects which are there to assist the community at the second level. Mostly focused on gTLDs but of course they remain relevant for the ccTLDs as well. They include the IDN implementation guidelines and the reference second level LGRs.

---

Finally, we keep reaching out to the community. Since IDNs are focused on serving communities across the globe, we need their support to get involved to do our work and also we obviously reach out to inform them what's going on within the IDN Program.

So as far as the TLD Program is concerned, we released the first set of Label Generation Rules which covered the Arabic script for now. These Label Generation Rules eventually should include all the scripts which are used by our communities across the globe. We've identified at this time at least 28 scripts which we are eventually going to go towards.

Since March 2016 when Arabic was integrated as the first script into this root zone LGR, we have worked with other communities and the Armenian had completed with Arabic. Since then, Georgian script community, Khmer script community, Lao script community, Thai script community and this is slightly all very recently, Ethiopic script community have also finished their work.

Some of these, the way the process works is when script community finishes their work, we release their proposal for public comment. And then based on the feedback received by the community, the generation panel, the community based panels which are working on defining these rules for top-level



---

domains, they incorporate the community feedback and finalize the proposal which is then handed over to the integration panel to integrate.

So, we now have many of these proposals finalized. Some are going to go through final public comment process. And we are anticipating to integrate them into the root zone LGR likely to be in April but there is a possibility that that may actually get delayed to about May of this year.

So, this is a status of all the different community panels which are in action. As I said, shared earlier at Armenian and Arabic have already finalized their work at the time of LGR1 about a year ago and Lao, Thai, Khmer, and Georgian community have also finished their work.

But as you can see, there are many other communities which are very active including Chinese, Japanese, and Korean communities. We also have New Brahmin, Greek communities which are active. The Latin generation panel is just starting out. They've now almost finalized their initial proposal to form themselves based on that we will start the work. But then there are also a few communities which still need to start this process and finish their proposals.

---

In addition to developing the rules, the linguistic and technical rules which will define valid top-level domains and their variance for the root zone, we also developed a tool which all of us can use to use these Label Generation Rules. These Label Generation Rules are in a very specific format which has been defined at IETF and specified in RFC7940.

And so, therefore, these IDN tables are actually machine readable if they are in this format. And we now actually have a tool online which you can use to not only create these LGRs for a particular language or script, but you can also use LGRs to validate labels whether a particular label request is valid based on a particular LGR which has been loaded up in this tool.

And then also there are couple of management functions which are available through these tools so you can compare to different LGRs to see what the differences are between the different IDN tables, different versions of IDN tables in this format.

And then you can also use, look at if you already have repository of labels, you can run those labels on different versions of LGRs to see what is the impact of changing the LGR on the currently delegated labels, for example.

---

This tool is available for you to use. The link is on the slide. Since it's beta version, it's password protection but the user guide has both the credentials to log into the system. And the link for user guide is also available here. And you can also download this tool. It's free to use, completely free to use. It's open source so the links are given here. You can actually download it and use it on your own systems as well.

In addition to the TLD Program, we also continue to support the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. So far, 57 TLD labels, ccTLD labels have been successfully evaluated from 39 different countries and territories. This shows the summary of where we are. And of these 48 IDN ccTLDs have been delegated representing 38 countries and territories. And they cover about 21 scripts and 35 different languages.

IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process should undergo an annual review process. We had open release to follow that process. We had released a public comment announcement in January 2015 to review IDN ccTLD process. We had received some comments back on second similarity review. Based on the comments which were significant, the Board in 2015, June 2015 resolved for ccNSO to look at those comments and review the second similarity process.

---

In collaboration with GAC and SSAC, the ccNSO has gone through that process and reviewed the EPSRP guidelines. That's what these are called and has recently adopted the final report which is sent back to the Board for consideration. And based on eventually how the Board asks to implement that report, we will update the IDN ccTLD process, Fast Track Process and close that public comment which started in January 2015.

In addition to the top-level work, we also continue to work on two projects which are more related to second level. The first one is IDN implementation guidelines. The purpose of these guidelines is to focus on second level IDN registration policies and practices. And they're specifically designed to address any end-user concerns specifically actually user confusion and things like cybersquatting. They are focused on gTLD registries and registrars offering IDNs at the second level. However, they also remain relevant for IDN ccTLDs, of course.

So, these slides are, I apologize, slightly older. When I sent these slides out, the IDN guidelines were still under review by the working group. But since then, these guidelines have been posted for public comment. So, the final sentence needs to be updated, these are now out and they are open for public comment. And I would very strongly recommend that you please look at these updated guidelines. And please send us feedback.

---

There have been the members from ALAC ccNSO, GNSO and SSAC who have worked together over the last about one and a half years to develop these guidelines. The guidelines are covering six topics and they have 18 recommendation. The topics include transition from IDNA 2003 to IDNA 2008 protocol standard format of IDN tables, consistency of IDN tables and practices, IDN variant labels, similarity and confusability of IDN labels and terminology.

The working group also looked at registration data and EPP and found that they had no guidelines or recommendations in those areas and have asked the community to let them know if the community thinks there should be anything said in those areas as well.

Finally, the reference second level LGR or IDN tables that's of work which is mostly focused on the new gTLDs where what ICANN is doing is since ICANN has to do pre-delegation testing of IDN tables, what ICANN is doing is making these tables publicly available as references against which the pre-delegation testing is done for new gTLDs.

However, that doesn't mean that the tables have to conform to these reference LGRs. The tables submitted by the gTLDs may deviate from these. These are just the references for

---

consideration of the community as they develop their IDN tables.

Finally, we keep reaching out to the community to let them know what we're doing. And we also really value and invite contribution of the community to the IDN Program. We have dedicated web pages, reasonably easy to get to, [icann.org/idn](http://icann.org/idn). And that will take you to all of the projects which we are working on.

We also reach out to SOs and ACs during ICANN meetings like the session today. And we also have a regular IDN update presentation at ICANN meetings which is scheduled for tomorrow in case you want to learn more details about what we're doing.

And then we are also reaching out to communities at events across the globe, different events across the globe either directly through the IDN Program or through the GAC Team at ICANN.

I thank you for very patiently listening to the update. Here are some links to connect with us and I will end my presentation and I will be happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. Any questions from the floor? While you think about those questions, I would like to ask you, Sarmad, what can we do, the ccTLD community, one or two pointers that you could give us that we could contribute to this tremendous effort that you have been working on?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you for the question. First, I would like to start by first recognizing the amazing level of engagement of ccTLD community within the IDN Program already. Allow me to go back to slide, many of these script panels, we have very active membership leadership coming from ccTLD, ccNSO community, basically. So, first of all, thank you for all that support which you've already been providing to us.

But there are obviously some of these panels where we do need more support. And I would like to point out the three different panels specifically. We are currently starting work on how to handle IDNs within Latin script. And that's a very big landscape we have to deal with because Latin script is used from Pacific Islands, Australia all the way to North America, South America, on every continent.

And for this panel to be effective to represent all the community which uses Latin script, we really do need membership on this

---

generation panel from all these geographical areas. Specifically, we need some specific membership from Africa and Australia and Asia Pacific region.

So, if there are members here who would like to participate in this process or who know people who would like to participate and volunteer for this process, please do contact us and we'd really appreciate the help and support you provide to us.

In addition, we are also wanting to start work on Hebrew, Sinhala and Tana. Sinhala is spoken in Sri Lanka and Tana in Maldives. Hebrew is used in Israel as well as Europe. So please, if you are interested in contributing to those efforts, please also let us know.

And finally, we also have a panel on New Brahmin scripts. These are scripts which are used in South Asia. We do have quite a bit of interest from India but we are specifically looking for more interest from Nepal and Bangladesh and possibly Sri Lanka for Tamil script which is part of the list of scripts which New Brahmi's generation panel will be looking at. So those are some areas where I think some more contribution from ccTLD community and ccNSO would be much appreciated. Thank you.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much, Sarmad. Any other questions in the floor? Well, as we have heard, this program requires the help of several regions, Africa, Australia, also need help in Hebrew. And if there's any of you that knows anyone that can help us with this program, it'll be much appreciated. So, with that, we thank you very much. Thank you, Sarmad, for the opportunity. And once again, have a good afternoon.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to present the work. Thank you.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I guess we can have a five-minute break but we will reconvene in five minutes for the Legal session. So, if the panel members for the Legal session that are in the room right now could perhaps start taking their seats. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**