ICANN75 | AGM – Joint Session: ccNSO and GAC
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

[THIS SESSION IS BEING RECORDED]

[RECORDING IN PROGRESS].

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Hello. Welcome to the ICANN 75 GAC and ccNSO meeting on Tuesday, 20 September. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by ICANN expected standards of behavior. During the session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. If you're remote, please wait until you're called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the GAC room, please remember to raise your hand in the Zoom room. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for the session on the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Manal Ismail, GAC chair. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch. Good morning and afternoon and evening for those joining remotely. I would like to start by welcoming ccNSO colleagues who are joining us for this bilateral where we get to discuss topics of common interest and get some updates on progress and development within the PDPs that ccNSO are taking care of.
So, a very warm welcome, Alejandra. I will leave it to you to introduce the rest of the ccNSO speakers and moderate, please.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Manal and thank you for welcoming us here. It is our pleasure to be with you. Today, I will -- we will have in the agenda ccPDP3 review mechanisms and introduction of the DNS abuse standing committee from the ccNSO, as well as the ccPDP4 on IDN ccTLD string selection process and to kick off, I will give the floor to Stephen Deerhake to speak about the ccPDP3 review mechanism. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Greetings. I wish to thank you for pitching up. I'm pleased to do an update. I'm here today with the Working Group Vice Chair, Dr. Eberhard Lisse. It is an honor to address the GAC. It has been a while since any of us have been able to do this, and we accomplished a lot of work between the last update since I presented to you.

First, retirement policy was completed, approved by ccNSO council and also by ccNSO community and submitted to the board for consideration. I'm pleased to report that the board has consideration of the retirement policy which has been years in the making on their agenda for their meeting on Thursday so hopefully we will see some good stuff there. Next slide, please.

Agenda for today is a quick run through on the background. We will dive into the principles that have been guiding us as we have developed the written policy. I will give a quick update on the status of the Working Group and go into key elements of the draft policy. Next slide, please.

So, by way of background real quick, we got chartered as a Working Group back in 2017. We have been around for a long time. The timeframe starts in 2017 but actually, the ccNSO has actually been pondering this problem for a very long time beginning back with the establishment of the framework of the interpretation Working Group. Based on that work it became apparent that the policy with respect to delegation, transfer, revocation, retirement of ccTLDs needed to be developed and we needed consistency on that and hence we were established by the council. Next slide, please.

The guiding principles that we adopted are low cost to process, limited duration of the process, unlike our development process, so the actual policy, accessibility of the process and we adopted the concept of fundamental fairness.
Next slide, please.

I'm pleased to say we have made considerable progress as of late and completed draft policy language and subjected it to stress testing with success. We are pretty far along, actually. Next slide, please.
Key elements of the draft for review, this is really the core of the Working Group's activities. Next slide, please. The draft policies that you can see from the slide provides a policy foundation for much of the retirement policy work. For those wondering what CCRM stands for it is not in the ICANN glossary yet. It stands for customer -- I can't even remember now.

EBERHARD LISSE: Country code review mechanism.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No. It doesn't. Customer something or whatever.

EBERHARD LISSE: No, no. Country code review mechanism.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, is it? okay. Country code review -- my Vice Chair tells me. I will give you a second or two to digest all that. Let's move on to another component of the key elements of the policy, naming the objective of the review. Next slide, please.

So, basically, the purpose of review is to provide an avenue for a party affected by action of the IFO, the functions operator, a means to question that action and additionally is an enforcement tool to ensure that the IFO has complied with the relevant policy involved in the dispute. Next slide, please.

So, we have a couple of triggers that will initiate a review. The first is that if the IFO makes a decision that is covered under the policy and in return, the party affected by the policy takes issue with the action of the IFO and then requests a review of the decision by the IFO.

At the conclusion of the review, if no significant problems were discovered in the IFO decision making by the review process, the IFO's action basically stands, and the review process is terminated.

The more interesting question is what happens if the review panel finds fault with the IFO's decision?

Next slide, please.

In the event that an IFO action has been reviewed and the review panel itself takes exception to what the IFO has done, things get a little more interesting. The cases are if the IFO -- Zoom is doing weird stuff here. My apologies. Zoom just hijacked my machine.

Yeah. No. I'm back. Okay. We're back. The IFO can accept the finding of the review panel in which case the matter is resolved and the review is closed. They can accept the finding, but they also have the option to have basically a redo and modify their process.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Stephen, sorry to interrupt. There is a question in the chat: what does IFO stand for?

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Internet function operator – IANA function operator. I'm sorry. Currently the IANA.

EBERHARD LISSE: Commonly we refer to the entity dealing with this as IANA, but IANA is actually a function. So we call it the IFO. It is the IANA function operator because at the moment this is done by another entity with three letters, the public identifiers, PTI, but that in theory could change. Whoever operates the IANA function is identified as with the three letters IFO.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The third option for IFO in all this is telling the review panel that they disagree with their findings and further tell the review panel that they will ignore what the review panel has told them what they need to do.

What is going on here? God almighty. I will turn Zoom off. It just hijacked my machine again. Sorry about that. Next slide, please.

In this scenario, the disclosure burden placed on the IFO varies based on when the disputed IFO action requires board approval or not. The important thing here is the policy insists on disclosure. So depending on if it's a Board thing, the Board is notified. If it's something that doesn't require Board, then the Council and ICANN CEO get notified and presumably some action or actions will be taken as a result.

Next slide, please.

In the event that the IFO does do a do over and submits a second version of their decision with regards to the CC manager affected by what the IFO has done, that ccTLD manager has to make decisions as to whether or not they want to start the process over again with another decision process or if they want to accept the -- the revised version of what the IFO has done. Next slide, please.

So, basically, for a new ccTLD, if one ever pops up in the ISO3316 table and eventually is destined to make its way into the root, no doubt it will have multiple applicants applying to be the manager.

So, in that case, if there is a fight over who wants to be the manager because it is IFO decision as to ultimately who they put into the root, it will likely trigger a review process.

In that circumstance, multiple applications can come in because there is multiple people effected trying to become the manager. In all other cases, only the CC manager is subject to a transfer, revocation or retirement decision so it is the current manager. The bulk of them will be that.

Next slide, please.

We have that in there twice, it looks like. Next slide, please. There we go. The review process manager will be the person that is responsible for overseeing the handling of a review request. In the spirit of keeping costs down to a minimum, leveling the playing field for smaller ccTLDs lacking financial resources to completely fund review requests, the policy stipulates that the review manager will be funded by ICANN.

Additionally, the review manager will be part of ICANN since they are funded by ICANN. And as a result, they will also be managed by ICANN. The qualifications are rather dire.

Strict, rather.

The reviewer has to be familiar with the industry for a minimum of 10 years. The overreaching goal is to secure people with deep TLD experience who are also unbiased. Again, as noted in the previous slide and at the start of the talk, those reviewers will also be paid by ICANN so as to minimize the cost to ccTLDs. Next slide, please. Next slide, please.

The IFO obligations under the policy stipulate once a review request has been submitted, the IFO is locked, and they cannot go ahead and fiddle around and do whatever their policy proposal was that the review has been launched against. If the review manager determines that the IFO has gone ahead and done what they wanted to do, which was objected to, they need to advise both the ICANN CEO and ccNSO Council as per our policy.

Next slide, please.

Can a decision of reviewers for a given IFO decision apply to other IFO decisions? No. They are one-off decisions applicable only to circumstances related to the specific review request. Next slide, please.

Again, can there be more than one review for a given IFO decision?

The answer, again, is no. Primarily because we don't want a situation where a disgruntled manager keeps filing review requests over and over and over again. Next slide, please.

So, underpinning it all, the ccTLD structure is the ISO3166 table and ICANN is not in control of it. It is managed by the ISO in Geneva and thus, in the event if there are significant changes made to it in the future or significant changes to the policies [it] covers or ICANN bylaws, it might affect it and the policy will have to be reviewed at a minimum and more likely revised, probably extensively.

Next slide, please.

So, next steps, the Working Group will continue to finalize structure and language of the initial draft policy given that the Working Group achieved consensus on both the proposed language of the initial draft policy as well as the various stress tests applied against it, the Working Group is operating in an expedited manner with the goal of getting the initial draft policy out for public comment sometime in November of this year. It is noted that the public

comment period will last at least 40 days. So, in any event, the end of it will carry over through the holiday season and the closure of the policy comment period will be in early 2023. Any questions? That is the presentation.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Stephen. Looking if there are questions. I see Denmark. Please go ahead, Finn.

DENMARK: Thank you. Finn Petersen from Denmark for the record, and I wasn't sure I understood everything. I was a bit confused because I didn't know what IFO was.
This also referred to transfer of -- of one top domain name to another operator. Is that my understanding?

And there might be national legislation in -- in such a situation, how is the scope within the system?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We don't take into consideration the nuances of national legislation where a law is passed that says that the current manager must no longer be the current manager, and we prefer this other guy.
Eberhard, you are thinking?

EBERHARD LISSE: In short, this won't allow us to appeal national legislation. It is only for decision that IANA function operator takes under its policies or ICANN policies and national legislation supersedes everything anyway.

DENMARK: If I understand, we can have tendering procedure and select another so-to-speak that is more beautiful, and this will not interfere with that process?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Go ahead.

EBERHARD LISSE: This is a review mechanism against decision of the IANA function operator. This is not a review against a decision of a national government or national parliament rather, making the laws.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It doesn't supersede what they are doing either. Additional questions?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes. One more question from Indonesia. Ashwin, please go ahead.

INDONESIA: Thank you. Also, what is important for -- for me, at least, perhaps also for other GAC members, is the, what you call it? The status of the organization that run the previously IANA functions. You see, previously, IANA was part of, if I'm not mistaken, US DoC. Then it was transferred after 2015 meeting in Singapore to PTI and so on which is what you call it? Non-profit corporation. And then they have contract with ICANN. If you are talking about IANA function, is there anything left in IANA function that is not operated by PTI? If so, which organization do that and who is responsible for that organizations? Is that still in the previously like IANA in the US DoC or no? It is not a part of PTI but run separately. You know, these kinds of things are important like when Verisign carry out operation of root file zone for example, Verisign do it under contract

of who, and who give contract to Verisign? This is kind of data ownership that is important for at least in Indonesia, it is important. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. If I understand your question, yes. Currently IANA function is a distinct entity from PTI. PTI is currently the overseer of what the IANA function does. At the end of the day, IANA is -- that group is under ICANN's control. ICANN has led a contract to PTI to deal with IANA stuff that is outside of ICANN at the moment but it might not be PTI in the future.

That contract comes up for periodic tender and depending on PTI's performance ICANN might sack them and bring somebody else in.   IANA function has to be eternal otherwise the Internet will cease to work. Does that address your question?

INDONESIA: Yes. Perhaps later somehow in the ICANN can provide information on how data organization, how data is organized within these organizations. You see, there is so many organizations that look after the data. I mean, you have not mentioned about Verisign root zone file, for example, who actually own the data in the root zone file. It is operated by Verisign, but who actually give the contract to Verisign? And, you know, things like that and what is important for perhaps some other countries is actually who control the data in the file and data in AS number and IP number and so on. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The IANA is responsible for all the numbering stuff, of which there is a vast array of different things that they number and keep track of. With regards to the root zone, IANA at the moment is the gatekeeper and any change made to the root zone, at the end of the day, they have to okay it. And in terms who quote

unquote owns the root zone, it is not clear to me that the concept of property ownership is appropriate in this discussion. Eberhard, have any thoughts?

EBERHARD LISSE: The RFC document, request for comment that guides the ccTLDs is called RFC 1591. That is the founding document on which we all operate, which has been interpreted in the framework of interpretation. It has a very important point there that the concept -- the question of ownership is not important. The question of service is important.

Understanding the question, and we all understand the question and I don't think it is for this forum to address it. The important thing is it doesn't really matter who owns the data at any particular time and point. The IANA function is operated by the PTI company, public technical identifiers for the time being and that might change or not.

If it changed, the control over the root and data in the root moves to the other company. Our policy would then apply to the new company as well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, one last question from Jorge Cancio, from GAC Representative of Switzerland. Please, Jorge, go ahead. He is joining remote. Sorry.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal, I hope you hear me okay. Jorge Cancio for the record. Just to follow up on the question from Finn, I think, in the end, there will be always a decision by the IFO.

So, if -- if the decision from the IFO is implemented national legislation or national decision from a country, for example, to re-delegate the corresponding ccTLD, is that decision by IFO subject to the appeal mechanism that we are talking about?

That is the first question. If yes, on what grounds? To what extent is this -- is that appeal possible? Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: The question is on what grounds revocation and transfer would happen. ccTLD can only be revoked if there is substantial misconduct. The test what happens if a country imposes national legislation and tells IANA function operator to re-delegate and revoke and transfer against the incumbent operators which hasn't happened so far and hasn't been tested so we don't know what the situation is. However, the -- the -- every ccTLD manager is subject to the law of the land. Once a country has passed legislation, he will not -- the ccTLD manager won't be able to oppose a revocation. But once [inaudible] without the country enforcing its laws on the operator, that is a separate question. So I wouldn't see this as an issue. It is not that a country will ask the IFO to revoke but will tell the operator who is subject to its laws inside of the country, this is the law, we will enforce it, and that operator will ask for a transfer, as it has happened repeatedly in the past.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'm sorry. You?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Any further questions?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No further questions. I'm handing this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. One last slide, if I can have that. Oh, all right. We won't have the last slide. He has moved on. All right. Thank you, everybody, for your time and attention.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Thank you, Stephen and Eberhard. And continuing with the agenda, we have the introduction of DNS Abuse Standing Committee, and we have Nick Wenban-Smith, who is remote.

NICK WENBEN SMITH: Thank you, everybody. Hope you can hear me loud and clear and maybe even see me.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Yes, we do.

NICK WENBEN SMITH: Perfect. Okay. Thank you. That is the right slide so ccNSO has a unique perspective, I think, in relation to the topic of DNS abuse. We, as I'm sure you are very well aware, are very diverse and different community and we are very globally distributed unlike many gTLDs, which is very American dominated. Obviously, we work very closely with our national governments on what are the correct procedures policies practices registration, activity for our local communities working in partnership with local Internet communities, including governments, obviously.

So, what I'm saying is that this is not a policy objective of the ccNSO. We don't create sort of global standards. That is not at all what the country codes do. We did feel that the debate about the topic of DNS abuse was carrying on. It

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

appeared as though country codes either didn't think this was a problem or were not interested.

Those two -- those two points are completely not true. It is just we don't have a policy remit in this area. So, we decided to -- we obviously consulted with membership, including all of the members of the ccNSO and discussed what was the appropriate response we should do, and we decided to form a standing committee. If you can put the next slide.

So, like I was saying, there is no policy formulation here. I think there is lots of sensitivity amongst the ccNSO membership that this would defacto create best practices or standards that there would be an obligation or strong -- a strong incentive for countries to follow.

And countries in the country codes are fiercely independent and there is a lot of resistance to that. I talked previously about the diversity.

Yet, when you are comparing the registry operations of one ccTLD, you are very likely not comparing an apple with an apple. You are comparing an apple with an orange.

They are very, very different and diverse, whether that is linguistic, legal structure, governance, registration policy. This is a huge amount of diversity, which means you are not -- you would need to be very careful when you draw conclusions when you just talk about the CCs as one entity.

And I think it is very important at this stage to talk that many ccTLDs are very well established by nature of the operation and many of us go back now more than 30 years and these are mature, well-established and well-governed registries.

And for that reason, whenever there are studies done, whether that is in the ICANN DAAR reporting or the European Commission who published a study earlier this year, you will see that country codes rank, actually comparatively, very well. I mean, that is to say that they come low down on the list of abuse

so that -- the low down and being low on the list of abuse is a good thing not to be top of the list.

And yeah. There is a lot of national, local, regional activities in the European region, which is the region I come from.

The registries work very closely together. They share information. They try to ensure that threats and people taking advantage of weaknesses in the registry systems are understood so that we share that information and build on each other's experiences.

Okay. Next slide, please.

So, having said that the DNS Abuse Standing Committee is not going to create new policies, it needs to be said: What are we going to do? I put on the slide here that you will see this is very much a forum for discussion and information sharing and building of resources.

So, we wanted to have a place where if there were DNS abuse questions it would be clear who to approach. If you have an issue in ccNSO and you don't know about -- about -- about a particular country or you are not sure what is the ccNSO position on countries or on DNS abuse, then now there is a formal standing committee that can act as a focal point for those sorts of discussions and liaisons.

I think education is incredibly important. So, one of the things that we did in ICANN74 was to have a -- a sort of a review from each of the five ICANN regions as to what one registry from each of the regions was doing in terms of activities in terms of mitigation of DNS abuse.

One -- there is two. There is two subgroups, that we formed two Working Groups. The first one is to undertake a survey.

The survey is very exciting. It will be launched today and is a survey of all of the members of the ccNSO. We seek to form a credible and authoritative resource which gives the global multi-stakeholder community actually an authoritative position on what are the practices of the different CCs and are there any trends? And so we are going to do a survey of all of our members to find out, well, what are the issues on -- on an individual level in terms of policies, procedures, measurement is very complicated area, measuring abuse and what are different members of the ccNSO doing and we will obtain it in a survey and then try to see what the -- what the trends and data tell us and to use it as an authoritative resource when it comes to communicating with not just our community but outside of our community.

The second subgroup is around communication and resources.

So, we seek to have a dedicated e-mail list. We already within the ccNSO have a dedicated e-mail list for security threats. We were going to do a similar type of information or sharing list for DNS abuse topics.

And information know how and to create a repository of resources for -- for registries to be able to take as they wish to individually best manage their DNS abuse.

And yes. A big part of this is that I was explaining inform, educate, basically to make sure that people outside of the CC community in the ICANN ecosystem, outside of the ICANN ecosystem and in our national communities are fully aware of all our activities and that it is not. If CCs are a little bit quiet on the topic of DNA abuse, it is largely because we deal with it privately. It is not a major issue for most of us.

And to ensure that there is not a vacuum in which other people can interpret the silence means that we are not doing anything about CC and ccTLD abuse. I have said this a number of times.

So, I share the chairing of the committee with my colleague Bruce, who is on the stage for you. You can wave at everybody. But, you know, I -- I have some issue with some of the -- some of the word -- some of the language for the topic of DNS abuse. I think when it comes to registration policy and operational practices, mitigating abuse is probably taken as an absolute given. If you want to run a good registry, your policies and practices should be ensuring it is safe and secure and stable for your users.

Of course, that would include ensuring there aren't any abuse whether that's technical DNS abuse or other types of abuse, and these are good registry management practices and as mature and responsible registries, then we -- we want to -- we -- we think this sort of goes -- goes without saying we, of course, will do this, but understand there is a bigger debate, and that it is important that we have a voice and a face to speak at it. Is that the next slide?

So, I am pretty sure that is the end of the slides so I sounded a bit hesitant. I don't know, Bruce, is there anything I didn't manage to cover? It has been a long night, and if I haven't been clear enough, I apologize.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you. You covered it well but I'm happy to help with any questions, particularly on the topic of the work we're doing on the survey from any GAC members.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Any comments or questions from GAC colleagues?

Okay. Nick, I think this was crystal clear. Yeah. We have one hand up now from Chris Lewis-Evans. Please, Chris, go ahead.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

UNITED KINGDOM:	Chris Lewis-Evans from the United Kingdom. Nick, thank you very much for it. It sounds like good work, and as you mentioned, a lot of the ccTLDs do a lot of good work that shows them to be low on the abuse list.
	I think the survey you are carrying out would be really interesting to see what information you can share amongst ccTLDs and whether it can sometimes also be useless in gTLDs. I think there is a lot of learning across the whole of the community.
	You have a survey out at the moment. Are there going to be further surveys, and if so, can GAC maybe raise any questions that might help with some learning there?
NICK WENBEN SMITH:	Thank you very much for the question, Chris. From my perspective, I think this is just the first in hopefully a series of surveys so we will be able to see trends and evolution that will be guided by our community primarily.
	But, as you understand, this is about outreach and connection and listening and discussing the topic with other communities and I want to -- you know, I think it is -- it is self-evident, but the GAC is an important part of -- of that community.
	Of course, where the GAC comes up with good questions and improvements, I see this as continuous improvement and anything to -- to raise the standard or to gain better insight, I think, is -- it is definitely where we are going. I should say to the whole GAC that I had the benefit of a separate session two weeks ago with the Public Safety Working Group and don't think I'm turning anything sort of out of school.
	But, yeah. We want to continue close liaison and dialogue and make sure that where there are -- where there is experience and information and benefit to our community from -- from know-how and insight from yours that we definitely have that cross -- cross-fertilization, I guess, and to make sure that ultimately our mission is to be good country code registries for all our users

and stakeholders and that the safety and security and reduction of -- of threats and DNS abuse and all those sorts of things is very high on our agenda and anything which we can do to facilitate that, we would absolutely welcome. I don't know, Bruce, if you have got any thoughts, but we haven't done the first survey yet. It is a bit premature to think about that second and future ones.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I think a challenge is the survey we have had quite a bit of input from members of ccNSO that are part of the Working Groups and is quite a lot of questions there now and we have to balance between asking hundreds of questions and nobody having enough time to fill them in versus asking enough questions to provide useful information. So, as Nick said, I think it is the first time that a survey of this scale has been done in the ccNSO and our focus at the moment is just encouraging participation and certainly to the extent that GAC members have contacts with ccTLD managers back at home and encourage them to complete the survey and when we have the survey results, I'm sure whenever you do a survey and get results that it always prompts people to ask more questions and we can refine it in the next iteration as Nick has said.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nick and Bruce. We have one more question from Brazil, please. Luciano, please go ahead.

BRAZIL: Thank you. More of a question. I think we are struggling sometimes with what abuse means in other -- in other -- in other debates here.
I think in this case it would be interesting to see. This is essentially informed by national legislation and probably many countries, and national laws will define what DNS abuse is or somehow inform what DNS abuse is, and think it

will be interesting to see how this plays out in this -- in this -- in this survey that might be an interesting element to -- to draw information from on our other discussions under ICANN on what is the scope of abuse of DNS abuse in general. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: Some of the questions we've asked there, we've asked as a two-part question we asked firstly what types of DNS abuse as discussed in the registry community here and to what extent does a ccTLD manager look at things like phishing and malware, so the more traditional DNS abuse, and then we have a separate question about content-related issues and we ask to what extent does ccTLD take action with regard to content, and we have a list of items which we commonly hear ccTLDs take into account three or four choices around content and we have another choice of if it's an area of content that we have not covered in our list, then the ccTLD manager can say we look at this specific area of content as well. So it's separating DNS abuse from content issues I guess.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. For sake of the transcript, the speaker was Bruce Tonkin. Handing it to Alejandra.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Manal, and thank you very much, Nick and Bruce, for the introduction of the task. And our next topic in the agenda is ccpdp4 on IDN ccTLD string selection process. For this, we have for this Kenny and Anil. Please.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening for anyone who joined online remotely. I'm Kenny Huang, chair of ccPD4, and also with Anil, the co-chair of ccPDP4 work group. It is my pleasure to give an update on IDN ccTLD selection process. And next slide. Today's topic cover including ccNSO IDN ccTLD string selection policy roadmap and also basic principle and basic criteria for selection IDN ccTLD string, and also identify deselection of IDN ccTLD, and last one will be general applicability of ccTLD related policies. Next slide, please.

We go to the roadmap starting from three years ago and in 2019, we have fast track process and also IDN ccTLD policy proposal derived from 2013. From there, we start to work on policy of selection of IDN ccTLD string and specific inclusion of IDN ccTLD in ccNSO and next slide, please.

The roadmap we achieved so far, starting from ccPDP2 and identified the evolution and fast-track process and already been closed for ccPDP2 and also we did a gap analysis overview for IDN ccTLD policy that was complete in June of 2019. Starting from there working on ccPDP4, so far we have bylaw change process to allow IDN ccTLD and ccNSO that have already been approved by ICANN Board, effectively on 2nd of June 2022 and we also established ccPDP4 [and we have] already been given issue report adopted by ccNSO Council in May 2020. So that is a progress report so far. And next slide, please.

That would be the overview how we are working on ccPDP4. We have full Working Group and three sub-Working Group and the first sub-Working Group is variant management and also sub-Working Group in deselection of IDN ccTLD workgroup and third subgroup working on confusing similarity. The full Working Group, we run full Working Group basically to update policy document and add recommendation of [inaudible] given by all the subgroups including the selection requirement that has been achieved and variant management by full Working Group that is almost done and also confusing similarity discussion for full Working Group is expected to be done in December of 2022 and also stress testing starting from ICANN75, and we consider other

consideration and finally, we expect to deliver initial report in January of 2023. Next slide, please.

So that will be the major key milestone [we have been able to achieve.] And now we have conclude a basic document that was complete in September of 2021. And variant management subgroup starting from 2021 already complete work in July of 2022 and we conclude deselection subgroup that we complete in January 2022 and update basic policy document that together with variant management and deselection subgroup and recommendation that is already complete. And also, we have confusing similarity subgroup and also expect to be done in November of 2022 and inclusion for variant management subgroup and confusing similarity subgroup expect to be done in November of 2022. And last one, we will give initial report we expect to be done in January of 2023. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

So, now we covered the principle underpinning the policy initially, for example, IDN ccTLD string must be associated with territory and ccTLD and IDN ccTLD are all country code top level domains, that's the basic criteria, and also, we try to preserve security, stability and interoperability of DNS. That's basic requirement for operator of the ccTLD. And also requests for delegation of IDN ccTLD should be an ongoing process. And last one, the number of IDN ccTLD per territory are determined by criteria. I will introduce basic criteria later. Next slide, please. That would be more fundamental criteria for selection of IDN ccTLD string. The IDN ccTLD string must be a meaningful representation of the name of a territory in a designated language and related script.

Based on ISO 3166-1 principle and basic core element can be identified visual association between name of a territory such as in English, in French, in Malay or Chinese or Japanese or other languages and their corresponding code element.

Okay. Next slide, please.

Other criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD string especially for technical criteria, IDN TLD must comply with IDNA 2008 that include RFC 5890 and 5895 and its successor, and also, we need to follow technical criteria defined by root zone label generation rule and generation Working Group. And only one IDN ccTLD string per designated languages would be selected so select IDN ccTLD string must be non-contentious in the territory and have evidence by statement by significant interest party in the territory. Significantly interested party is derived from RFC-1591 and interpreted by framework of interpretation, significant interest party always include relevant government. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

So, also, we have deselection subgroup discussion and based on the discussion we also need to also comply with all of the proposed retirement policy.

Deselection of IDN ccTLD especially, we have to define any trigger event in terms of retirement policy. Once a trigger event has been identified and if any situation match the trigger event, we activate the retirement policy.

Trigger event of IDN ccTLD will activate, initiate retirement policy of the selected IDN ccTLD and also its delegated variants as well. Next slide, please. What will be potential trigger event for deselection or retirement of IDN ccTLD, which include, for example, removal of name [inaudible] of a territory from ISO3166 list. For example, the selected and delegated IDN ccTLD is no longer meaningful representation of the name of the territory. For example, if the territory or the country change the name. And for example if language denoted at IDN ccTLD string is no longer a designated language. And the other one, the script in the IDN ccTLD string is no longer a script in which the designated language is [Indiscernible]. And last one is selected IDN ccTLD string no longer supported by significant interested party in the territory. For example, the

government don't accept the selected IDN ccTLD, then we would activate the retirement policy. Next slide, please.

Next slide.

So, we also have applicable policy, so IDN ccTLD existing policy and we have to comply with IDN ccTLD. For example, delegation, transfer, revocation, retirement of ccTLD also apply to older IDN ccTLD unless otherwise any specific requirement has been documented in the proposed policy. Next slide, please.

Okay. That concludes the end of my presentation and I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: In addition to what has been presented, I just want to inform GAC here that the ccPDP4 Working Group is also now discussing the review mechanism and the possibility of introducing a review mechanism in IDN ccTLD Working Group 4, that will happen in next call itself. Whatever we have heard about ccTLD PDP Working Group 3, we'll be taking that as a base document so there might not be confusion in the review mechanism of IDN ccTLDs and ccTLDs as a string. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you, Anil. I'm happy to take question.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kenny and Anil. GAC colleagues, any questions, comments? Yeah, please, the Netherlands. Go ahead.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

NETHERLANDS: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. I'm Alisa Heaver, and I couldn't find the raise button so quickly. Sorry. I wonder how is the uptake of IDNs at the moment in the different CCs?
So in the different ccTLDs, is it significantly higher than in general at gTLDs or basically the same? Thanks.

KENNY HUANG: Excuse me. Kenny Huang. Are you talking about any report or statistics regarding to [inaudible] IDN ccTLD or compared to other gTLD? Are you talking about a comparison?

NETHERLANDS: Yeah. Basically if there is at all any statistics of how ccTLDs are doing on the uptake of -- of the IDNs and maybe broader if that is even being compared to other gTLDs.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you. I don't have comprehensive data on hand but basically, old IDN ccTLD and when [they apply and they operate,] they have a signed agreement with ICANN. And probably, Anil can update on the other data because I don't have data on hand, sorry.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: I think your question is correct that the uptake or adoption of IDN ccTLDs as compared to ccTLDs is quite low right now. There is a -- there is a process of creating an ecosystem of making IDN ccTLD actually work in a multilingual Internet process, and that work is being done by universal acceptance, UASG that we have heard about it. There is approximately 50 countries who have adopted IDN as per the latest knowledge that I have, but the number of IDNs, now the uptake is close to 100.

In India from where I come, we are operating in 22 IDN ccTLDs using 15 scripts and we are finding it slightly difficult but the growth we are able to register in adoption of IDN ccTLDs in the last two or three years is more than 30%. I hope other ccTLDs are also maybe eager to adopt it soon and the reason is very clear that more than 65% of the global population are non-English speaking. Because of that, the Internet actually is not adopted by them fully. This is a very important topic that we should take. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. So, seeing no further requests from the floor from -- for the floor from neither the GAC nor the ccNSO, I'm handing it back to you, Alejandra. Any final comments before we conclude?

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much, Manal and members of the GAC for having us here with you. We are always happy to -- to report back on what we are doing and we are always available for any questions.

SPEAKER: Excuse me, Chair there is a hand on the platform, actually. I'm not sure it is visible.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Sorry. So, do you have your hand up?

SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am. May I proceed?

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Okay. Please identify yourself. Are you with GAC or ccNSO?

SPEAKER: From the GAC side.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Sorry. Go ahead.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I've got two questions actually. Am I audible?

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: No. Can you please identify yourself and speak closer to the mic?

SOUTH AFRICA: I'm Peter from South Africa, am I audible? First question is in relation to the related policies that the previous speaker mentioned. Do we have timeframes in terms when that should be done and completed? I'm saying that because the speaker before the previous mentioned there isn't -- there are other issues that have never been tested. For instance, the delegation and other -- when the ccTLD is retired and when the new one is getting [to be, wonder if there's] anything that has been tested before. The last question then will be for the gentleman that talks about the DNS abuse.

My question will be that you spoke of the awareness all across. Do we have timeframes of those awareness roadshows? When will it be and when are you intending to have them finalized? Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: We have proposed timeframe according to the original roadmap. The most import timeframe will be by the end of the year. Sorry. Initially in January of 2023 we need to propose an initial draft report to the ccNSO and move forward

to the next [place] on the policy development process and going to next step, next [stage.] And so far, we also break down into different several milestone. For example, talking about the completion of the variant management subgroup and also deselection subgroup and confusing similarity subgroup, all the subgroups, they are giving final recommendation to the full Working Group. So basic criteria and timeframe have been addressed so far. And for the rest of the process according to ccNSO policy and depends on ICANN Board approval policy and so that will be on the rest of the policy process. Does that answer your first question?

SOUTH AFRICA: Yes, sir.

KENNY HUANG: The second question for DNS abuse. Okay.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Excuse me. What is the second question regarding DNS abuse. I didn't get it. Can you please repeat?

SOUTH AFRICA: The question was in relation to the DNS abuse standing committee and what you're intending to do. you spoke of raising awareness and promoting discussion and education, and my question to you was: When will that be done?

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Well, I'm not sure if Nick or Bruce would like to take that. If not, I'm happy to do so.

Okay. I'm -- I don't see them online right now. So, the raising awareness and discussion, it will be an ongoing thing for this standing committee. That is the -- their goal is to gather information from around ccTLDs and share it among ccTLDs and also outside the ccTLD space so everyone can know what ccTLDs are doing and this will inspire ccTLDs who are taking certain measures and see other ccTLDs doing something different to see if those measures fit their -- their progress.

And to also communicate outside of the ccNSO and ccTLD environment, like for example, here in the GAC or other areas of the ICANN ecosystem on what ccTLDs are doing. Does this answer your question, sir?

SOUTH AFRICA: In the interest of time, we can move. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, and Alejandra, thank you very much for always coming to update the GAC and share common interests. I would like to also thank Stephen and Eberhard for an informative update on ccPDP3 on review mechanisms.

And Bruce and Kenny, I'm sorry. Bruce and Nick for the introduction of the Domain Name System abuse standing committee and to Kenny and Anil for the informative update also on ccPDP4 internationalized domain names. This has been informative and thank you all for the active engagement and fruitful discussion. This concludes our bilateral. And for GAC colleagues.

So, we -- we will be meeting with the board at 15:00 local time, 7:00 UTC. Please be back in the room promptly for the meeting. Thank you very much, everyone. Thanks.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Thank you.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR