

---

ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum – ccNSO: Policy Session  
Wednesday, June 16, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 CEST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, everyone. Welcome to the ccNSO policy session. My name is Kim Karlson, and, along with Kathy Schnitt, we are your remote participation managers today.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper format, as Kathy is noting in chat right now. If you'd like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute yourself and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphones when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. The transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcript, click on the Close-Caption button on the Zoom toolbar.

Today, we will hear from the ccPDP3 Working Group and the ccPDP4 Working Group. To kick things off, I'll hand the floor over to Eberhard Lisse. Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Welcome. My Chair apparently has not managed to get in, but it's an atrocious time for him in New Jersey. If he comes on, he will take—there

---

**Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.**

---

he is. So I can just make a small introductory remark until he's ready to do it.

This is about an overview about the policy development policy process on retirement. We want to give a small feedback to the community because the ccNSO members will have to vote on this.

Stephen, are you ready to proceed?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I am, if you can hear me. I had difficulties with getting the link organized.

EBERHARD LISSE: Yes, we can. So you carry on.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Great. Thank you very much for pitching up in the interim there. Good morning and good afternoon and good evening to everybody, depending on your time zone. For me, it's early morning. At least it's light out. For the record, I'm Stephen Deerhake, the ccNSO Council member and also Chair of the ccNSO PDP3 Working Group that's responsible for developing ccNSO policy for both the retirement of ccTLDs as well as a review mechanism for decisions made by the IANA function operator with respect to ccTLDs. I'm the ringmaster for this teleconference.

---

Before I go further, I do wish to give a shoutout to key staff support, particularly Kimberly Carlson, who is also up very early to work her usual Zoom magic. Whilst I'm doing that as well, I also want to thank Bart Boswinkel and Joke Braeken, who do have home court advantage, timewise, being both based in the same time zone as the meeting we're trying to hold, and also to Bernard Turcotte, who has provided invaluable wordsmithing and other services to this working group and who is also suffering the same time zone issues that I am.

So, as Eberhard pointed out, our purpose here today is to give the overall community an update on ccNSO policy development initiatives. Currently, we have two underway: ccPDP3, which involves the ccTLD retirement and ccTLD review mechanism policy initiatives, and ccPDP4, which involves ccTLD IDN work.

So we're going to split this session up into three subsections. First will be a review of the completed ccTLD retirement policy, which is scheduled for ccNSO Council approval tomorrow. And I do hope that happens—I'm sure it will—after which it's going to go out to the ccTLD community for its approval as well. I'll do that presentation. The working group with respect to the retirement question is complete.

The immediate obstacle is overcoming statutory constraints regarding both the voting percentage and the supermajority that is required for a successful ccNSO member vote for approval on that. I'll elaborate on that shortly.

Then the second subsection will be a brief review of where the PDP3 Working Group is with regards to the development of the review mechanism. That'll be led by Bernard.

And then the last session, which I expect will take up about half of our total time today, will be devoted to the ccPDP4 Working Group on IDNs. I will be turning the floor to Kenny and Anil, who will present on the work today of the ccPDP4.

Then, at the conclusion of his presentation, I'll open the floor to question to questions for either PDP3 or PDP 4 issues.

So, with that, Kimberly, yes, you've read my mind. Excellent. So this is where I'm going to put on my you-must-vote hat on and solicit active participation from my fellow ccNSO members. If you can skip down one more. Yes. Thank you. As you can see, council is expected to endorse the proposed retirement policy at their meeting tomorrow. I can confirm that we will get this out to the membership as soon as possible. We hope to get voting underway by the 7<sup>th</sup> of July, with a termination of voting on the 28<sup>th</sup> of July. So the month of July will be voting.

But as you can also see, we need at least 87 members to actually case a vote, whichever way you cast it. But we do need that minimum number of turnout from a voting standpoint. For this to pass with the membership, we also need a 66% supermajority in favor of it.

So all I can say to my fellow ccNSO members is please, please, please step up and vote in July whichever way you feel about the retirement proposal. But please get out there and vote so that we can hopefully

---

meet both hurdles. Let's put it that. But turnout is key to this process. Otherwise, it's going to drag on out into the August/September timeframe. It'd be nice to wrap this up before then.

So, with that, let me take my electioneering hat off and dive into the substance of the retirement policy proposal. Thank you, Kimberly, for the general trigger of that slide. You read my mind. So some of you have seen these before. We've presented, I think, now twice the general outline of all of this. It may be even one more time than that. I mean, I remember doing it when we were still meeting in actual person.

So, at the end of the day, what initiates this process is the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. If they get an itch to remove a two-letter code from the table, it starts the retirement process. That's the short and long of it. This approach that we're taking here is consistent with our RFC 5091, as well as the framework of interpretation.

Next slide, please, Kimberly. So we do have exceptionally reserved codes. There's .uk and .ac. (United Kingdom and Ascension Island) and .cp and .cq. But the change to these is the same as the change for the usual code, which is, if it's removed by the maintenance agency, then it triggers a retirement process. Again, it's at the whims of the ISO Maintenance Agency. But then, so are the introduction of said codes into the table to begin with.

So, Kimberly, if I can have the next slide, please. So IDN ccTLDs. I have to say I think we did a nice job of kicking the issue of the IDN ccTLD retirement-triggered events over to our colleagues working on ccPDP4. Hopefully, the retirement policy presented here cover their needs. But

---

we have left it up to the ccPDP4 Working Group to identify their triggering events however.

Next slide, please, Kimberly. Thank you. End of process. I think this slide is relatively self-explanatory. The overall goal of the policy is to maintain consistency between the ISO 3166-1 list and what's in the root zone. That's all we're trying to do here on that.

Next slide. Thank you, Kimberly. This is where you get the big visual. As you can see, the default timeframe, if you run down the right-hand side of this slide, is with no arrangement between the ccTLD operator and the IANA functions operator. It's a five-year retirement plan, in effect. No action required on the part of either party.

However, we do encourage, going down the left-hand side of this slide, negotiation, coming to an agreement, between the IANA function operator and the affected ccTLD with respect to both coming up with a retirement plan and then coming up with an agreement to the end date/retirement of the ccTLD, which then involves an execution of said plan and a conclusion of that plan and, as you can see at the bottom of the slide, removal of the ccTLD from the DNS root zone file. With the negotiation between the IANA function operator and the affected ccTLD of a retirement plan, the retirement of that ccTLD can be pushed out for a full ten years. That is the benefit the cc working together with the IANA function operator to sort out a way of gracefully retiring said ccTLD.

I think that's my last slide. We have one more, do we not? Yes. Thank you. The applicability. This is the last one of my slide deck and it kind of speaks for itself. I mean, the actual policy is a wrap at this point. It's

---

heading off to the ccNSO Council vote tomorrow, as I mentioned previously. Hopefully, after that, we'll get it out to the ccNSO community. We have a high hurdle to reach with that community vote, both with respect to the number of the cc's that need to participate on way or the other and also with the supermajority of 66% that we need to achieve. But I'm hoping we can do both and then push the policy forward up to the Board for its consideration.

That's it from me regarding the ccTLD retirement policy. I'm assuming Bernard is on the call and, if so, Bernard, I'm going to turn it over to you to lead us through the update on the activities of the working group tasked with developing a review mechanism. So, Bernard, if you are there, the floor is yours, sir. And you are there.

EBERHARD LISSE: Bernard, if you're speaking, we can't hear you. Maybe you must push the button on your headset again.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That pesky mute button, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Can you hear me now? There we go.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, there we go.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That’s how we know it’s that pesky mute button, yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Good morning, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good morning, everyone. All right. Review mechanisms. As Stephen has mentioned, we’ll go through this rather quickly. Our topics will be the history of review mechanisms for ccTLDs—and by “review mechanisms,” just so everyone is clear, I mean, once the IANA function operator makes a decision and that is sent to the Board, unless the Board rejects that decision, there is really no option for any ccTLD to contest or appeal such decisions—an update on work to date and our next steps.

So next slide, please. A quick history. RFC 5091. The Internet DNS Names Review Board, a committee established by the IANA, will act as a review panel for cases in which the parties cannot reach agreement amongst themselves. The INDB’s decisions will be binding. So that was back in 1994.

We leap forward to 2015, when the ICANN Board adopts all of the recommendations of the ccNSO FOI Working Group, which includes the following in 4.8. The FOI Working Group believes it is consistent with RFC 5091, Section 3.4, and the duty to act fairly to recognize the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA operator to an independent body.



---

In March 2020, the ccNSO Working Group for the PDP on a Review Mechanism held its first meeting.

Next slide, please. Update on work to date. The working group identified the following IFO decisions which could be subject to review: failure to accept the delegation application for a newly created ccTLD, contested delegation of a newly created ccTLD by a losing party—what happens is, when they are new ccTLD that are created, there can be more than one applicant—rejection of a transfer request by a ccTLD manager, contested revocation of an active ccTLD—just to note, revocation and retirement are two different things here on the basis of how they are proceeding—contested retirement of an active ccTLD which does not correspond to an ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 code element—we crafted this language rather carefully; of course, this is about what is commonly referred to as exceptionally reserved codes—IFO refusal to grant an extension to the retirement period for a retiring ccTLD, and failure to accept an IDN ccTLD, dependent on the IDN ccTLD PDP and the responsibility of the ICANN Board.

Next slide, please. All right. We've been working with giving ourselves some general principles: preserve the stability, security, and interoperability of the DNS, as is core to the mission of ICANN, And, keeping in line with the IFO Working Group's alignment is ensuring predictability and legitimacy of the process, however it turns out.

Specific considerations include: the process for a review mechanism should be low-cost and should be limited in duration. I'll go back to low-cost here in a second.

---

When the group has been discussing this, we of course looked at the IRP mechanism in the independent review process for ICANN, which was meant to be a short-term and low-cost process which, up to date, has not really worked out. Costs are in the millions of U.S. dollars and, in some cases, carry on for well over a year and sometimes multiple years.

Delimited duration is something that everyone is very understanding of in that, if we're trying to decide the faith of a ccTLD, we can['t] have that hanging in the balance for years while parties decide what's going to happen.

Accessibility. We understand the notion that there is a variety in the ccTLD operator world. They're not all huge operators. Some are very small. We want to make sure that everyone has a fair and equal access—a level playing field, if you want. And, of course, we want to ensure fundamental fairness.

Next slide, please. The working group has also been working with ICANN Legal. Obviously, any such policy will have to be looked at by ICANN Legal. That will provide its update or thoughts on any proposal we prepare to the Board before it's approved. In a presentation, ICANN Legal stated its position regarding the following the corporate governance fundamentals: “The ICANN Board is not able to defer decision-making to other bodies. Fiduciary duties preclude this. ICANN is entrusted to perform the IANA function, not an external tribunal. ICANN is not in a position to place decisions [on] IANA function external to PTI [on] ICANN.”

---

Next slide, please. The working group will continue to interact with ICANN Legal and consider its work in the context of the input by ICANN Legal in an effort to complete the first draft of the review mechanism. Going forward, the working group will proceed by a topic-driven working method of addressing one topic per meeting, where there will be a topic paper produced for that topic. So basically, it's a structured approach going forward, using those principles that were outlined previously to look at all the situations which could be appealed which we mentioned at the beginning of the presentation.

Next slide, please. And that's it. Our Chair, Stephen Deerhake, who is ringmaster today. Our Vice-Chair, Eberhard Lisse, who stepped up while Stephen was coming on. The staff lead is Bart Boswinkel. Our ccNSO page is here, and our wiki is here. That's it from me. Stephen, back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, Bernard. I greatly appreciate it. I hope people have a better idea/sense of where we're going with the review mechanism policy development.

At this point, without further ado, I think I will turn the floor to Kenny and Anil, who ably represent[s] the ccPDP4 Working Group on IDNs. I don't envy, but I do thank them for their work on that. So, without further ado, Kenny, the floor is yours. It looks like our Zoom wizard has the slide deck queued up for you. So carry on, sir. Good to see you. Good morning.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you, Steve. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. We're going to introduce the ccPDP4 Working Group's IDN ccTLD policy update. My name is Kenny Huang, Chair of the ccPDP4 Working Group. And also, Anil is the Co-Chair of the ccPDP4 Working Group.

Next slide, please. So basically, of the topic we're going to cover, the majority will be in four parts. The first part: we're going to introduce, why the ccPDP4? Then, coming up we'll be introducing the [inaudible] and timeline for the ccPDP4. The next one will be most the important things to date: to get your feedback about a criterion and principle we have already identified and will try to collect your feedback on. We also have a list of references and [micro] documentation for you for reference.

Next page, please. So the overall [role] for the ccPDP. We do have a fast-track process and also have a list of open issues and also a [inaudible] introduced. We have [a] ccTLD policy proposal as well. And we try to move to policy for selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

Next page, please. So where are we now? As you already heard, the ccPDP2 cross-evolution of the fast-track process [stopped to get] analysis overall of IDN ccTLD policy, which has been completed in June 2019. So there are two specific activities that would be replace ccPDP2. The first would be a bylaw change process to allow IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. We're now waiting for the next date of the ICANN Org and ICANN Board decision. The second action would ccPDP4 [inaudible] policy to

---

select IDN ccTLD strings and the issue report adopted in the ccNSO Council in May 2020.

Next page, please. So I'm going to introduce [inaudible] and timeline for ccPDP4.

Next page. So ccPDP4 [on] the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. So the issue report was already adopted in May 2020 by the ccNSO Council. [The group of called for] volunteers. That happened in July 2020. The first kickoff meeting was in August of 2020. The current stage: we tried to develop an initial development. That was starting from last year until December of this year.

Next page. So that's the overall timeline in the subgroup. Basically, we have full working groups. The full working group is responsible for updating the basic document and integrating all the input from subgroups. We'll have three subgroups tentatively. The first subgroup would be variant management, which was formed in February in this year. The second group would be on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. It will be formed in August 2021. And the third subgroup will be for confusing similarity. That will be formed in October 2021. All feedback and recommendations will be integrated to the full working group which comes out with an initial proposed policy recommendation in December 2021.

Next page. So here we come to the most important part of today. We're going to introduce some things about a criterion, most importantly to get your feedback. I moved a section to [Bart]. He will be helping to get input from the community. Bart, [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Kenny. Thank you to you, and welcome to this part of the policy section. This will be clearly the interactive part of this session, where the working group is looking for your feedback and comments, effectively.

The way it works is a little bit like previous sessions you may have attended. We'll turn through the core topics that the working groups want to present. Then we'll ask question if you have any. Then we'll ask if you have any questions for clarification—so if something is unclear, you have comments, etc.—and then we'll go into a polling exercise, where we'll present a poll where you'll have about 30 seconds to respond. Depending on your feedback, we'll start having a discussion. So, if it's clear, if everybody fully agrees with the working group, there is no need for further discussion. However, when there is divergence, I will ask you about your views. I will not address you personally but only if you feel comfortable speaking up. So that's a little bit of the way it goes.

So to be very clear, this is not a vote on the proposals. This is just taking the temperature of the room as people are familiar with ccNSO meetings now. Your feedback will be used and will be very valuable for the working group to adjust its course and adjust their main proposals to date, if necessary, because that's the final point, as Kenny already alluded to. The working group has reached a certain point where they present the criteria or the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. They're now looking into the procedures and process on how to verify, etc., these

---

criteria and the proposals. And they're already well on their way in doing this. So that's one.

Maybe one more. As you could see from the roadmap, the principles and criteria's origin is that they are used in the IDN fast track and they've been tested in the IDN fast track. So the working group has looked at necessary updates, given that the fast-track method was developed almost 13 or 14 years ago, starting in 2007.

So that's the introduction. Let me start with the first slide on the results of the working group to date, and that's the principles underpinning the policy. The reason for calling this this way is that these principles are effectively the overarching principles. They're set as parameters around the policy recommendations to ensure that the recommendations which are developed meet these criteria. They are presented to assist future interpretation of the policy and assist in implementing the proposed policy. Again, this method was introduced in the fast-track process and proved to be very helpful. They take into account these principles and take into the IDN fast-track process and subsequent discussions. So that's the background of these principles.

Now let me highlight two points on this one. So I think number one, for those who are not familiar, this principle says the IDN ccTLDs must be associated with a territory. In the principles, there is a section of the document—we'll read through it on the next slide—that will be a definition of "territory." It's clearly that an IDN ccTLD must be associated. This is with the territory. And this is, in a way, using the method underpinning the ISO 3166 methodology or the strength of the

---

ISO 3166 standard for this particular exercise—so the overall selection or the selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

Secondly, what is probably very important—that’s why you saw this introduction by Kenny on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs—ASCII and IDN ccTLDs. So all ccTLDs [are] country-code top-level domains, effectively meaning that all processes and procedures which have been developed over time for ccTLDs [and] ASCII TLDs do apply to IDN ccTLDs as well, including the delegation transfer and the retirement process and revocation. So that’s the very important to understand as well.

Then, maybe the third: the number of IDNs per territory are determined by the criteria. So it’s not an arbitrary number. I will get to that later on as well: what the criteria are. The fast track has already proven that this is a valid way. For example, Anil is from India, and India, under the fast-track process, currently has 22 IDN ccTLDs, if I’m not mistaken.

So that’s the introduction on the principles underpinning the policy.

Are there any questions from your end around these principles? I’ll give you a few seconds to either raise your hand ...

I saw your note and I see a question from Desiree: “Should IDN ccTLDs apply for ISO 3166 or after these?” Desiree, ISO has its own process. Actually, we’ll see IDN ccTLDs. The reason for creating this policy is to mimic, a little bit, the visual association. But we’ll get to that point later on.

“The request for delegation should be an ongoing process” I’ve noted your comment, Hiro. Thank you.



---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bart, I see a hand raise from Patricio.

BART BOSWINKEL: Patricio, go ahead. Sorry, I didn't look at it. Patricio, go ahead.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Hi, Bart. Good morning, everyone, or whatever time of the day it is. If we go with our own definition of the word "territory," aren't we at risk of violating the principles of Jon Postel's? And are we getting into the business of defining of what is and what is not a country? Wouldn't it be better to keep the authoritative list, the ISO list when deciding who should apply for an IDN ccTLD?

BART BOSWINKEL: Patricio, may I get back and put this in the parking lot? May I get back to your question when we go to the next slide?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah? Because the definition is included, and, actually, we'll see there's a clear reference to the ISO 3166, precisely for the reason that you've noted. But at the same time, we'll get back to this in a minute and then ask if you agree with that definition. So that's why it's included in the

---

principles already in the document. But our first one is to list the policies.

So are there any further questions to this? Or maybe, just to be on the safe side, can you go to the next page, please, Kim? Then we'll go back to the poll one. So, as you can see, this is clearly, Patricio, a definition completely based on and that takes into account the ISO 3166 standard as has been used all along. So this is just to ensure that you are all aware of this definition.

Can you go back one slide please? So if there are no further questions around these principles, can we put up Poll 1 please, Kim? So the question is, do you agree with the principles? So the range is very simple: yes, no, and no opinion. Please submit your response.

And can you show the results, please? I think there is clear agreement—at least agreement. There is a lot of green ticks for the principles. And there is no objection.

Maybe, just to be on the safe side, somebody with no opinion, could you allude to this? Explain why you think ...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That would be really helpful for us. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Anybody? There's not—yeah, Eberhard, go ahead.

---

EBERHARD LISSE: I voted yes, but it's just to [inaudible] here. This is not in any way final. This is just to see whether the working group is on the right path. So feel free to express opinions in any way you want.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: The opinions for, against, or no opinion are helpful for the [deliberations].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. And I see one question from Peter. Yes, this is the exhaustive list of principles underpinning. We'll get to the criteria. And, [Lito], we'll get to your question in a minute. So the criteria is the criteria developed by the working group. This is to contrast against setting that every country could have 20 IDN ccTLDs, for example, without taking into account any criteria. That was the purpose of including this in the criteria. So it is a criteria that the criteria determine the number of IDN ccTLDs. Thanks.

If there are no further points regarding this principle, let's go to the next slide, please. And, again, the definition of "territory." This is a longstanding definition, I would say. Again, it has been developed by the working group and has also been used in other areas. It's part of the glossary of the retirement process and the review. It's been used to summarize and to avoid the un-clarity [and says] that we need to include, in the policy, country [as] a subdivision or other area of

---

geopolitical interest because that's the way it's been described in the ISO 3166. So that's why it's a definition. It's included in the start and also the exceptionally reserved ones. And you heard Stephen allude to this already in the retirement part.

So let me get back to you, Patricio, on this one. Patricio, does this address your concern or your question?

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Yes and no. Yes, it is a definition I would have expected, but no in the sense that I wouldn't have expected this to be spelled out in the previous slide because, if you read the previous slide, that leaves open the door to "territory" being redefined in a different way along the way, while the reference to the ISO list as stated from the beginning leaves no room for other interpretations.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Patricio. If you would go to the document and the reference of the document that was circulated, you will see that, in the document itself, it's part and parcel of the principle itself. So it's included in the first time it is mentioned and throughout the document and also through the glossary. So this was a matter of design of the slides to do it this way. I hope that addresses it.

Eberhard, go ahead.

---

EBERHARD LISSE: We could have just switched the slides around and defined “territory” first. Then this question would have not arisen. But as I said, these slides and these principles are for taking the pulse of the community to know whether that working group is on the right path. The actual document will be written, I’m 100% sure, properly. I saw in the chat that participants of that working group mentioned that the ISO played a big role. Therefore, I don’t think, Patricio, your complaint, while valuable, is founded. This is just because of the order of the slides here.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Eberhard. Going back, Peter Van Roste, to your question about the principle on equality [on] IDN and ASCII in the ccNSO process, yes, that has been taken care of and it is part and parcel of the bylaw updates, including the ccNSO processes themselves, and will be implemented. But that’s not part of this particular exercise. That’s been split off, as you could have seen. I hope that is a response to your question.

Then let’s go on, if there are no other questions or clarifications. Can we do the poll please, Kim? Poll 2. So do you agree with the definition of “territory”? Again, this is just taking the temperature of the room. This is not a formal vote. It’s just to inform the working group going forward.

Thank you. Okay, this is—thank you. There is one no. Could the person who voted no, if he or she is willing, share his or her views on why you disagree with the—

---

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We would love to hear from the no vote. Please don't be shy. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't see any ... Or type it in chat—yeah, go ahead, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Hi to all. Of course, I fully agree with this, but I wonder if somebody might object to using the word “territory” instead of “country” interchangeably. We're using it interchangeably here, but the main word is “country” [over] “territory.” Someone maybe feels that their IDN designation is somehow demoted from country to territory. I don't believe this, but I wonder if someone is thinking in that realm of thinking. But of course, I fully agree with this definition, and I think it's a good one.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Javier, and thanks for speculating. But I hope the person who voted no will respond.

Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: If I can un-speculate, I'm not a member of this IDN working group, but we must remain consistent that, for every ASCII ccTLD, there can be at least one IDN ccTLD. So, if we just say they're countries, then we leave the subdivisions out. And there may be subdivisions where the predominant language or the name is different from the main

---

language. For example—now, it’s a bad example—in the Faroe Islands, which form part of the Kingdom of Denmark but not part of Denmark itself, they speak a different language. If they were part of ... Or maybe Wales is a better definition. If Wales wanted their own IDN, there we’re having a problem because it’s not a ccTLD. If there was an island that has a different language, but belongs to a country—for example, the Christmas Islands belong to Australia but have their ISO code—other from English, it may be valuable.

So I wouldn’t really tie this to country. I would remain strictly consistent with the ISO definition.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you for reinforcing that point.

Javier, is that an old or a new hand?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Old. Sorry.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, even if you don’ feel comfortable speaking, if you have objections to these definitions, please either e-mail me because I think it is important for the working group to know where your thinking is and whether they can address your concern.

Thanks. Let’s go to the next slide because now we’ll stop and go into the criteria. So one of the criteria that the working group agreed upon—

---

this is probably broader than what is currently under the fast-track process—is that an IDN country-code top-level domain—so the string—must contain at least one non-ASCII character; a non-ASCII character that is A to Z, and the numbers are 0 to 9, and, I think, hyphen and the other one.

So it is important to understand the implication of this one. For example, to illustrate this, the working group included in its documentation two examples: one of what is not considered an IDN ccTLD, and one is considered an IDN ccTLD or eligible. So the eligible string would be “Espana,” with the “n” with the tilde. That would be eligible under this criteria as an IDN ccTLD string. Not acceptable would be, for example, “Italia,” which doesn’t include a non-ASCII character.

So that is core of these definitions. And this is about corner cases because most are especially due to Latin scripts. But this was a criteria for the working group.

Any questions on this one?

I don’t see any hands up. Nothing in chat. Thank you.

So let’s go to the polling, Kim. The next poll. Do you agree with this proposed criteria or not? Or you have no opinion? Please cast your opinion.

And the poll is closed. Again, thank you. So there is clear ... So, at least if you have no opinion ... Yes. If it’s substantial or because you’re not part of the process, [that should be a] different reason. Maybe if you



---

want to allude to it, please raise your hand or type in chat. Otherwise, we'll move on.

And there is no divergence. I don't see any responses.

Let's go to the next slide, please, Kim, because now we're getting into the real meat of the criteria. The next three slides all have to do—or the next couple of slides—with the IDN ccTLD string and the relation with the territory, how this is structured through the criteria. So, as a starting point—this is directly quoted from (or not directly but clearly paraphrased) the latest version of the ISO 3166 standard—the principle underlying the representation of territories—so countries, subdivisions, and areas of geopolitical interests—in two-letter code elements is the visual association between the names of the territories, in English (or French sometimes), and their corresponding code elements. So the two-letter code is considered to be a visual association with the name of the territory. This is the core of, I would say, the way the [MA] associates two-letter codes with a territory.

The working group indicated or has discussed this criteria, and there is a clear consensus, not just from the working group but also in previous efforts, that this principle of association, however structured, that there needs to be a principle association between the IDN country-code strings and the name of the territory and that it should be maintained. The way this is expressed by the working group but also under the fast track is that the IDN ccTLD string must be in meaningful representation of the name of the territory, however meaningful representation is detailed. But at least that is the association between the IDN ccTLD

---

string and the name of the territory. So meaningful representation is the way the visual association is ensured.

So let me first ask you, are there any questions on this part of this criteria? Because we'll get into more details later on.

I don't see any hands up.

Now, what I'll do is I'll go on to the next poll. This is purely around maintaining that link between the name of the territory and also the association between the string and the name of the territory. Can you pull up the poll, please, Kim? So do you agree with this criteria? So the criteria is that the link should be maintained between the string and the name of the territory.

I see your question, Marie-Noemie, I'll get to it in a minute because it's a very valid point. I see the vast majority agrees, and there a few "no opinions."

Marie-Noemie, the risk about it is that you lose the association between what is considered a ccTLD and a territory. And that was the starting point for ccTLDs at all. The confusion with gTLDs will increase dramatically. At least that was the underlying thinking when it was designed originally for the fast track and now again. I hope this explains the risk of doing it otherwise. And that's another important element. It maintains the link between ccTLDs or cc's and the ISO 3166 standard. So that's a related reason.

So thank you. Going to the next one, the next slide. Now we're going into detailing, what does meaningful representation of the name of the

---

territory mean? Again, the working group has developed some procedures and required documentation, but what you see in front is your basic criteria—go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry. So what does meaningful representation mean in this context? So that means that the string—consider this just as, for lack of a better word ( I know I shouldn't do this, but I still will)—needs to be the short-form name of a territory. Let me give you an example of what is meant. I live in the Netherlands, but the official name is the Kingdom of the Netherlands. So the short-form name is the Netherlands—not Holland, but the Netherlands. And the full name is the Kingdom of the Netherlands. An abbreviation could be nl because that's the two-letter code. Then the designated language—we'll touch upon designated language in a minute—needs to be in language of the territory. So, in my case, in the example I've used it needs to be in Dutch—so the Netherlands—although it's Latin, so there's no non-ASCII. But that's the basic mechanism, and that's the basic criteria that is called for. I hope this clarifies it.

“Considered by whom?” In territory, Hiro; to be considered by whom. We'll get to it in a minute. The string must be selected and will be selected by the significantly interested parties in territory. What that

---

means we'll touch upon a little bit later. I hope that answers your question at this stage.

Alan, to your question—"The link between IDN and the territory is not maintained Could the IDN be revoked?"—"retired" probably is what you mean. The working group will address this later on, and there will be a subgroup discussing this. So we can't preempt. And they haven't started, as you could have seen from Kenny's slide. We'll get to that in the next iteration when the Selection Working Group has started and completed its work.

So, going back, are there any questions for clarifications on this criteria?

I don't see any, other than ...

So, Kim, could you put up the poll, please? So that's the: do you agree with—forget about designated language—this criteria? So it's that the string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory. Again, thank you. I think the working group will be very pleased with the results, knowing this only the temperature of the room. But still. Thanks.

Let's go on to the next slide, please. So, as I said and as I alluded already to in my example, the name of the territory—now we're really getting into the IDN side of things or the multiple languages around the world ... The string must be a meaningful representation in a designated language of the territory. The working group, also following what happened in the fast track, looked at the definition of designated language. A designated language is a language, as you can read, that

---

has a legal status in the territory or serves as a language of administration. Again, this definition is taken—and is still valid—from the expert group on the geographic names from the United Nations.

In the fast-track process and in other areas, the term “official language was” used (and in the definition as well), but, based on some discussions of this working group and previous efforts, it became clear that official language causes confusion because of the term “official.” That’s why it’s now called (and that’s the working group proposed the term) “designated language”—so designated in territory as a language that meets this criteria.

So what does it mean in practice? I think Anil and India is a very good example. “Official language” might create some confusion, but India has at least 22 languages—so different languages (we’re not talking about scripts yet; we’re talking about languages) which have a legal status within India [that] all serve as a language of administration, to give you a basic idea of the implications. That’s the reason why India is eligible or was eligible for all these 22 IDN ccTLDs.

So any questions for clarifications? Comments from your end?

I don’t see any hands up, nor any questions in chat.

Can we go to the poll, please? So please complete the poll. Again, thank you [for] agreeing with this definition. I won’t spend too much time on this anymore.

Can we go to the next slide, please, Kim? This is where you can see the interplay between the principle that the criteria determine the number.

---

This follows, again, a long and extensive discussion not just from this working group but also in the past. In principle, there is only one IDN ccTLD string [for] designated language. This will need to be revisited. Just a pre-warning, which is not part and parcel of this discussion: this may need to be revisited when the Variant Management Subgroup has completed its work. But for now, the starting point of the work of this working group is this criteria. It also includes—this goes back to my example; the example I just used with India (but there are other territories as well)—that you have multiple IDN ccTLDs. A country might be associated with multiple IDN ccTLDs, but they need to refer to the name of the territory in a designated language, and these designated languages need to be different. So that’s the first.

The second step. This is, again, a complication in some cases. In some territories—we haven’t touched upon this, but ultimately that’s the point—[it’s] the use of scripts. A language is always expressed in a script in a recent writing system. As the working group required IDN ccTLD strings to be a meaningful representation of the name of the country in a designated [script], it needs to be designated in a script, and that script could be Latin but also other scripts—for example, Cyrillic, Greek, Chinese; a lot of them. But at least that’s where you can see the link with IDNs in general and the related RFCs. So that’s the background of the second sentence.

So, if there is a territory where the language is expressed in more than one script—the known example being, for example, China and Taiwan (but I also believe Korea and some other countries or territories)—then

---

a language-per-script combination is eligible. So that's what the second sentence is about.

I hope this is clear, but I open the floor for questions. Any questions, please?

I see, Lito, your question: "If there is more than one string allowed for any reason" ... In principle, if you look at it from a perspective of variant management, it is going down that path. For example, under the fast track currently, you already see IDN ccTLD strings, not taking into account variant management, are treated differently and separately. Most countries or most territories or most IDN ccTLD managers are the ccTLD managers but is not a requirement. I think there are three or four examples under the fast track already where you see that the IDN ccTLD manager is a different manager than the ASCII ccTLD manager. The issues to this point are addressed, with respect to the ccNSO itself, in the bylaw change or the proposed bylaw change.

I see your question, Hiro: "If there is just one designated language, the same stands?" What do you mean with that question? Could you allude to it, Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA:

Hi. [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, go ahead. Or type in the chat.

---

HIRO HOTTA: Can you hear me?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, Hiro. We can hear you very well. Go ahead.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Hiro, we can hear you.

HIRO HOTTA: Okay. In the first sentence, it says that, if there's more than one—this is the language [inaudible]—if there's just one designated language in the territory, it [can] have one unique IDN ccTLD for the language. So the first sentence is very restrictive because it says “more than one.”

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, that's the summary, as already noted. But to be clear, the drift of this one—we'll ensure this will be referred in the text—[is that there is] one unique IDN ccTLD for each designated language.

HIRO HOTTA: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: So if there is only one designated language, there's only one IDN ccTLD. If there are two designated languages, two. Then the exception to that basic rule is the second sentence. Does that answer your point?



---

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Hiro. Thanks for the question.

Patricio, I see: “Designated may be spoken only in particular region.” Again, Patricio, whether it is a particular region or not is not relevant. If a designated language—can you go back one slide, please? The designated language a legal status in the territory or serves as a language of administration. If there is documentation or the working group agreed that documentation is required to show that it is a language which has a legal status in a territory or serves as a language of administration, then how limited the region is doesn’t matter.

You can go the other way around. It depends a bit on the size of the country. But I assume that, for example, in India, some of the groups who speak a designated language or use a designated language are relatively small, considered to the total Indian population. But if you would compare it to the population of my country—we have 17 million people living in the Netherlands—it would probably four or five times the size.

So that’s why we don’t go into the details of the country. This is the criteria. It’s up to the country itself to designate their language and to document it.

So any further questions? 1:12:45

---

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Further up in chat, [Abdullah Akkam] had a question. “Is there a limit on the number of strings where a language is expressed in more than one script?”

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. It’s one. So one per script. So if a language—

EBERHARD LISSE: One per language or one per script?

BART BOSWINKEL: So, if you have the combination that a language is expressed in two scripts, then there is the limitation of one per script. But that’s the exceptional rule. But in principle it’s one per designated language.

Patricio, I saw your hand up.

PATRICIO POBLETE: If I may clarify.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, go ahead.

PATRICIO POBLETE: My question was because there may be a lot of political implications [to bear]. Suppose, as an example, that, in Chile, the Rapa Nui language which is spoken in Easter Island, which is an island belonging to Chile. Suppose the Rapa Nui was given this official status or designation. So

---

there could be an application coming for Chile in Rapa Nui. But if it was granted, the Rapa Nui people would want to have the name of their island represented in their string and not the name of Chile. They could actually feel it like an insult after they got their Rapa Nui having an official status; to have it represented as Chile, which is just the same string, and not the name of their particular island.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. And the working group did not address this particular scenario. However, what they addressed and what you will see is that, in principle, that is an internal issue and that's an internal territorial issue. It has to do with what is the legal status of a territory. Again, the way the documentation is required is there needs to be a letter of support by the government and also by the other significantly interested parties.

So this is all the selection process, and these are the criteria. But the selection process itself is an internal matter for the territory. I hope that addresses your concern because I know there are a lot of scenarios, especially when minorities get involved. But at the end of the day, the issues should be resolved—at least that's the driving point of the working group—internally. Does that address your concern, Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE:

Yeah. If it's clear, then it shouldn't leave room for a political fight to be carried over to this ccNSO.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: No. That's the whole intention. We'll get to that in a minute.

But if there are no more questions for clarification, unless, Kim, I missed one ...

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Yeah. There's actually a few questions and comments here. Jamal LeBlanc from ICANN Org has a comment. "An expat may prefer to use his or her designated language, despite living in another country."

Roelof Meijer from SIDN has a question to Pablo. "It has to be meaningful representation of the whole country of territory, correct?"

BART BOSWINKEL: That is correct, yeah, because you talk about the name of the territory.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Okay. And that was it. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: Going back to Jamal, Jamal, an expat may want to use this, of course, but the question is whether the language he or she uses is a designated language in that territory. So that's what we're talking about. That's why we refer to the territories.

I see no ... And one more from Maureen. "Take Belgium, for example. Three official languages: French, Dutch, and German. Each language is

---

part of the country.” Yes. In principle, if you would meet all criteria—this goes back to my example of India with the 22 because that’s the living and the best example based on these criteria—each and every name of the territory in Dutch, French, or German would be eligible if you would meet all the other criteria for Belgium. That’s because of the different designated languages. I hope that answers your question.

I don’t see any ... Let’s go to the poll. I don’t see any ...

Okay. Thank you very much. Again, everybody agrees.

So let’s go to the next slide. We’re getting to the end now. I think we’ve discussed ... So one string per designated language. We’ve discussed this one. So now we’re going into the non-contentious ... And you already alluded to the ... Or some of you alluded to this point—Patricio with his example, as well as others. So this is about that the selected IDN ccTLD string must be non-contentious within the territory.

Now, the word “selected” is used deliberately to express that the significantly interested parties in the territory need to select the IDN string. So once it hits the next phase—the application is submitted—then we talk about a selected IDN ccTLD string, or the working group talks about it. The selection process should result in a string that is non-contentious, and non-contentious by the significantly interested parties in the territories. The working group tried to align its definition with the concept of a significantly interested parties which was derived from RFC 5091. So it was not only used in the context of this work but also in the context of delegation and transfer of ccTLDs and as interpreted in the framework of interpretation. The text in the proposed

---

proposals to date clearly references the definition from the framework of interpretation.

As I said—this goes a little bit more into the details of it—the support and/or endorsement or non-objection (because, in some cases, people feel not comfortable in non-objection but only to support but only to non-object) should be documented and clearly evidenced in a statement by the significantly interested parties.

So that’s the way how the working group proposed it. It will be done in-territory. And it’s very clear that this is an internal in-territory matter, going back to the idea that others outside the territory should not be involved.

Questions for clarifications?

Eberhard, I see your hand is up.

EBERHARD LISSE:

We are running out of time, and we haven’t had any opportunity for the community to ask questions about the [inaudible] is important because there is a vote coming up. So I wouldn’t like to cut you short because the IDN thing is important. But I think we have taken the temperature of the room now and we need to give the community an opportunity to ask about retirement.

---

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah, of course. May I finish this one—the question—just as a polling, and then I'll hand it back? Because the next one—this was the final one. Please go ahead. So, please, if you support this ...

Again, thank you.

Next slide. Just to be on the safe side so you can see it, it's about technical ... This will come back when we discuss variant management as well.

Next slide so you can see what happens. This is the final ... This is where the Variant Management Subgroup is.

Next slide, please. This is all about the reference and background material. After this session, the slides will be available for everybody so you can check the reference and background.

So back to you, Stephen. And thanks, Kenny.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, both Kenny and Bart, for that. I'm now throwing the floor open for questions on either PDP3 or PDP4. Given that we're about to open voting on PDP3, I would love to see questions on where we are with the retirement process. So don't be shy. We're here to answer them. We're voting in July. We have two high hurdles to meet, as I expressed and as you can see on the slide: 87 members and 66% in the affirmative. Both are high hurdles.

Any questions on retirement? Are you happy with it? Not happy with it?

---

I do see a hand up from Yuri, so the floor is yours. Go ahead, please.

YURI TAKAMATSU: Thank you, Stephen. Can you hear me?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes.

YURI TAKAMATSU: I have one question regarding the ccPDP3 retirement policy, about the process. In your presentation, maybe Slide #9, after the trigger event, you showed that someone will send an invitation to ccTLD, I think. So I was wondering who will send that invitation, whether the cc's need the arrangement or not. [inaudible] the slide. "How does the retirement process look like?"—that slide. Maybe ...

EBERHARD LISSE: The flowchart.

YURI TAKAMATSU: Yes. Flowchart. Ah, yes. That one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: There we go.



---

YURI TAKAMATSU: Yes. At the top part, under the trigger event: invitation to discuss retirement plan. So does this mean that someone ... Who will send or ...

EBERHARD LISSE: All of this is between the ccTLD manager and the IANA function operator.

YURI TAKAMATSU: Okay.

EBERHARD LISSE: The IANA function operator manages the root, enters and removes to and from the root. So, if they become aware of the removal of the ISO code, they will start the process by giving notice to the ccTLD manager. All DNS-related correspondence or engagement is between the ccTLD manager and the IFO.

YURI TAKAMATSU: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope that answers your question.

I also note in the chat that Patricio has weighed in on PDP4 with some language change going forward. So I recommend that to [Kevin, et al].

Any other questions regarding either PDP3 or PDP4 at this point?

---

I'm not seeing any additional hands, so I make note of Patricio's comment.

Given that we are at the top of the hour, all I can do at this point is encourage my ccTLD colleagues to vote regarding ccPDP3 retirement. Vote. Vote early. Vote often. But do vote. We need to turn out on two levels.

And I think that's it from me. We're out of time. [Lito], thank you as well. Patricio, you read my mind. I'm not seeing any other comments, so I think I can say we're done. I just want to thank everyone for participating today. We had a nice turnout. I wish you all well. Hope to see you in person soon. I personally will start walking to Seattle if they say we're going to have a meeting in Seattle. I think, at this point, we're done. I want to thank staff. I want to thank everybody for participating.

Kimberly, I think you can kill the recording. And we're done. Thank you.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you all. Please stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**