MARRAKECH – ccNSO: IDN ccTLD Policies Preliminary Review
Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

AJAY DATA: Good morning and welcome to the ccNSO IDN Preliminary Review Team update on Thursday, the 27th. Do we do the roll call to start with? Thank you very much. I will leave you, Bart, to update. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. I see a lot of faces who are not familiar with what we're discussing here. What we intend to do is … I need to speak up? Okay. I'm not used to that. Sorry.

So, what we'll do is, especially for those who are relatively new to this work, we'll run through the IDN, the presentation this group gave to the ccNSO meeting and to the GAC, but spend some more time on the overview of and the differences on the gap analysis itself because we didn't go into details. And that, effectively, also leads into the second point of the agenda. Could you go to the presentation? Not to me. Thank you.

So, this slide is called the roadmap and we introduced it at the Kobe meeting, and the reason for calling it a roadmap is to – next

slide, please – deal with a few major issues that we already identified. Next slide, please.

One major issue is – and I see some people probably who represent IDN ccTLDs – is that, by definition, IDN ccTLDs can currently not become members of the ccNSO. It's to do with a bylaw definition and that needs to change. In 2013, in the overall policy, it was already addressed but that policy has not been adopted to date. So, that's one issue, and it's about time that IDN ccTLDs … Again, it's voluntary, but if they want to become members, they should be able to become members. Currently, there are 61 from 42 countries. Next slide, please.

There are a number of outstanding open issues which have evolved over time. One of them is around variant management. There has been a lot of work of all kinds of script communities, language communities, about the root zone label generation rules, etc., to find and to define alternatives or variance to, say, IDN TLDs. One way or the other, there needs to be a policy in place how to deal with all these variants.

So, the ICANN Board reached out to both the ccNSO and GNSO to start addressing this. It was recognized already in the IDN overall policy that I referred to from 2013. So, the draft policy. And that policy includes a placeholder, effectively meaning it needs to be

developed at a later stage when more is known. It now is about time that this work is undertaken.

A second major piece that is clearly – and I will go in a little bit more detail later on – needs to evolve is around confusing similarity. The confusing similarity review has evolved under the fast track. Initially, it was similar to the evaluation procedure which was used for the new gTLD process. So, the same criteria, same procedure, and same methodology. However, over time, this methodology proved to have some issues. And under the fast track – and that was the reason why we had to fast track – it was further evolved and it could be experimented with in a reasonably restricted environment.

So, it has evolved over time, and one of the reasons for undertaking this work is, again, to review what is in the draft proposal, update it. And the ccNSO Council has reached out to the GNSO in order to check whether it would be feasible, possible, to harmonize the two processes again because probably from an application user perspective, it doesn't make sense to have two different procedures dealing with the same kind of issues which is around confusing similarity of top-level domains. Currently, that is the case.

A third major project or part that has evolved is the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. Currently, to start with, there is no policy around the

retirement of ccTLDs, whether it's IDN ccTLDs or ASCII ccTLDs. So, the country code top-level domains. There is a policy needed. I see some wandering faces. Let me explain why. ccTLDs, country code TLDs, originate – or the country code originates – from the ISO 3166 code. The country code list (so, ISO 3166-1list) includes the names of countries and territories, the vast majority is from the UN context, but there are some other areas as well.

What people tend to forget – and that's the way, probably, and that's my interpretation. How the brain works is countries come and countries go. There have been some examples in the past of major countries that have dissolved. For example, the Soviet Union at the time. Recently, it is, for example, the Netherlands Antilles. The Netherlands Antilles were – and that's probably the least contentious example because it's recent and it's a clear case of what could happen. The Netherlands Antilles is part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. I know this because I'm Dutch. It consists of islands in the Caribbean. The legal status of these islands changed and some of them are independent areas, country. So, more sovereign. So, the Netherlands Antilles dissolved and now you have Curacao, Saint Maarten, and some municipalities in Aruba.

So, the country code – the Netherlands Antilles as such – was removed as a country name from the ISO 3166 list. Hence, dot-AN was removed from the country code, and therefore the ccTLD

manager or the ccTLD dot-AN was removed from, ultimately, out of the root zone. It was replace – or, replace is another thing. It was succeeded by dot-AN and dot-SX. So, you see, the list of countries or the countries and territories are not stable. It evolves.

Another example recently is the addition, for example, of southern Sudan which became dot-SS. And you have some significant changes in the names of countries which may result in a change of the country code. There are changes of country names which do not result in a change of the country code, and hence there is no need to retire them. But if there is a significant change of the name of a country, this may lead to the retirement of that ccTLD to be replaced by another one. So, it is less stable than people assume.

This will also result – and there is a link between IDN ccTLDs or the creation of [IDN] ccTLDs and being listed on the ISO 3166 code. So, that's one. It's almost a [inaudible]. A country needs to be on the [inaudible] territory, needs to be on the ISO 3166 list to be eligible for IDN ccTLDs. And there are additional requirements. And maybe there is a change in the additional requirements. Maybe that could trigger the retirement of the ccTLDs.

For example, a major change in the name of a country, because an IDN ccTLD needs to be a meaningful representation of the

name of the country, and hence it could change, and hence the ccTLD could retire or should retire but that's up to the future work.

So, there is a clear link between what is in the lingo of the Retirement Working Group, the PDP Retirement Working Group, called a trigger event. As of that moment, the work or the process defined by the ccNSO PDP 3 – that's on the retirement of ccTLDs – applies.

But, in the future, what needs to be developed and in the context of IDNs, is the retirement or the trigger event for the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. Next slide, please.

These are the outstanding issues that were known. In Kobe, the community discussed how to get from fast track process, an overall policy that's still, since 2013, in draft mode with open and outstanding issues to a policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings that is up to date, addresses the main issues, in amended ccNSO Article 10, to allow the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. So, that's the background of what we are doing here and what needs to be addressed. Next slide, please. We'll skip this one.

Again, this is another way of looking at the roadmap. It shows you where we are. It is stopping the evolution of the fast track process and looking at PDP 2. PDP 2 is around IDN ccTLDs, so that's what

I've referred to. Be aware it's not been adopted by the ICANN Board, so it is not a real policy. It is just a proposal since 2013.

So, this working group, what we are discussing today is around the preliminary review team, on the task undertaken in gap analysis of the overall policy. So, it has looked at the outstanding issues and it has looked at the policy and it has tried to identify areas that need to be addressed, either through – by which methodology and that's what we're going to discuss today.

Then this working group will come up with a recommendation or an advice to the ccNSO Council how to move forward and it's going to be [inaudible]. At least we have, say, a baseline from which to work.

Then, the goal, say the advice could be step three is split PDP 2, so the one that's in draft mode, go for a bylaw change. Request a bylaw change. We now know how it works, because [inaudible] bylaw change around the IFRT, and maybe even launch a new PDP addressing a limited set of issues identified by this group and build on the work which is already done and which is included in PDP 2.0 because what is there and what is good you don't throw away. You don't need to reinvent the wheel. Next slide, please.

As I said, this group in the PRT is around where we are. The previous slide is step two, the gap analysis, it shows a bit what I just concluded. Next slide, please. I'll go in details.

Now, we go into the preliminary findings to date. The members of the working group will be asked today of this review team to confirm for the final time, say that list is stable.

For you, for those who are in the room, I'll just briefly go over the details. One of the, I think, important findings is that – and this is all … Please take into the context. Otherwise, it becomes very cryptic. The context is the policy development … Say, proposals for the IDN overall policy, as I said. So, the results of PDP 2.0. That is the baseline document. Everything that's included here refers to that document. That's what we've been looking at or what the working group has been looking at.

So, there are no major changes needed in respect to what is included and that's part two, section 2.2 of the overall policy with respect to the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs. Effectively meaning that there is no need for additional policy work in that area. So, it's almost ready, if the working group advises this, to go to the ccNSO Council, and if the advice in the ccNSO Council takes this recommendation advice on board, to ask for a bylaw change with respect to include the IDN ccTLDs and the ccNSO.

So, that's the path forward with respect to the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. It is very clear and probably that's obvious from the introduction, there needs to be policy work around the retirement of IDN ccTLDs variant management. There is nothing

in place and it needs to be done. And the only way this could be done is through a policy development process.

Now, there is a question. Do you want to do this in two separate PDPs or put it in one, and let's say as two main topics that need to be addressed under the same policy development process? There are pros and cons to both approaches and that's something that the working group will need to discuss and recommendation, and ultimately the council needs to decide upon.

Then, a third major block – and we'll go in a bit more details around that one – is the update of the relevant paths of the IDN ccTLD selection process. So, what is currently in the proposals and under the fast track process because the overall policy builds upon the experience of the [variant] fast track process, so this is effectively a final opportunity to update the current fast track process. I look at it from that angle.

So, paths needs to be updated and adjusted in the overall policy document. Obviously – and that's why I've alluded to it, the confusing similarity piece and maybe the whole structure of the document to streamline it.

Finally, which is probably I should have started with this point, is the way the overall policy and the fast track document is and the methodology is structured, it starts off with identifying some

principles that underpin the work of the working group, of the proposals. It offers a framework to interpret whoever is interpreting the policy in implementation work or beyond implementation on what the working group at the time and the community intended to do. These principles, I'll touch upon it a little bit, at least from a preliminary review team, are still solid and valid so they still keep on underpinning the IDN policy. That's why the review team addressed these principles and looking at them, and was asked to check whether they're still valid, yes or no. So, that's part of the work as well. Next slide, please. Maybe I'll skip this one. We'll address this on the table as well. I've talked about this one as well and you will see it in the tables. Next one.

Update [relevant]. Probably this is easy because that's the most elaborate part of all the tables. This refers to the different sections in the overall policy. As said, confusing similarity is defined in the PDP 2 document. It's also defined in the fast track process, the implementation plan. There is experience in the GNSO as well.

So, if you would look at these processes, they have evolved or some have evolved over time, so you can note a divergence between the procedures and processes, but also in the criteria have been used and the methodology of assessment.

EN

One of the major debates – and I'll really go into the weeds of this but it is what the future working group has to deal with is if you would look at the fast track process or the fast track implementation plan, there is a reference to a guideline on the extended process similarity review panel (EPSRP). The methodology they use is based on a cognitive psychology and neurosciences, and what they effectively do is, if you look at it, it's only been used three times. They've done some statistical analysis of observations of people to check whether there is confusing similarity. That was, at the time, the latest in cognitive science, how to deal with similarity issues. That was a very scientific way of dealing with it and that was in response to the experience of the work under the first panel.

So, it was not so much a review. The EPSRP is not a review. It is another way of looking at it, very much in depth, very complicated, very esoteric and very expensive. The question is whether they should be continued or find a more practical way forward, but at least it produced results and it was a response to the experience under the original fast track process.

And it has evolved again further because there was still an issue whether something which is now called the risk mitigation possibility or panel and measures. So, even if there are confusing similarity and the requestor applicants wants to pursue, if that entity commits to introducing risk mitigation measures because

of confusing similarity, whether they should be allowed yes or no and to what extent and who should measure or who should assess these risk mitigation measures.

So, that's how much into the weeds this whole procedure got. The question is whether they should go on. That's a very complicated debate and probably – and probably as I said from an end user request applicant point of view, it would be good if, say, the procedures and processes between for all TLDs are more or less comparable. That means, say, for gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs and maybe even for ccTLDs, although that probably will not happen. But at least for IDN TLDs. So, CC and gTLDs, so there is more predictability, etc., from a requestor point of view.

Another one relates to IDN tables and also this is a byproduct of the root zone label generation rules and the terminology needs to be updated. That's the least of the problems. But also the requirements for IDN ccTLDs with respect to IDN tables. It needs to be reviewed.

There are some more procedural aspects. For example, the documentation needs to be provided with only English or other languages. There are some examples on, say, the fast track process but ultimately that's a debate you have. And there are some other areas in the overall policy that need to be addressed. For example, the IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel and the review.

Should it be maintained? Should it be five years? Should it be ten years, etc.? Because, say, one of the … The review team has noted it's doing a review as well but there are so many reviews. The question is even if you will put it in the policy, whether you will find whether it's is pragmatic to do it because there are [inaudible] volunteers who are willing to do the work or able to do the work. Go ahead.

AJAY DATA: Just to add one thing. When the string goes into that root zone, it does not distinguish between it is a ccTLD IDN or gTLD IDN. It is a string. And if we have [inaudible] between the GNSO policy for IDNs and ccNSO, then it may be very difficult to find the access there and create [the strings] what ccTLDs may be looking for. So, it will be very, very important to have [inaudible] with GNSO where the variant at least is agreed upon and confusing similarities are agreed upon and then it goes into the root zone.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Ajay. Next slide, please. Go ahead.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: I will talk about the script mixing. I think script mixing is the [inaudible] of the two languages. Maybe the two languages has the same context [inaudible] left to right. It's okay for me. But if

we mix between [inaudible] context language and other context language, of course it will make a lot of confusability. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Related and I think now, again, we go into the weeds. There is another study group running in parallel on emojis. So, where we go from emojis into IDNs, probably there is some gray area. So, that's something that all comes together and needs to be defined precisely probably in the new policy with respect to IDN ccTLDs. At least for the top level because that's a major distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs. We are only dealing with IDN ccTLDs at the top level. The registration policies, etc., are out of scope of ICANN policy [inaudible].

Again, going to the underpinning principles – and I should have started with this. Effectively, point one and two are a little bit the same. IDN ccTLDs, what it really means is IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs are all ccTLDs and they should be treated the same and the same policies should apply, with one major difference that is around the string selection. The major difference between IDN ccTLDs and ccTLDs, ASCII ccTLDs, is the way the string is selected. [inaudible] strings are selected because it's included in the ISO 3166. The string itself, the country code, so you just add a dot for it. That's the requirement.

IDN ccTLDs is more complicated because they are not defined that way. There is no external standard that defines IDN ccTLDs. I know this because at the time when the fast track was developed, we are looking for all kinds of tables and there is no consistent table and I can assure you ISO 3166 doesn't have one. They have, in some cases … Nor does the UN. They have the UNGEGN but they do not work with every [inaudible]. And the UNGEGN list does not include all the official languages or designated languages of a country. It only has the few that have been listed. It's a voluntary thing.

So, there is no such thing. It is very important, as a basic principle for the underpinning the fast track process, underpinning the overall policy for IDN ccTLD string selections and [further] that ccTLDs are all the same, no matter whether they're an IDN or, say, ASCII ccTLD. And this implies, effectively, the first point that the ICANN processes are around or the policies for delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement. So, effectively [ROC 1591] applies to both IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs and the newly to-be-developed policy around retirement and review mechanisms applies to both as well. So, that is a fundamental principle, and probably from a ccTLD perspective, whether it's ASCII or IDN, it also implies they should be treated similarly – I will not say the same, but similarly because there are some aspects that are different – in their relationship with ICANN and in their

relationship with the ccNSO. So, that's [inaudible]. So, these two elements are probably fundamental.

Then, the third one is [everything] and also provides the basis for interpretation of the policy and of the fast track process is maintain and preserve the security, stability, and interoperability of the DNS. It should not break the system. That's effectively what is said at the time.

So, these are very fundamental principles that drive and have driven the policy development processes and the implementation. Yes, go ahead, Abdalmonem.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Thank you, Bart. For retirement of ccTLDs, I will talk about if I am ASCII ccTLD and I will retire. So, it is immediately the IDN one for my country will be retired as well?

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't know but I could imagine the situation. Take .NL as an example, the Netherlands. We do not have an IDN ccTLD. Maybe we could have one [inaudible] which has some non-ASCII signs, so there's no meaningful representation. But assume there is something in an ASCII ccTLD. If the Netherlands would dissolve, and would be removed from the ISO 3166 list, probably – and this is a fundamental requirement. Maybe we recall what I said in the

start. To be eligible and [inaudible] an IDN ccTLD, the country, the whole territory – and we talk about country and territory – needs to be listed on the ISO 3166.

So, if the Netherlands disappears for whatever reason, the ccTLD disappears and the IDN ccTLD will disappear as well. Again, that's the logic, because there is no link anymore. But that's only at the level – the very basis level.

But if you look at the other requirements, like for example, dot-NL is a country code that's been assigned by the [maintenance agency]. Take, for example, the Netherlands would go for the same name [inaudible]. The name should stay the same name. It should maintain the same name. But the country code – say, the name in English or French – would change significantly, and therefore the country code would change. It would go from Netherlands to Holland, for example. That would mean a change in ccTLD but [inaudible] both are the same. That's the mind game you need to play with me.

Then, it would mean the IDN ccTLD is not touched. The country is still listed but the IDN ccTLD is not touched, so it could remain. But the ccTLDs change because the country code changes. That's why you need what is a trigger event is different for IDN ccTLDs in some cases than for the ccTLD. If Netherlands would disappear altogether, then both would. I hope that clarifies it.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Well, [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have an online comment from Dennis Tan. "On the IDN ccTLD string selection, it may be useful to have ccNSO input on the study group report on the use of RZ LGR which is looking at the issue of consistent applications of the RZ LGR by GNSO and ccNSO. The comment period is closing."

BART BOSWINKEL: I think, from a ccNSO perspective, I can't say anything. I just can respond from the staff perspective. We have circulated this to individual ccTLDs because there is no position at this stage yet from the ccNSO. They haven't touched this topic for quite some time. Maybe, say, as soon as this work continues and it's geared up and really started, that is about time. But I think on the RZ LGR, we've informed – from a staff perspective, we informed the CC community, including some of the IDN ccTLDs. It's up to them to respond. There is no ccNSO position in that [inaudible]. I hope this clarifies it.

Let's continue to the next slide because now we're going into what was happening today. I think from the basic work that was done is how to include IDN ccTLDs and discuss bylaw changes needed. I think this is fairly easy for the future work and that the PRT can conclude something like this, say there is no additional work needed. It's just moved forward.

What needs to be discussed today and maybe at least identified is after the PRT has concluded, there are no changes needed to the tables, that we start to discuss how to do this and probably there aren't just one or two [inaudible] possible. Either revisit PDP 2 and start it back or start a new PDP and then think through how to work on, say, variant management, confusing similarity and other areas. I could suggest some ways. Again, there are limited ways of doing this but at least come up with some recommendations in that area. So, that's where we are. Next slide, please.

And following our meetings over the next few weeks, I hope that the PRT will be able to conclude on a report to the ccNSO Council, so they have it hopefully by the end of August. And the reason for end of August is because the holiday. We do have, if it's the end of August, have the opportunity to use and start working on really implementing the recommendations of the PRT by Montreal so we can really kick off the substantial work by Montreal. If it's a PDP, we have to go – the ccNSO has to go – through certain steps

to launch it and to initiate the real work, including a call for volunteers. So, that was it. Any questions on this part from those who haven't seen this before, are new and are interested in this work? I see some faces. Go ahead, Abdalmonem.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: This is just a comment. I think before adding IDN ccTLD manager to ccNSO, could consider first the most important which is variant management – should consider variant management and the [inaudible] in order for the broader selection of IDN ccTLD and then go to the proposal for ccNSO to be a member inside ccNSO [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: And just to be very clear, and just for the record, the ccNSO, although it has members, it is open and the working groups are open to members and non-members. Have always been open. The major disadvantage of not being a member is you cannot vote on the PDP. You cannot elect your council members. And you cannot participate in the board selection process for board seat 11 and 12. These three things are exclusively for the ccNSO members. So, that's the major difference. Everything else, there is full parity between non-members and members.

This was an introduction to item two of the agenda, the finalization of the table. For those who are new, what we have done over time – just a brief explanation, the way the working group has worked to date is initially we worked on a table that included the section specific in the proposal itself, he topic that was addressed, and then some comments whether to – around, say, why it should be addressed. Maybe change of direction. And this needs to be cleaned up, the comments, and streamlined. But at least the topics that need to be addressed in future are identified in this section in the proposal.

So, first of all … And now I'm turning to the [inaudible] otherwise. We could sit here the whole day. For the members of the review team, you had all had the opportunity to look at it. This is a final reading of the table. So, this is about section 2.11 of the overall policy proposal. So, that's PDP 2 on the overall policy. Is there anything that you want to delete or change? Please note the comment at the bottom of the document and that comment was a point Ajay made and it will be recorded but that's out of scope of this group and probably out of scope of the PDP itself is whether the parity between ccTLDs should be maintained, given … So, effectively the underlying principle, one vote per country/territory. Or should there be a weighted system, some countries are less equals than others? No comments? Next page, please. Go ahead, Abdalmonem.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah. [inaudible] item in 2.11. [inaudible] the number of [inaudible] on the number of languages [inside this country] and the number of [population] was because language. Maybe I am India and have [inaudible] in this country I think five languages, for example. And these five languages have a lot of population. [It's the biggest] language. So, I will have five IDN ccTLDs for [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: That's effectively what it says. Going back, it is for each of these categories, there is only one. So, if you have 100 languages in a country, official languages, there will be 100 IDN ccTLDs. If there is only one – and this happens to be a Latin language, like my country – there is [none]. And if you just have what you see in some countries, only one official language other than, say – which uses a script, a non-Latin script … For example, I could imagine the Arabic countries. I don't know that much. They only have Arabic, then it's one ccTLD because that's the old policy. And under the IDN policy, it's only one IDN ccTLD in the Arabic language/script. So, that's what it really means. So, only one IDN ccTLD per designated language/script. Next slide, please. Next page.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

So, we now go into the criteria for the selection. This is section 2.12, first page. The members of the review team have seen this before. Final reading of this document. Any comments, questions? Maybe for the audience, if that's unclear. But that's all there is [inaudible] review team because we need to create the base to move forward. None? So, this is now finally concluded. Next page, please.

Next page, same topic, 2.12 of the overall policy. Any comments, questions? None. Thank you. Next one. Again, 2.12. Can you see the different sections? We will normalize this going forward. It's one of the things that's on my to-do list. No comments. Again, finalized. Next page, please. Closed. Next section.

Section 2.13 on the procedure and documentation. So, the first section was on the criteria and this page is on the procedures and documentation and it follows a bit the structure of the fast track implementation plan. So, on this page, any questions, comments from the PRT members? If none, next page, please.

Same question from my end. Comments, additional remarks, anything? None? Closed. Next one, please.

This is the final section on 2.13. Any comments, anything else? Again, closed. No hands up. Next page.

This is 2.14, selection [inaudible]. So, miscellaneous policy proposals. There are some remarkable ones, to use that word. They've been identified. One of them is, for example, the creation of an IDN ccTLD table over time. It has a certain purpose. It was introduced at the time. The question is whether it still needs to be included because it's quite some work and the question is the added value. But that's a personal view. No comments, questions around this from any of the members of the PRT? None.

Next page, please. Questions, comments on this one, 2.14? None. Move forward.

This is around 2.2. This is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs. Again, voting. This is more a clarification and a discussion of the working group around the voting mechanism. And this is, again, to maintain parity among country and territories. This is [inaudible] UN.

Membership definition. Next slide, please. No questions. No questions, comments. Next page, please. Next page.

Other topics. Again, this is very obvious. Variant management retirement of IDN ccTLDs needs to be included in the next efforts. Next page. And that's it. No comments. Thank you.

So, that means we got a solid basis now for moving forward and to start drafting a report, what needs to change in the overall or

what needs to be addressed. Now, can we go to the agenda, please?

Suggested methods, resolve issues. We should have had a Google Doc but don't worry. What I suggest that we do for the next call – and Ajay, I'm looking at you and the other members of the PRT. I think what needs to happen is the table with the results of the review need to be consolidated, put in the same language, etc. That's something that the support staff will do. Then we add one comment, and this goes back to the original Google Doc and add suggestions on how to address this. For example, the bylaw change is effectively recommend to council to request a bylaw change to the ICANN Board of Directors. That's probably with regard to section 2.2. So, that will be included in that table.

Another one is, if you would go back to the substantial issues, it's very obvious they need to be addressed to a PDP. The question is – and that's something to discuss, whether this should be separate PDPs. So, you would have a PDP on variant management and confusing similarity and maybe [inaudible] on the procedures or will we do it under the umbrella of one policy development process? There are pros and cons, as I said.

Secondly, some of these topics are very big, like variant management and how to deal with it because they complicate it and probably there are probably who are very interested in that

area. Not just in the ccNSO but also in the GNSO. So, we need to think of a methodology that respects both communities but where they can coordinate their efforts and the results of their coordinated efforts can feed into at least a PDP. Say, the ccNSO PDP.

Let me be a little bit more explicit. I could imagine … Say, cross-community working groups, they have – in the past, the ccNSO and GNSO have tried to work with a cross-community working group on the use of country and territory names. However, one of the real issues there was the status of the results was unclear. And if you will go to the guidelines on the cross-community working group, effectively cross-community working groups are not intended to do policy work because they're a little bit separate of a policy development process and policy development process is paramount.

What I could imagine, however, is that we set up a joint work party with people who are working under one PDP and working under another. This work party has a very light weight charter and invite other expertise, experts, and this charter is – or terms of reference – and they discuss matters and they advise the working groups under each of these PDPs because you've got the members there who take on these results on board in that way. And it could be even that we agree to disagree. Say, we agree that harmonization is not feasible but at least that's a lightweight structure where you

can coordinate without any baggage of cross-community working groups. It's a new way.

I think some of these working parties have proved to be very or reasonably successful. Not very timely but at least successful. And say the ccNSO at least has I think a good experience around the risk mitigation panel, how that [works]. So, it is an alternative way and we need to discuss and explore it but at least that's one of the potential alternatives that the working group could – say, this group could discuss and suggest to the council because I think … Or you have a study group but that's more a fact-finding mission, like the emoji study group. It's not really about resolving and trying to find something. So, there are different tastes and different ways and I think this is again an area for creativity.

So, going back to the table that Kim kindly put up, effectively … So, we add the final column to the table with the recommended way forward and how to address the issues. And that's all this working group needs to do, this review team. It just needs to suggest and then we put some language around it and tie it in a ribbon and send it to council. Any questions around this proposed way forward next steps?

AJAY DATA: Considering the timeline which we think is August end, probably we need to have many calls before to finalize and move forward

and suggest what we need to do and which direction we are moving. [inaudible] to be taken after we submit this document [in the part of] the document.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry?

AJAY DATA: This [inaudible] some materials a part of the document, [inaudible] PDPs [inaudible] or a new PDP initiative?

BART BOSWINKEL: Can you go back to the agenda, please? Because I think the working group, the PRT, is created under next steps.

AJAY DATA: Because we already agreed on the point. We have no [inaudible]. We already have a consensus on whether those additions were made. So, what is the next step now?

BART BOSWINKEL: The next step is that we need to say, for reporting purposes, is include the suggested way forward because we have it in our heads but the community and the council doesn't have what to include in the report. So, it's included in the report, first of all, the

issues identified and next to each of the issues, how you want to address it. And that's either through a bylaw change, PDP may be an [inaudible] more in-depth recommendation. And then you combine this into a report which is just recapturing almost what was in the slides on an introduction. This is how we've approached this, this is the list, maybe an executive summary and that's it.

AJAY DATA: So, there's no going back and forth. So, [inaudible] summarize.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So, the next meetings, going into the next meetings, I think, say, next week everybody is traveling and I am at least taking a few days off. My suggestion is to reconvene as a group. The week of the 18th is probably a good one. Yeah, that week. The 15th. That's on a Tuesday. So, the Tuesday of the 18th.

AJAY DATA: 18th is okay.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: No, the 16th.

BART BOSWINKEL: 16th, Tuesday.

AJAY DATA: No.

BART BOSWINKEL: Doesn't work? We will send out …

AJAY DATA: I will try to find [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: We can go on and we do it at the same rhythm, a call every week. So, we ensure … We take the steps quickly and it's reasonably [inaudible] so we should be able to conclude this in two or three meetings in July. So then, every week, going forward [inaudible] 17th.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's almost the 31st of July. It would be nice to finish it before 1st of August.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think, if you agree this way forward, there's nothing much … It's more probably discussing from a document basis is easier than doing this on the fly, etc.

AJAY DATA: Any other question anybody has?

BART BOSWINKEL: AOB?

AJAY DATA: Nobody.

BART BOSWINKEL: From the audience?

AJAY DATA: From the chair?

BART BOSWINKEL: Wave at us.

EN

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much for attending. It's very unusual to see Katrina sitting at the back here, [inaudible]. Thank you very much for attending the call and of the session. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019