
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO: ccPDP4 Working Group on Selection IDN ccTLD Strings
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 AMS

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO ccPDP4 Working Group on Selection IDN ccTLDs String Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz. I, along with Kimberly Carlson, are the remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak, and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For those not seated at a microphone, you may use the aisle microphone to speak.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. Thank you very much.

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.

I will now hand the floor over to Kenny Huang. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG:

Thank you, Claudia. And thank you all for joining the ccPDP4 Working Group meeting. I apologize again because I couldn't be there in person. And today's meeting, we're a little bit different because we have a specialized designed for today's meeting [that we'll] introduce later. And that's today's agenda. We're going through this agenda, introduce ICANN74 Policy Update and also Next Steps Working Group. Scenario testing. That's what we're going to do today. And also update our next meetings and Any Other Business. Next slide, please.

So here is the Policy Update Session. I believe most of you already participate in the policy update we introduce at this session. And also introduced the variant and variant management, and also collect some feedback from the community as well. Next slide.

So here's the next [phase] for ccPDP4 full working group. And we already include three sub-working groups. And actually, most of the sub-working groups already completed their jobs. And the subgroup for Variant Management is already in the final stage for the subgroup. The De-Selection Subgroup already closed, and everything has been complete. And also, Confusing Similarity Subgroup is also in the final stage, review the basic document. So that's our status. I'm going to the next page, please.

Okay, I'd like to move Bart. He will try to conduct how to run scenario testing. Bart, can I move over to you?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Kenny. So welcome, again, to this PDP4 Working Group, and we're going to do an experiment today. It's late in the afternoon, so unfortunately we can't do this really remotely at all, not as small groups and developing scenarios. So, we came up with the idea that in this case we'll use scenarios that you've already identified in the various papers that the working group has developed; and then check with you, first of all, the scenarios themselves. And secondly, how you view the scenarios. How they would play out under the full policy. So that's where your input will be needed.

And then secondly, if you have the results, so how does this scenario play out under the policy that you discuss and assess whether the outcome is unwanted or there are any side effects that you view as out of scope or unwanted, and whether the policy needs to be adjusted. So this is effectively a preview on the scenario testing we'll do in future meetings using the scenarios that you've already developed in discussing the overall policy.

The two scenarios we'll be discussing today are related to the de-selection mechanism or the de-selection of IDN ccTLDs. There were at least two scenarios that we've identified, so we'll go into

a little bit more detail. Let me explain what we will propose or what you will do.

We'll share and show you the scenarios in a few minutes. Then we'll give you some time to think through what the impact might be or how the policy will play out with that scenario. And I'll give you two to three minutes to think this through. Then I'll return to you and ask you to share your views on how it will play out. We'll record this with sticky notes in the Jamboard. So this is for your future reference.

And afterwards, again, you will have some time to check, to say the second question. Does the result that you foresee or does the testing itself result in an unwanted outcome? So that's the way it will play out. I hope it will be as interactive as it could be if we were not wearing masks and we could really discuss this. But this is at least a way of trying to do this in this hybrid environment. Can we go to the Jamboard, please?

I'll give you a few minutes to think through the scenario and then we'll discuss your thoughts. And then the second part will be discussing the results of your initial thinking and whether the outcome is unwanted or there are unwanted side effects. Can we go to the next frame, please?

So this is the first scenario, and this is ... Let me explain it and run you through it. So there is one territory that, in the past, had two

applied-for IDN ccTLDs strings, AlphaccTLD and BetaccTLD, for lack of ...

Can you go back to the scenario, please? That's something else. I don't know who's doing this. Kim? Yeah, okay. No problem. I don't know if this is a better view.

And maybe in the meantime, for those of you who did not attend the Policy Update, there was a polling around the de-selection mechanism, which I think resulted ... In principle, the trigger events identified by the working group to date are supported. There were no objections, and there were some people in the room who were not sure or had no opinion. So that's with respect to the trigger events themselves.

And with respect to the mechanism, again, there was support. Not in the numbers of the trigger events themselves. But also no objections and just not sure and no opinion.

So now we can go back to ... So that was just for the record. Can you go to the next frame, please?

So we're back in the Scenario 1. So read with me. We have an IDN ccTLD. So we have a Country A which where there were two IDN ccTLD strings, AlphaccTLD and BetaccTLD, which were both valid at the time of the application. So they're delegated, everything else. And all the criteria that were developed by the working group have been met.

AlphaccTLD is still in the designated language and related scripts, so it's a meaningful representation. However, for the second one, BetaccTLD, this is no longer the case. So there might be a change of name of the territory or the BetaccTLD is no longer in its designated language. That is, in itself, not relevant. What is relevant is that there is another country or territory, B, which applies for its IDN ccTLD string that does meet the criteria. But BetaccTLD has not been deselected and there was no confirmation request.

And as a result, although the BetaccTLD would meet all the criteria because BetaccTLD was still assigned and delegated for Country A and it doesn't meet the criteria anymore, the other country, Country B, cannot request the delegation or the application or valid, etc. So that's the basic scenario. And this is a result of your discussions with the working group.

I see, Hadia, your hand is up. Go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. My question, just to confirm, both ccTLDs were actually delegated?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Okay, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: And one is no longer valid. Doesn't meet the criteria anymore. So, any other questions/comments around this specific scenario? So just to clarify this scenario? Can we go to the next frame?

So if you look at this and you think about it, how would you ... I'll give you a few minutes to think through this scenario and come up with, say, results how this would play out under the proposed policy—this assumes that you have a reasonable understanding of the policy and whether—that would be the second question—how you would assess and judge the outcome of this scenario. Does it imply a need for a change? So this is the scenario testing that we will do.

So I'll give you three minutes to think through this scenario, starting now. And maybe, Kim, you can go back on the frame so people can read this scenario. Thanks. Starting now.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Bart, if I may ask something now or after the two minutes. After the two minutes.

BART BOSWINKEL: And if you just participating remotely, absolutely you're invited to participate as well. That's why we do it this way. And we record your views on the sticky notes as well. Thanks.

One more minute. 30 seconds. Time is up.

Hadia had a question first, and then Peter. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I lowered my hand. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Bart. To the best of my knowledge, the current policy, the [draft] policy—this scenario makes it obvious—has an asymmetry compared to ASCII TLDs. Because in the case of two-letter ASCII TLDs, we have this cooling down phase, or the traditionally reserved, and the prohibition of a reassignment in the ISO code; and therefore, also, the prohibition of a reassignment as a TLD.

Now this is an ISO decision, and this is also ICANN following this in a way. So I think there are two issues with this scenario. One is the preconditions ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Can we go to the next frame? Joke, can you take the sticky notes, please? Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Okay. So I think there are two issues with this scenario. One is, it is extremely hard to actually meet all of the criteria because it would mean that while the representation previously was a [inaudible] reasonable representation of the name of Country A, it should now be a reasonable representation of Country B. And there's probably only a very, very narrow scope of scenarios where would make any sense.

And the other part is that this is not necessarily about the fact that this other one has not been deselected. It is pointing to a gap in our current draft, to my recollection, because even if it had been deselected, we haven't thought about what would happen with an instant reassignment. I think that might need to be addressed.

BART BOSWINKEL: The other question is ... And this is more about, say, about the unwanted things, but I'll raise the point here as well. Or you might think, "Okay, so be it. The other country cannot yet apply for it because of the cooling down period."/8 So we've got the cooling down period or five years of retirement, at least. Or 10 years of retirement due to the policy, even it were deselected. That could

be an outcome, as well, that you say, “Okay, that policy provides for it.”

So it's really the interplay of the policies as well. But that's something to discuss at the next point. But that's why we are doing this, because this was raised an issue in the discussions when the deselection was discussed by the subgroup and the working.

Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much. More or less, I raise my hand for the same issue that Peter just mentioned. So, reassigning to another ccTLD could be very problematic. We need to think of those registered under this old IDN ccTLD. So this is also the issue that I see. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. Peter and Hadia, you still have your hands up. Irina, go ahead.

IRINA DANIELIA:

Just a minor comment. I don't understand why “no confirmation was requested” is mentioned, actually, in the description of the situation because I don't see that this is actually related to the situation described. [Could you turn the slide back]?

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible].

IRINA DANELIA: Oh, I'm sorry.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Just two microphones at once. That's the issue. Look, the reason why the confirmation is not requested ... If you go back to the policy itself, it is clearly that one of the recommendations is that ICANN should not be policing. And if you look at the mechanism that was proposed, it clearly indicates, say, only if there is a request by the same country or territory, then the confirmation needs to be requested. So not if there is a request from another country. That's why it's so specific. [They're] both from the same country.

And if people do not want a new IDN ccTLD—and that was in this scenario—then it will not happen. There is no confirmation requested. And so nobody will officially know whether or not that, say, BetaccTLD IDN ccTLD is still wanted or not.

IRINA DANELIA: Well, your reply makes me feel that I do not then fully understand the triggering events because, in this situation, the second IDN could become ineligible, for example, because the country

decided not to use the second script. And in this particular situation, why would any confirmation be necessary?

BART BOSWINKEL: Joke, have you captured that one? Thank you. Any additional comments around this scenario? So, how it would play out and questions around it would play out? Go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Bart. I was wondering, do we need more information? Like if, actually, the country from the very beginning, as has mentioned, hasn't actually used this IDN ccTLD and you have no registrations under it. Does this differ than an IDN ccTLD with actual registrations? And would that affect our decision in relation to the period that needs to elapse before we do delegate this to another country? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me just allude to the point about the Retirement Policy, assuming it will get adopted by the Board and implemented. There is a period in five years, and after which that ccTLD and a future IDN ccTLD will be removed anyway, no matter how many registrations are under management from the IDN ccTLD manager.

So it could be extended to 10 years, whether that's a specific or special circumstance. But that will happen. So, whether there are just one or two at the point of removal or a hundred thousand, it really doesn't matter according to the policy. And how that IDN ccTLD ...

It could be various reasons why it's not in use. You can see it now with some of the IDN ccTLDs which are probably not as successful as people hoped they would be, etc. The volume of registrations is probably very a hard one, and that's one of the reasons why the Retirement Policy was developed as it was developed. I hope that's another consideration.

Any other one on how this scenario would play out under the policy? No?

Now, looking at these various situations and what people brought up, the next question is, is this a situation that you would accept of the policy? So, does the results and the questions you've raised, does that result in any unwanted outcome or side effects of the policy? If you can go back to the previous frame to have a look at the points you raised right now. And I'll give you, again, two minutes to think through whether this would warrant a change of the policy in your view. And then we can have a discussion about [inaudible].

Can you go back one frame, please? So people can [inaudible] the outcomes. And I'll give you, again, two minutes to think through whether you want this as an outcome or not. Starting now.

One more minute. Thank you.

So, up to the next frame. So you've seen how this scenario may play out. Who may I give the floor around the outcomes of, say, the scenario under the policy, whether you think its unwanted or anything else?

Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Bart. I do think that the outcome is the right one, but for the wrong reasons because it's like the missing of the retirement that blocks this, but the blocking itself is okay because we missed the opportunity to enter a cooling down phase. So in my previous intervention, I avoided the issue by not talking about the blocking. And the blocking needs a bit more attention, I think. We need to go back to that. What happens if there is ...

If everybody outside the country, for example, knows that the criteria are no longer fulfilled but the country just refuses to inform PTI or the [ISO] about that, that's the thing that we've avoided so far. Again, the result is right, but for the wrong reasons.

BART BOSWINKEL: So would this help, for example, if in the policy there is a clearer link to the Retirement Policy? Would that help in your opinion? So if we really make very clear, say, “The time of retirement takes about this time”? Or is there something like, “There is an expectation that if it's not used and there is a deselection in country, that people would inform ICANN”? Because this is directed at ICANN. This not a PTI thing. Go ahead.

PETER KOCH: I think this is getting a bit complicated because pointing to the retirement, and then we're talking about the 5 to 10 years is one thing. The rest of these 50 years' period that we currently assume to be stable in 3166 is not part of our policy. It's not part of the Retirement Policy, but it informed the decision to start with a 5- to 10-year period. Had the non-reuse period from 3166 been much, much shorter, then maybe our retirement phase would also have been shorter.

Now the risk here is that the country codes come from ISO 3166, [so we need to] make a reference there. The string for the IDN ccTLDs comes out of nowhere. At least there's no external reference that we can point to. The complicated thing, I guess, is to mimic the situation with 3166 without defining a known policy and thereby falling into the temptation to define what a state is.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Irina, I see your hand. Just a minute, please. A follow-up question for Peter. Does it make a difference that that's one of the major differences, at least at this stage, that IDN ccTLD strings—or, say, what we consider the country code in the IDN—is not as widely used? And that was one of the reasons why they have this cooling down period like, for example, country codes from the ISO 3166.

These are also used currency, but also in libraries, etc. And that was the real issue. They have far more ... They're broader used than just, say, for the DNS. And we're talking about codes for DNS. Does that make a difference for you?

PETER KOCH:

Interesting consideration. The question is, back then and today, what would dominate the extended use of the tool at a country code? Is it the currencies? Is it something? Or is it really the Internet? And experience with .yu and others—[.cs], for example—already shows that the Internet was probably more painful to reuse this than the other ISO standards, for example. So we are [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: I think that the libraries did have a real issue with CS, I can tell you, based on [inaudible].

PETER KOCH: Yeah, but probably they were vocal only after the fact, then. And, of course, libraries and identifiers going very stable. That's now second-guessing the motivations for why did 3166 end up with that 50 years.

BART BOSWINKEL: Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you, Bart. I would agree with Peter that outcome is correct. I would also say that, hypothetically, this might lead us to necessity to think about, as mentioned, this blocking period and also about a reason to check whether the trigger event for retirement has happened. Probably such an external request might lead to at least checking whether the IDN ccTLD is still eligible or not. But practically, for the Country B, I don't think it makes any sense because they anyway will have to wait five plus many, many more years. And still, I don't think, realistically, they will still want that IDN.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. So, anybody else who wants to react on the outcome of this scenario, whether it's unwanted or you see side effects that are unwanted? Go ahead, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Bart. Just one clarifying question and then I'll follow up with my observation. So what I'm hearing is that the original country with the BetaccTLD string needs to take affirmative action to relinquish or give back the string, the delegation. Is that correct?

BART BOSWINKEL: If you look at the mechanism, how it is proposed, as soon as there is a request for a new IDN ccTLD, then ICANN is expected to ask whether there is a change in circumstances. And there needs to be a confirmation. If there is no ...

So specifically, there is no request. You know the designated language has changed, for example—so one of the major criteria. And no action is taken. What will happen? And some other country wants or ... Say, a request from another territory for a similar or the same IDN ccTLD string.

It's the inaction of the original IDN ccTLD that is causing some of these issues that we're discussing. Does that answer your question?

DENNIS TAN: I think it does. So, my observation, then, because there is affirmative action from the original territory or country, so would that be—talking in the context of unwanted outcomes—a way to front run an IDN string to block a future territory to get that string?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe. It's a real corner case, probably. As Peter already alluded to, if you think about the ... Again, if you think about the criteria we have like meaningful representation of the name of the territory, it needs to be a meaningful representation. The other country needs to have that same kind of meaningful representation. If you can front run ... It's difficult. And the same designated language. And the same script.

Anybody else on this one? Otherwise, we go to the next one. No? Thank you for your feedback.

Next, can we go to the second scenario? So this one is a little bit easier, as you can see. A country has changed its name from Alpha to Beta. And in doing so, it has also changed its designated language—and there is a typo—and script.

So, the ccTLD manager has requested the delegation of a newly assigned two-letter code because of the significant change of the name of the country. The ISO 3166 has assigned a new two-letter code to that specific country, which is really advertised and

promoted. However, it has not requested nor does it intend to request an IDN ccTLD.

So, what will happen? What should happen? What should happen with the original Alpha IDN ccTLD? And again, this is around deselection, so there is a request for a new IDN to be delegated for an ASCII ccTLD, but not for a new IDN ccTLD. So again, the question is whether the trigger event under the current policy is initiated/launched.

So, think about it. I'll give you, again, two minutes to think this through. And then we'll go through the same round of questions. Thanks.

20 seconds. Time is up.

So, who may I give the floor to, to provide some input on the first question? Can we go to the next frame, please, Kim? How would this play under the policy? Let's see. And again, this was one of the scenarios that was included in the overview.

Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA:

Thank you, Bart. From my view, it's absolutely clear the change of the designated language or script is mentioned, like [inaudible] trigger event. So I just see no other potential way.

BART BOSWINKEL: Again, if there is no clear indication, the question is whether ICANN Org or whomever should go out and ask for a confirmation. To date, it has not been included. But that's the question.

Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: I'm stumbling a bit across this "the ccTLD manager" as if there would be only one. Now which one is the one we're talking about? The one for the IDN ccTLD or the one for the ASCII TLD?

BART BOSWINKEL: It could be the same.

PETER KOCH: Should be the same. Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: Could be the same.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, could be the same.

BART BOSWINKEL: This is the scenario. It could be the same. So assume it's the same.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. In that case, and I didn't look it up, but I don't think we have a Transfer Policy for the attachment of an IDN ccTLD to a “changing ASCII TLD.” In that case, the IDN ccTLD would have to go because the country code is going to be removed. And for as long as nobody asks for another one, then it will not come into life again. But this transfer is ...

Even if they would ask, so what happens with an IDN ccTLD if the underlying [ISO code] changes? I'm not sure that we addressed that.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]. We'll check later on. I think that's why we do these scenarios, to check whether this is included.

Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So actually, I cannot see any issues with this scenario. And you asked if ICANN needs to send a confirmation. Even that, I don't think is necessary. I'm trying to think of a problem that could arise and cannot, like, pin any. And I do not even see why ICANN needs to send a confirmation. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: The point [that I was] trying to capture in this scenario—at least, say, the group—is the IDN ccTLD string no longer meets the criteria.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, I know. But it doesn't exist.

BART BOSWINKEL: It exists, but it doesn't need it anymore and nobody wants to use it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So it is delegated. Yeah, but it's not in use at all.

BART BOSWINKEL: And there is a change, so the country changed its name, etc.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: And changes even the designated language and script. So, yeah, I don't know what are we ... It doesn't belong there.

BART BOSWINKEL: If nobody asked for an alternative, nothing will happen. So it remains as it is. If you look at the mechanism that was proposed by the working group, to date, it is that there needs to be a reason for, say, as we said, or what's in the policy. ICANN Org is not

expected to police. That means it's not actively looking into changes, etc. So only if there is a reason to ask for a confirmation, then ICANN Org is expected to act. And if nothing ...

So if the IDN ccTLD string is ... There is no alternative requested, etc., then nothing will happen. The status quo will remain even if it doesn't meet the criteria.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I guess it shouldn't, like ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Assumes a little bit more action on the part of ICANN in that kind of situation. Is that what you're saying?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So the point here ... So let's say that ICANN just send out a confirmation and the ccTLD never responds. What happens?

BART BOSWINKEL: Then it's considered ... That is dealt with under the policy. Then it is considered that the confirmation is not provided, and then that's the trigger event.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, but then do you need, still, to wait five years and you need for all of this to happen? Yeah. So, this is what you're saying, but I don't know that we need that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Peter.

PETER KOCH: I don't think I agree with that assessment. I do think that under the current policy, when the 3166 code is gone, everything is changed. Then that is an entry deleted and an entry added in the 3166 table. And with that, there's a triggering event for getting to remove that initial IDN ccTLD.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you look at it, say—and that's one of the issues we discussed—it's not the country code that is triggering it. It could be, say, there could be a significant name change, for example, in the English or French which causes the cc, so the country code to change—and not in the designated language. That's the whole issue. If the designated language ...

Yeah. It's so difficult without resorting to actual examples. But assume a country speaks in Arabic. And then the French or English transliteration of both changed, for whatever reason, because that's what people want—but not the Arabic one. So the

normative part of ISO 3166 will change because that's based on the French and English transliteration. And the country code may change. But the name of the country itself does not need to change.

And the IDN ccTLD is about a meaningful representation in a designated language of the name of the country. So, not in the French or English, or nor in the country code. As long as the name of the country is listed in the ISO 3166, then it's fine.

PETER KOCH:

And there I disagree. And that, I think, needs a bit more investigation. I don't think we have a ... [There's] actually no change of that entry. No, it needs more thought. Complicated issue.

BART BOSWINKEL:

This is about what happens if a country code ... So, the two-letter code changes, but the IDN or the meaningful representation of the name ... Or the name of the country itself doesn't change in the designated language.

PETER KOCH:

The IDN ccTLD is always attached to an entry in the standard. And the entry in the standard is not just the two letters. It's the line in the standard. Right?

BART BOSWINKEL: The name of the territory, yeah.

PETER KOCH: There are lots of things that ... And the online [browsing] platform is probably not giving the best impression of all of this, but the question is, is it still the same entry or is it an entry that was removed and added like we have had examples with others? So, there are other elements that may or may not change, and there's not really a clear delineation, I think, whether it's new or a changed entry. And this is independent of whether the country name changes. But this [stuff]. Difficult.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's why we do this. Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here, speaking as an individual. I think it's quite an interesting discussion, and I think the two parts—the one that Peter mentioned and the one that Hadia mentioned—are probably the key aspects.

One is, when the ccTLD ASCII code—ISO 3166—change, it should be a trigger event. And then the consideration should be whether the IDN ccTLD is still a meaningful representation of the new country name, if you will. If it is still, in your Arabic case, then we

might go down one path. And if it is no longer a meaningful representation of the country name, then there could be a different pathway. So maybe that's the way you think about it.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the point. That's why we're doing this, to check whether this is provided under this policy, yes or no. So it's [inaudible]. We'll need to check.

Oksana.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you, Bart. I think that only changing the language can trigger the event. And the changing of the ccTLD is not a trigger event. Thank you. It's just a [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: And also, the change in script can cause a disruption.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Not the name of the ccTLD.

BART BOSWINKEL: But that means the name itself in the designated language. It could be in French or English.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: If it is in the same language, no problems [for me].

BART BOSWINKEL: Hadia.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you, Bart. If I understand what you're saying, now we are saying that the language/script are no more the ... It's no more the designated language or script. But we're also saying that the IDN ccTLD is still a meaningful representation of a country name. And according to our criteria, if it's not in the language/script designated, then it's not eligible to remain.

And here's the big question. If we now say that meaningful representation is important and the designated language or script is not as important, than we need to go ahead and change the criteria. We could say if it is a meaningful representation, that's enough. And then that would lead us to thinking, “So, what's the role of the language/script here?”

And in that case, we could say, “Oh, we don't need to refer to language or script.” It just needs to be a meaningful representation from the very beginning instead. And here's the dilemma. Right?

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you for your input, etc. We've got five more minutes. As I said at the start of this session, this is an experiment. I've used scenarios based on what was developed by you under the policy. If you go back to the documentation we had, we've introduced some areas that need to be tested.

I want to ask you, does this work for you to do this scenario testing this way? Because normally you do this in a kind of very interactive way in developing scenarios. Unfortunately, due to the social distancing, etc., it's impossible. So this was just, in that sense, an experiment whether this works for you. If it doesn't work for you, then we need to do something else.

So, who can I give you floor to, to respond to that question? And also, please, Kenny or Anil and anybody participating remotely, could you respond whether this works for you—yes or no. Because I think the next time and going forward, in a couple of weeks we'll need to do this as stress testing, and we'll need to do it online. So, some feedback, [please].

KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Bart. And thank you, all participants. Basically, I think that's a very good exercise, although he put us into a very difficult situation. But I think that's the purpose for the scenario testing. Under the stress testing, we can understand our proposed policy—where will be the potential shortage—and we

can refine our proposed policy. I think that was a major feedback from the exercise. Thank you.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you, Bart, for inviting me. First of all, I would like to inform all participants here online or on-site that similar kinds of deep discussions we undertake when we try to discuss the policy framework. And that is why it takes time.

But definitely, because now the audience are more and we have more numbers of people. So always getting inputs from more numbers of people brings more wisdom and it makes us to modify the policy, as Kenny has said, as the various possible scenarios are available.

So definitely, the stress test which we are conducting and we are going through this are quite useful in formulation and modification of the policy. So I would like to thank all who have participated [in it]. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks, Anil. Anybody in the room who wants to respond to this experiment? No? Thanks, then. I'll hand it back to you.

This was the end of this scenario testing exercise. So we just went through two scenarios. One of the things we all need to do is

develop further scenarios—and probably we need to do that online as well—and then stress test against them.

Kenny, back to you.

KENNY HUANG:

Okay, right. Thank you. And also, thank you for everyone participating in the scenario testing. So, go back to our calendar. The next meeting coming will be the VM Subgroup and the CS Subgroup meeting and the full working group meeting. And usually we have every subgroup meeting every other week in turns.

So, Bart, do you have a proposed schedule for VM and CS Subgroup meetings?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No. I think the first one we ... I'm looking at Dennis. We did discuss it, and I think it's two weeks after the closure of the ICANN meeting. And that was the first one. And then followed by the CS group, etc. And then we'll go back to our usual place. The Variant Management Group will be done fairly quickly, I hope. Maybe two or three meetings, and that's about it. And then the full working group will need to look at the results and have a discussion about it. And then we'll start the real stress testing because then the Variant Management part is also included. So we want to keep with the pace of a meeting every week. So, first the variant then

the Confusing Similarity and in the end of the day, the full working group again. So that's the proposal. So we start with the Variant Management Group again, Kenny.

KENNY HUANG: Okay. Anil, your question?

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Yeah. Thank you. As chair of the Confusing Similarity Subgroup, I would like to also inform all of you that we may not need more than three to four sittings in calls to conclude the Confusing Similarity Subgroup because we are already quite close to concluding the agenda of the Confusing Similarity. So maybe after two or three months, we can have a full working group meeting also. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: Okay, thank you. Thank you. Anyone? I think that's very good news because [inaudible] Subgroup is going to be to the end and very soon. So as Bart suggested, we're starting from the VM Subgroup meeting first. Probably two weeks after ICANN74.

Any other business? Hearing none. Okay, I'd like to close the meeting. Thank you for all of your participation, and especially contributing your effort into the scenario testing and developing

a lot of scenario models. I think we could call that a feedback and try to refine our policy.

Okay. Thank you very much. Our meeting will end here. Thank you.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]