Joint session: GAC - ccNSO
ccNSO PDP update

Bilateral session with the GAC
Background - 1

• To date decisions taken as part of the processes for the delegation, transfer and revocation of ccTLDs are not subject to a review or appeal mechanism.

• **According to RFC 1591, section 3.4,** the Internet DNS Names Review Board (IDNB), a committee established by the IANA, will act as a review panel for cases in which the parties cannot reach agreement among themselves. The IDNB’s decisions will be binding. This IDNB was never established by IANA, or any other entity.
Background -2

- **Framework of Interpretation (FOI)**

With respect to the IDNB the FOIWG noted: The FOI WG believes it is consistent with RFC 1591 (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.
Background -3

- CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability

Following public comments on its first proposal, the CWG-Stewardship proposed that: An appeal mechanism, for example in the form of an Independent Review Panel, for issues relating to the IANA functions....... In addition, as part of the CCWG Accountability Proposal to enhance the Independent Review Process, the results of delegation/re-delegations are explicitly excluded.
Background -4

- ICANN Bylaws 1 October 2016

Section 4.2 Reconsideration......(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.2, the scope of reconsideration shall exclude the following: (i) Disputes relating to country code top-level domain ("ccTLD") delegations and redelegations;
Goal

- The goal of the working group (WG) is to report on and recommend a policy for a review mechanism with respect to decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of the delegated Top Level Domains associated with the country codes assigned to countries and territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 and within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development Process.
The WG began by reviewing all the currently available review mechanisms currently available to ccTLDs with regards to IFO decisions:

- IFO Internal Review of a decision
- Mediation / IANA Naming Function Contract section 8.1(c).

None of these meet the requirement of the FOI that “…the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA Operator to an independent body.”.
Status as of March 2022 - 2

- As its next task the WG began looking into establishing a binding review mechanism in co-operation with ICANN Legal.

- At the request of ICANN Legal the WG provided them with a document titled “Questions from the CCPDP-RM to ICANN Legal regarding how ccTLD review mechanism decisions can be binding on ICANN.” in September 2021. As of this update the WG is still awaiting a response.
While awaiting a response from ICANN Legal the WG has been working on a non-binding review mechanism which would be a faster and less expensive alternative to a binding mechanism and could be used to assist in the development of a binding review mechanism. The work on the non-binding mechanism is advancing well and could be completed by the end of 2022.
Information on the CCPDP-RM

- Wiki
  https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/Policy+Development+Process+%28ccPDP3%29+-+Review+Mechanism
- Chair: Stephen Deerhake - sdeerhake@nic.as
- Vice-Chair: Eberhard Lisse – el@lisse.na
- Staff Support:
  - Bart Boswinkel – bart.boswinkel@icann.org
  - Bernard Turcotte – Turcotte.Bernard@gmail.com
  - Joke Braeken – joke.braeken@icann.org
  - Kimberly Carlson – Kimberly.Carlson@icann.org
Purpose IDN ccPDP4

Develop a ccNSO policy, taking into account the experience IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process, that in time will replace the Fast Track Process.

The policy will:
- Address potential open issues relating to validation & delegation of variants of IDN ccTLDs
- Define the events that trigger the process to retire an IDN ccTLD.
IDN ccPDP4 structure

Full Working Group
- Update basic policy document from 2013 (completed)
- Update basic policy with sub-group recommendations

Sub-group Variant Management
- Focus on defining & validating variants of IDN ccTLDs and requirements for the delegation of variant IDN ccTLDs
- Area coordination with GNSO IDN EPDP.
- From IDN ccPDP4 perspective coordination warranted by:
  - Using results to date SubPro & other basic documentation
  - Coordination at leadership level
  - Partial joint membership, partial joint staff support

Sub-group De-Selection of IDN ccTLDs
- Completed

Sub-group Confusing Similarity
- Update basic process
- Take into account experience IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process
- Start End March 2022
## Progress to date Full WG

### Completed first pass basic policy document

### Agreed on basic IDNccTLD recommendations

- IDN ccTLD has to be a meaningful representation of the name of a territory in a Designated Language (read: official language) of the Territory in script in which the Designated Language is expressed
- Definition of Territory
- IDN ccTLD string has to contain at least 1 non-ASCII character
- Support selected string Significantly Interested Parties (includes, but not limited to relevant government of the territory)
- Required documentation
- Process steps
- Inclusion of Deselection (“Trigger mechanism”) in basic policy document

### Inclusion of Deselection (“Trigger mechanism”) in basic policy document
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Basic document</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Proposal DES subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Association with a territory in ISO3166</td>
<td>Section 0, Principle I</td>
<td>Removal of “territory” from ISO 3166-1 list.</td>
<td>Section 0, Principle I, additional text proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meaningful representation of the name of the Territory</td>
<td>Section 1.2.1 sub a</td>
<td>Change of name of the country</td>
<td>Section 1.3.1 Impact change of name of the Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change of Designated Language</td>
<td>Section 1.2.2</td>
<td>The language loses its “designated” status</td>
<td>Section 1.3.2 Impact change of Designated Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Designated Language/Script combination</td>
<td>Section 1.2.7</td>
<td>Script change for the Designated language</td>
<td>Section 1.3.3 Impact change of script or writing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support for the selected string by Significantly Interested Parties</td>
<td>Section 2.2.2</td>
<td>SIP no longer support the selected IDNccTLD string</td>
<td>Section 2.3 Selected string becomes contentious in Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The IDNccTLD must abide to Technical criteria</td>
<td>Section 4.1.1</td>
<td>Change of the general technical criteria, IDNccTLD string no longer abides to requirements.</td>
<td>Awaiting outcome Variant management subgroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status VM Subgroup

- Questions Staff papers/Technical Study Group (TSG) (Almost completed)
  - Completed: staff papers, agreed on use RZ-LGR for validation and identifying variant ccTLD
  - With respect to detail: distinguish between policy recommendations and advise to ccTLD Managers
    - Example: same entity. Definition “same entity” for SLDs is a local matter, however currently VM subgroup recommendation strong only to assign all variants of a specific SLD to “same entity”
  - Currently Under discussion: questions TSG, including limitation of delegation of variant IDNccTLD strings (criteria determine the number!)

- Next: IDN tables and requirement re IDN Tables under IDN ccTLD policy
  - IDN Guidelines v4. Note impact different, no impact on arrangement between IDN ccTLD Manager and ICANN

- Update basic process document
Overview from process management perspective

Status and overview
Major steps

- **Conclusion update basic document**: Completed 28 September 2021
- **Variant Management subgroup**: started August 2021 expected closure end of April 2022
- **Conclusion de-selection subgroup**: (scheduled end 2021/ early 2022): Completed January 2022
- **Update basic policy with VM and de-selection recommendations**: Completed
- **Confusing similarity subgroup**: first meeting expected end March 2022
- **Inclusion VM subgroup**: (scheduled end 2021/ early 2022): expected end of May 2022
- **Stress testing**: (start end Q2 2022, completion September 2022)
Thank you!
ccNSO & DNS Abuse

Bilateral session with the GAC
Process

ICANN72
Council consulted ccTLDs + ICANN Community

Pressure on ccNSO to get involved in DNS Abuse matters

ICANN73
- Seeking feedback
- Possible adoption of roadmap by Council.

Implementation of roadmap

Nov 2021 workshop evaluate impact/effort
Small team to prepare a roadmap
Jan'22 Council First draft of the roadmap
Feb'22 Materials shared with ccTLDs
DNS Abuse Session

Wednesday, 27 October 2021
Part 1: 21:30-23:00 UTC
Part 2: 23:30-00:30 UTC

Should the ccNSO become more involved in the discussions regarding DNS Abuse?
ICANN 72 - ccNSO & DNS Abuse (Preliminary results)

Develop a voluntary code of conduct for ccTLDs
Promote DNS Abuse mitigation initiatives with care
Do NOT focus all efforts on defining DNS Abuse
Create a DNS Abuse Mitigation Working Group
Promote that “one size does not fit all”
Remind all stakeholders that ccTLDs are not gTLDs
Create co-operations for regular audit mechanisms
Create a global database of abused domain names
Manage expectations about the role of ccTLDs & registrars
Support community developed voluntary frameworks
Encourage ccTLDs to participate in DAAR
Consider a role for TLD-OPS or similar group
Consider a best-practice, educational role
Share information with other parts of ICANN
Share information with ccTLDs and build awareness
Process

» Analysis of preliminary results of ICANN 72 (clustering)
» Impact-effort analysis ccNSO & DNS Abuse (workshop)

ICANN72
Council consulted ccTLDs + ICANN Community

Pressure on ccNSO to get involved in DNS Abuse matters

Council + ccTLDs
Nov 2021 workshop evaluate impact/effort

Small team to prepare a roadmap

Jan’22 Council
First draft of the roadmap

Feb’22
Materials shared with ccTLDs

ICANN 73
- Seeking feedback
- Possible adoption of roadmap by Council.

Implementation of roadmap
Impact-effort analysis
ccNSO & DNS Abuse

Results workshop | 17 November 2021
Methodology: Impact-effort analysis

- **High Impact, High Effort**: Projects you want to consider.
- **High Impact, Low Effort**: Projects you want to avoid.
- **Low Impact, High Effort**: Projects you strongly want to avoid.
- **Low Impact, Low Effort**: Projects with negligible impact and effort.
- Encourage DAAR
- Manage Expectations about ccTLDs
- Promote DNS Abuse statistics carefully
- Share the processes, create understanding of process with end-users
- Use existing definitions
- Support community voluntary frameworks
- Share the facts
- Promote one size does NOT fit all
- Consider educational role
- ccNSO as information sharing platform
- Remind ccTLDs are NOT gTLDs

- Create global database abused names
- Cooperation audit mechanism
- Voluntary Code of Conduct
- Share the facts
- Share the processes, create understanding of process with end-users
- Use existing definitions
- Support community voluntary frameworks
- Promote one size does NOT fit all
- Consider educational role
- ccNSO as information sharing platform
- Remind ccTLDs are NOT gTLDs

- Projects you want to consider

- Projects you strongly want to avoid

- Projects you want to avoid
Important considerations

- No policy making for the ccNSO (outside of remit)
- Platform to exchange information and experiences
Process

ICANN72
Council consulted ccTLDs + ICANN Community

Pressure on ccNSO to get involved in DNS Abuse matters

Council + ccTLDs
Nov 2021 workshop
evaluate impact/effort

Small team to prepare a roadmap

Jan’22 Council
First draft of the roadmap

Feb’22
Materials shared with ccTLDs

ICANN 73
- Seeking feedback
- Possible adoption of roadmap by Council.

Implementation of roadmap
Pressure on ccNSO to get involved in DNS Abuse matters

ICANN72
Council consulted ccTLDs + ICANN Community

Nov 2021 workshop
Council + ccTLDs
evaluate impact/effort

Small team to prepare a roadmap

Jan'22 Council
First draft of the roadmap

Feb'22
Materials shared with ccTLDs

ICANN 73
- Seeking feedback
- Possible adoption of roadmap by Council.

Implementation of roadmap

Tuesday, 8/March
14:30-16:00 UTC
Open session «
You are welcome to attend «
Thank you!

Questions or Comments?