ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Meeting: GAC and ccNSO
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AST

GULTEN TEPE: This session will now begin.

[Recording in progress]

GULTEN TEPE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ICANN73 GAC Meeting with the ccNSO session being held on Tuesday, 8 March at 1300 UTC. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC members to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod to keep accurate attendance records. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with <question> or <comment> as indicated in the chat, the feature is located at the Zoom bar of your Zoom window.
Interpretation for GAC sessions include all 6 UN languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon located on the Zoom tool bar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the session

facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.

Finally this session, like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. In case of a disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. This session is being recorded and all the materials will be available on ICANN 73 meeting page.

With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.

Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the ccNSO GAC bilateral scheduled for an hour. I would like to start by welcoming Alejandra, Pablo, Jordan -- and all ccNSO members who are in the GAC Zoom room. It's been a while since we last met with the ccNSO, so thank you very much for this opportunity and thanks to Biyi, the new ccNSO liaison to the GAC and to Pär GAC Vice Chair and GAC representative of Niue and our point of contact within the ccNSO for their inter-sessional efforts and coordination for us to identify topics of common interest for

our agenda today. But before starting, I would like to hand the floor to Alejandra for any opening remarks, please Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Manal, hello everyone. It is a pleasure to be here with you again. Last time we met was in May 2020 where we discussed the PDP update and also the ccTLD registry activities to fight cybercrime and cooperate with law enforcement authorities which included the actions taken about COVID-related domain names. We're willing to do the same thing again now focusing on experiences mitigating DNS abuse, and we have prepared a very nice agenda for you. Back to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Alejandra, and I think we're good to start, not sure who will be presenting from your side.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I can do that, thank you. So our first topic of the day is the ccPDP 3 on review mechanisms and Stephen Deerhake jointly with Eberhard Lisse will talk about it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you Alejandra, and Manal, great to see you again, even if just virtually, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everybody. It's an honor once again to be able to address the GAC and give you an update on the two working groups that I Chair.

Before diving into the work of the review mechanism Working Group, which is the topic here, I just want to thank the GAC for their endorsement of the work product of the retirement Working Group, thank you guys for that, we're now awaiting final approval of the proposed policy by the ICANN Board and I hope that comes soon.

Turning now to the work of the review mechanism Working Group. As you can see from the slide, the goal of the review mechanism Working Group is to codify the intent of our RFC 1591, specifically section 3.4 of that RFC, what we're trying to do here is to accomplish an actual implementation of what is described in the RFC as the quote, Internet DNS names review Board, unquote. Next slide, please.

Thank you. Our work is based on the interpretation of our predecessor framework of interpretation Working Group from a few years back and that Working Group was pretty clear that with respect section 3.4 of our RFC 1591, the ccTLD manager has the right of appeal of a notice of revocation by the IANA function operator. Next slide please.

Note that there is a carve out from the work of the CCWG stewardship and CCWG accountability groups in the run up to the liberation of IANA from the US government department of commerce for CC stuff. This left the review question really up to the ccNSO to sort going forward after that. Thank you. Next slide please.

Thus, the goal here of the review mechanism Working Group is to develop a policy for review mechanism which will accommodate decisions in the following areas: The first of which is the delegation of ccTLDs, the second is the transfer of ccTLDs, the third is the revocation of ccTLD, and the fourth and final is the retirement of the ccTLDs. So that is what we're working on. Next slide, please. Next slide after that. Thank you.

So where are we today? We began by carrying out a review of the various review mechanisms that are available within the ICANN ecosphere and as you can see on the slide, they're enumerated there, and our conclusion as working group was consistent with the framework of interpretation working group that none of the established review mechanisms met the requirements of the framework of interpretation laid out in their final report. Thus we carry on. Next slide, please.

So thus based on our conclusions regarding the applicability of the existing appeal mechanisms within the ICANN ecosphere, the Working Group set off really to sort out binding review mechanism and we quickly realized that we needed feedback from ICANN Legal and thus sent a formal document to ICANN Legal in September 2021 with our questions we would like to get some input from them on. Six months on we're still awaiting a response. I do have to say this is seriously problematic with respect our ability to develop a meaningful policy on this important topic, and this will be taken up with ICANN later in the week. Next slide, please.

So whilst waiting for the requested feedback from ICANN Legal regarding the binding mechanism, the Working Group has engaged in a discussion regarding a non-binding review mechanism, the goal of this approach is to try to sort out a low cost and faster mechanism with the idea that this approach will give us a way forward to a binding mechanism, and we hope to have that finalized this year. Next slide please.

So this one gives you the relevant wiki contact information as well as the contacts of myself, the Vice Chair, and the ICANN staff that is ably supporting the Working Group. I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Stephen. Any questions? Okay. I think this was crystal clear and thank you for the informative update. I'm sure it's of great interest to GAC members and colleagues and looking forward to...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks. So I see now we have the IDN ccPDP 4, on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. Kenny, please go ahead.

EN

KENNY HUANG: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. My name is Kenny Huang. It's been a pleasure to be here with you and also together with the co-chair Anil Kumar Jain. He is also the chair for the selection subgroup, we are going to introduce the IDN PDP 4 progress update. Next page please.

So the purpose of IDN ccPDP 4, we tried to develop a ccNSO policy taking into the account the experience of IDN ccPDP fast track process that in time will replace the fast track process. So this policy will address potential open issues relating to validation and delegation of variants of IDN ccTLDs. We also define the events that will trigger the process to retire an IDN ccTLD. So will go to the detail in the following page. Next slide, please.

So here is all of our structure for IDN ccPDP 4, we have full Working Group. The full Working Group has completed the policy document from 2013 and we also updated the basic policy with subgroup recommendations. I will go to some detail [while giving the update.] We have three subgroups. The first subgroup will be variant management. The variant management will try to define and validate variants of IDN ccTLDs and requirement for delegation of variant IDN ccTLDs, and we also have specific coordination with GNSO IDN EPDP. Also for IDN ccPDP 4, prospective coordination warranted by using results to SubPro and other basic documents, coordination at leadership level and partially joint membership, partially joint staff support, actually we have got a lot of support from staff as well.

The second subgroup, deselection of the IDN ccTLD, the mission of the subgroup already complete and I will give detail later. And we just formed a third subgroup for confusing similarity and it's just established. And we take into account experience IDN ccPDP fast track process and the first official meeting expected to be the end of March this year. Next slide, please.

So progress to date for full Working Group. And we already agree on IDN ccTLD recommendation including IDN ccTLD has to be meaningful representation of name of territory in a designated language—like the official language—of the territory in script in which the designated language is expressed. And we also definition of the territory and also IDN ccTLD string consists of at least one non-ASCII character. Support selected string significantly interested parties including but not limited to relevant government of the territory and also some other required documentation and process steps identified and inclusion of a deselection trigger mechanism—I will introduce what is trigger mechanism—in a basic policy document and inclusion of deselection in basic policy document. Next slide, please.

Last, an overview of the relevant IDN ccTLD deselection criteria. For example, first criterion, association with a territory in ISO 3166. The trigger event could be removal of territory from ISO 3166 list. Second criteria, including meaningful representation of the name of a territory. Trigger event could change of the name of the country. The third criterion includes change of the designated. Trigger event could be the language loses its designated status. The fourth criteria including

designated language script combination. Trigger event includes script change for the designated language. The fifth criterion, including support for the selected string by significantly interested parties. For example the trigger event is the SIP no longer support the selected IDN ccTLD string. And also the sixth criterion including IDN ccTLD must abide to technical criterion. The trigger event could be change of the general technical criteria, IDN ccTLD string no longer abides to requirements. Next slide, please.

GULTEN TEPE: Kenny, while I'm moving the slide, just a kind reminder from our interpreters since they are having difficulty to catch your statements. Thank you.

KENNY HUANG: Okay, sorry, I will try to speak slowly. So current status for variant management subgroup, [we have questions open on our] staff papers and also, we formed a technical study group, TSG, almost complete. So for example the staff paper agreed on use root zone label generation rule for validation and identifying variant ccTLD. With respect to detail we try to distinguish between policy recommendation and advice to ccTLD managers. I give some examples. For example, the same entity, definition same entity for second level domain is a local matter, however, currently variant management subgroup recommendation strong only to assign all variants of a specific second-level domain to same entity. Currently under discussion would be the question TSG,

EN

technical study group, including limitation of delegation of variant IDN ccTLD strings. The criteria determine the numbers.

Next, IDN tables and requirement re: IDN tables under IDN ccTLD policy according to the guideline. And we try to access no impact on arrangement between IDN ccTLD manager and ICANN. Also update the basic process document. So regarding to the variant management subgroup, all of the process is almost done, and so we catch up the schedule.

Next page, if you can hear me clearly.

So that is the overview from process management perspective. Next page. So here are some major steps we already accomplished and expect to be accomplished in the near future. For example, the first one, the conclusion update basic document already complete in September last year. The variant management subgroup started August last year and expected to be closed by the end of April this year. And conclusion deselection subgroup already done, completed in January this year. And also we also update basic policy with variant management and deselection recommendation and that has been done and complete. Confusing similarity subgroup, the first meeting expected to be held at the end of March this year. Inclusion variant management subject group also expected to be completed by the end of May. And stress test, we are starting the stress test by the end of the second quarter this year, expected to be complete in September of this

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

year. Okay. Next page, and that will be the end of any presentation. I am happy to take any questions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kenny, very informative, indeed, and again, all very important activities that I'm sure would be of interest to governments, deselection of IDNs and previous presentation also with transfers and revocations. So I'm sure it's all of interest. I'm just pausing to see if there are any questions or comments. And seeing none, I'm sure everyone is overwhelmed with the information. We maybe need some time to digest, and I'm sure we will get back to you with more queries and questions maybe later.

KENNY HUANG: Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kenny, and I think we're good to move on. next we have the ccNSO and DNS abuse, and I understand I'm handing this over to Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Manal. And thanks to Alejandra, of course, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone at this session. For those who don't know me—I'm sure you Manal and some others do from previous interactions—I am a ccNSO councilor and a NomCom appointee to the council. and I will talk about the ccNSO

effort to tackle the problem of DNS abuse. Before I start I want to make a very important note about the ccNSO's role and mission with this issue, it is not within the ccNSO remit to make policy on the issue of DNS abuse, and ccNSO can be only a platform, a coordinating body. This is the starting point that frames our thinking, that defines our efforts. However, the absence of the policy making remit or mandate does not mean that we do nothing. In contrary, we direct efforts in the best possible way and we do understand the pressure to get involved in tackling this issue. And this is our starting point and we're ready to do this and we are doing a lot right now.

So to deal with this issue in the best possible way, as you see from this timeline, we started with a consultation with our community members at the ICANN 72. Next slide, please. So we had a DNS abuse session chaired by our ccNSO Chair Alejandra and moderated by Nick Wenban Smith and various speakers as you see on the slides, and the session focused on the question of whether the ccNSO should become more involved in the discussions regarding the DNS abuse. Next slide, please. We asked the ccNSO community members about the options of how to get involved. And you see these options on this slide. For example, information sharing, best practices, educational role, and you see also preliminary responses from our community about these options.

So what did we do next? Next slide, please. Based on these responses and feedback from our community and the analysis of preliminary results, we had a workshop in November 2021, the ccNSO council meeting that was converted into a workshop discussing the next steps

EN

to consult community about the effort and impact analysis concerning those options. And the main goal here was based on these options to come up with a solid plan based on the feedback from our community.

And now next slide. Sorry about that. So on this slide, if you look at it, you see the metrics. And these metrics is the methodology that informed our thinking about the next steps based on community feedback on impact that particular actions or steps or projects might take and effort it requires. Because based on the community feedback we see that some of the actions have high impact and require either high or low impact and some can even have negative impact. So we discussed those actions with high impact and either low or high effort are the way to go, are those where we want to consider steps that we want to take. And some efforts that might have negative impact but require high effort, perhaps based on community feedback, we strongly want to avoid. Again, I want to highlight that this clustering was carried out based on our community feedback. Next slide, please.

As you can see based on this methodology, the most valuable and beneficial projects and steps aim at educational role but also the actions that do require high effort, for example supporting voluntary frameworks, sharing the facts, sharing the processes, creating better understanding. So based on the metrics, the small working group of the ccNSO which was tasked with creating and discussing the next steps and actions for DNS abuse came up with a roadmap and concrete proposals about the next steps for the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Again, I'm repeating myself here, but I want to reiterate first as a very important consideration that there is no policy making role for the ccNSO here and this issue outside of the policy making remit. However, as a platform for exchanging information and experiences on the DNS abuse issue, we can do a lot, and this is the goal of our current efforts and the steps we are suggesting. Next slide, please.

As I said, the small team prepared a roadmap for the ccNSO with actionable and concrete steps in accordance to all the feedback and evaluation we got from the community and now at this meeting, at ICANN73, we are seeking further feedback to finalize these steps and based on this feedback we will start implementation of the roadmap with these concrete steps after this ICANN meeting. Next slide, please.

So to present this information, including the roadmap, we're holding the session today actually after this meeting, and it is an open session. So you are very welcome to attend. I hope that those of you who have scheduling conflicts can watch the recorded later, because I believe— this is now my personal opinion—we have come up with a very good and actionable roadmap. The role of the ccNSO and the next steps and actions in the implementation of it is quite clear. Next slide, please.

So thank you for listening to this, and I also want to say I'm not the only member of the DNS abuse Working Group, there are plenty of them here, like Nick, like Alejandra, like Pablo, and I want to thank them for this effort as well. And of course, I believe that any of us would be happy to answer any questions or hear your comments.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Again, very interesting presentation, informative and very good illustrations, and I already see Laureen's hand up. So please, Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. This is Laureen Kapin, speaking in my capacities as one of the co-chairs of the Public Safety Working Group. First of all, Tatiana and colleagues, we certainly welcome this focus on the ccNSO on this important issue. I'm curious on slide 25, because it went by quickly, what the top categories of interest for work on DNS abuse was from your survey, I couldn't see it very quickly, so now I'm looking. So it's the blue category, agree. So looks like the one on the bottom was perhaps one of the top categories which is sharing information and building awareness. And then I also see best practices and an educational role scored very highly. And there are other categories, but I just wanted to get a better sense since it went by quickly what those top categories were, and if you have any comments on that, Tatiana, I'm sure we will get more information in the next session.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Laureen. Alejandra, if you let me take this comment, I will be happy to answer and then give the floor to whoever wants to speak. Yes, indeed, and most of the top categories which were scored highly here also went to the metrics as those which have the most positive impact. No matter if they require high or low effort, we

are going for them. So the starting point from ICANN 72 to the large degree matches the steps that the ccNSO will take next, like information sharing with other parts of ICANN and so on, so forth, but of course best practices as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Many thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Laureen and Tatiana, and thank you for the kind offering to join the following ccNSO session on DNS abuse. I'm sure everyone will be listening to the recordings if they are not able to attend, because we normally have a very compact, full day agenda for the GAC, but again, we will keep an eye on the session. Thank you very much. Any further comments or questions?

TATIANA TROPINA: Indeed, Manal, I see a conversation going on in the chat and of course I stand corrected that the first session at ICANN 72 was consultation with the broader community, but next steps starting from the ccNSO workshop, the steps were informed and discussed with the ccTLD community. Of course, Alejandra, and correct me if I'm wrong, we are ready to discuss with the broader community because one of the tasks is to share information, look at each other and to also speak about the ccNSO mission and efforts to other parts of the community and promote understanding that for example ccTLDs are not the same as

the gTLDs. We do not have the function of making policy that will go into contracts. The ccTLD community is different.

And having this broader conversation with the broader community is of course what we also envisage in our next steps. So thank you, Pierre, for your correction and of course I stand corrected. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Tatiana. And yes, indeed, one of the main objectives is of course to have discussions with the broader community and for this, Nick has prepared a little bit to talk about to the GAC. So please, Nick.

NICK WENBAN SMITH: Thank you, hello, wherever you are. I'm in Oxford in the UK. It is very sunny, but it was cold and frosty today, so kind of different from sunny Puerto Rico and I'm very sorry to not be there like everybody else.

Just a few observations from my perspective really. Firstly, we're not, generally speaking, contacted parties with ICANN at all, we're sovereign entities and serve our national communities and governments very closely, I'm sure most of us have close connections with our respective governments and GAC representatives. So when we talk about other initiatives within ICANN and particularly GNSO initiatives, when you look at the what the CCs are doing, we're not comparing an apple with an apple, this is a different type of category.

But having said that, I think we all agree it's a very important topic and it's important for the ccTLDs to be present and visible in it, because I think otherwise people might be mistakenly of the view that not something we're interested in or that we care about. Quite the contrary, I think you'll find ccTLDs are extremely proud of their very strong record in promoting Public Safety and having a very, very good record on DNS abuse, which is partly why I think you see this list on the screen showing awareness of the things that ccTLDs do and holding them up as examples of good ways to mitigate DNS abuse and to showcase, as it were, the things we do that work well is a really important part and runs through I think a lot of the activities of the ccNSO showing and sharing, we tend to show and share rather than tell and direct. That is more the way of the ccTLDs.

But certainly, if you look at recent reports—say, the Commission report on DNS abuse, you'll find that the ccTLDs are picked out as strong examples of how to mitigate, and ideas and practices that can help end users and everybody who is involved with the Internet in that community, in that country, to work well, be safe and secure without causing lots of problems in the registration system or difficulties for people who are innocent. We don't want to create too many complicated mechanisms which prevent people from actively participating online. So that is the balance.

So that is kind of the context here, and you can see that sharing information, best practice education role, those are traditionally the things the ccNSO does. So it's not totally surprising that in this slide,

that is what came out as the things that people agree we should do. Or rather, as I would say, it's not that we start to do, it's that we continue to do more of this but specifically addressing DNS abuse, because we have always shared information, built awareness and done these showcasing initiatives. And I've had, I think even from other members of the GAC and the Public Safety Working Group, have had very positive comments about ccTLD presentations in this.

So moving forward, we have come up with a roadmap to put into effect this practice. So we had an open call for ideas, we have assessed which ones seemed to be good ideas and which ones seemed to be not good ideas, we evaluated which ones achieve the highest impact for the least effort. And obviously, that's because there is a finite amount of time and resources and people to do these things, so we want to focus our time on the most useful things.

And we will talk about the roadmap further in the next session, but the idea would be that at our council meeting later this week, that we will adopt the roadmap unless we hear very good reasons or suggestions or refinements to do that. So we want to press on with this with some urgency and adopt it this week. We think it's hard work but it's common sense so we should just move on with it because I don't think we're going to create any better proposals and we should just start. I think this is more philosophical from my point of view but it's better to start than to carry on talking about things. So want to actually start taking some action [and put that into place] later this week, but we welcome obviously all engagement of all parties, but obviously, from the country

code side we have a very special relationship with the GAC and we're very open and accessible and willing to talk and very happy to have a proper positive engagement and make sure that what we do is done with your full knowledge and understanding and that you can understand what we're doing and why we're doing it and you feel that you have participated in that process as equally as we have in some way. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Alejandra, Nick. I agree. Sometimes, as they say, the perfect may be the enemy of the good. So let's get started, and thank you and for sharing the timelines. I think GAC colleagues now know where all the processes stand and what to expect next. This is very useful and very informative.

We had our bilateral with the GNSO yesterday as well and the DNS abuse was on the agenda. So they also have their small group. I'm just wondering whether there is—of course, we're very mindful that ccTLDs are different from gTLDs. But is there any alignment somewhere or any channels between those groups or they are completely separate efforts? And also, they have reached out to us as a community with some questions so I'm wondering whether you have the same channel between the GNSO and the ccNSO on this topic. Thank you. Alejandra, please go ahead.

EN

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Manal. Well, we're still in our early steps here so as Nick told you, this week we hope to kickstart this effort, but we are envisioning to have these connections with the broader community so not to be isolated, and of course to not build everything from scratch. So yes, we are planning on having liaisons to other ICANN community members and to see how we can interact in a way that we are sharing what the CCs are doing so people are aware of the different strategies taken by the ccTLDs and to learn from what is being done outside of the ccTLD world and also share that within our community. I don't know if any other member [of these other groups] would like to add anything else.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I see David, please go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Manal, and thank you, Alejandra. My name is David McAuley, I'm an employee of Verisign and I participate in the Registries Stakeholder Group on the GNSO side as well the ccNSO, and I'm a member of both small groups. At the present moment, I'm sort of an informal liaison and I am keeping the CPH small group informed of what we're doing on the ccNSO side. and it's largely been along the lines that we're putting something in development. ICANN73 will be a seminal moment for that, and there will be more of an opportunity to reach out, be in touch and informative following ICANN73. But the two groups are in touch informally through me. And as Alejandra just said, I think they

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

will be a little bit more formal following ICANN73 developments. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, David, for this update and good to know you are on both small groups so there is an open channel here and we rely on you. I'm just pausing to see if there are any further questions or comments. And again, noting that we have 130 new GAC members since we started to meet virtually, and I think we haven't met in a virtual setup with the ccNSO before, so I think all this information is brand new to quite a significant number of my colleagues, I'm sure it's very informative. I'm sure it's also a bit overwhelming, so some time to digest and get up to speed, and we may get back to you with any further follow-up. Alejandra, anything before we conclude?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just to let ourselves be very much willing to come back to you with any topics you would like us to present. We understand that as you said, there are new members joining the GAC every time, and we are more than willing to prepare any webinars you deem necessary or useful. So please do not hesitate to contact us, and we would be very happy to keep this open line of communication with the GAC. Thank you very much for having us.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, everyone, and I'm sure everyone would appreciate 15 minutes in addition to the 30-minute break. So to my GAC

colleagues, please be back at the GAC Zoom room at 10:30 San Juan time, 14:30 UTC, for our discussions on GAC operating principles.

Thank you very much, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]