Identification of specific areas for additional review and additional work on IDN ccTLD overall proposed policy

According to its Terms of Reference (see: Annex A), the Preliminary Review Team (hereafter: PRT. For membership see Annex B) was tasked to identify potential issues with respect to the two parts of the ccNSO Overall IDNccTLD recommended policy:

- Proposals (at a high level) for the criteria and requirements for the IDN ccTLD string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures.
- Proposals to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO.

Specifically, the review team had to identify issues and advise Council on:

- Whether additional policy work needs to be done on the Bylaw changes to enable inclusion of IDNccTLD Managers as members of the ccNSO;
- Delineate the scope and mechanism to conduct the review and - when considered necessary - update the 2013 Policy Recommendations, taking into account evolution of the Fast track Process, and other areas pertaining to the introduction and following introduction of IDN ccTLDs strings, which require a recommended policy, for example variant management and retirement of IDN ccTLDs.
- Advise on possible mechanisms to cooperate and/or coordinate efforts to harmonize the development processes, procedures and/or criteria pertaining to the selection of IDN (cc)TLD strings, specifically with respect to variance management and confusing similarity review of requested strings.

As required the PRT conducted an analysis of the proposed overall IDN ccTLD policy by comparing the proposed policy with current state of affairs under the Fast Track Process and also looking at other developments. The findings are reported per main section of the proposed overall policy (Table 1-5 below), by:
1. **Section in Document.** Reference to the specific section in the 2013 Board Report (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_41859/idn-ccpdp-board-26sep13-en.pdf),
2. **Topic.** Description of the topic as included in that Board Report,
3. **Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list**. The PRT comment and/or rationale for review and inclusion in the topics in the list, and
4. **Proposed next step.** The PRT advise to the Council on how to proceed to resolve the issues identified by the RT.

Based on its review the PRT advises the ccNSO Council to:

1. **Launch ccNSO PDP 4.** Launch a new ccNSO PDP in accordance with Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws to address the limited set of issues identified by the PRT (see Table 1 – 3 and 5 and 6 of this report) . In some areas a more detailed approach is proposed (confusing similarity review and variant management) to ensure a possible mechanism to optimise and streamline the efforts to harmonize the development processes, procedures and/or criteria pertaining to the selection of IDN (cc)TLD strings.

2. **Request change Article 10 ICANN Bylaws**. After consulting the ccTLD community, propose to the ICANN Board of Directors to amend Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO as foreseen in 2013. The RT notes that the proposed ccNSO membership definition should be reviewed and updated to address the issue identified by the ccPDP 3 Retirement WG and the ccNSO Council.

The PRT held weekly meetings since its creation in May 2019, consulted ccTLD managers and conducted a public face-to-face meeting at ICANN65.

TABLE 1: SECTION 2.1.1 Overall Principles

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.1 (I)	Association of the (IDN) country code Top Level Domain with a territory. Under the current policy for the delegation of (ASCII) ccTLDs, the two letter ASCII codes associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166--1 standard are eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Only the territories listed in ISO3166-1 shall be eligible to select IDN ccTLD strings	Ensure consistency with the delegation procedure for ASCII ccTLDs. Maintain basic principle that "IANA (ICANN) is not in the process to determine what is and what is not a country". No review needed.	No review needed.
2.1.1 (III)	Preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS. To the extent different, additional rules are implemented for IDN ccTLDs these rules should […].	As the DNS must remain unique and stable, ICANN must ensure full consistency of rules across all TLDs when it comes to their delegation.	No review needed.
2.1.1 (V)	Criteria determine the number of IDN ccTLDs. The criteria to select the IDN ccTLD string should determine the number of eligible IDN ccTLDs per Territory, not an arbitrarily set number	Any criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD must be based on the link between the IDN ccTLD and the Territory for which it is proposed. Agreed: the criteria are defined in section 2.1.2	No review needed.

TABLE 2: SECTION 2.1.2 Criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD String

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.2 C	The IDN ccTLD string must be a Meaningful Representation of the name of a Territory. The principle underlying the representation of Territories in two letter (ASCII) code elements is the visual association between the names of Territories (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their corresponding code elements. The principle of association between the IDN country code string and the name of a Territory should be maintained. A selected IDN ccTLD string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the Territory. A country code string is considered meaningful if it is: a)The name of the Territory; or b)Part of the name of the Territory that denotes the Territory; or c) A short form designation for the name of the Territory, recognizably denoting the name.	ICANN must ensure consistency between the policy to assign an ASCI ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD. In detail, the "meaningful representation" criteria should be crystal clear when it comes to territories that have multiple, official languages. To what extent does the selected IDN ccTLD string need to be (remain?) to be recognised as a ccTLD even if you do not know the language?	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.
2.1.2 E	If the selected string is not the long or short form of the name of a Territory then evidence of meaningfulness is required. Where the selected string is the long or short form name of the relevant Territory in the Designated Language as listed in the UNGEGN Manual, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007, or later versions of that list it is considered to be meaningful. Where the selected string is not listed in the UNGEGN then meaningfulness must be adequately documented […].	ICANN must make the "meaningfulness" criteria crystal clear as in the past ICANN had inconsistent approaches for the evaluation of the "adequate documentation". This applies also to the case when one territory has more than one designated language. Furthermore, the procedure should foresee an appeal step in case the selected string is not accepted because of not being "meaningful".	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.
2.1.2 F	Only one (1) IDN ccTLD string per Designated Language. In the event that there is more than one Designated Language in the Territory, one (1) unique IDN ccTLD for each Designated Language may be selected, provided the meaningful representation in one Designated Language cannot be confused with an existing IDN ccTLD string for that Territory. Where a language is expressed in more than one script in a territory, then it is permissible to have one string per	It is recommendable that any future IDN ccTLD policy addresses carefully – and with the support of linguist experts – the option of languages that are expressed in more than one script as well as the rules to be produced in case the same registry manages the ccTLD in ASCII and its variant in other script. At present, ICANN approach is not consistent and that may jeopardise	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and if deemed appropriate reconfirmed. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	script, although the multiple strings are in the same language. Notes and Comments It should be noted that other requirements relating to non-confusability are applicable and should be considered, including the specific procedural rules and conditions for cases when the same manager will operate two or more (IDN) ccTLDs which are considered to be confusingly similar.	the ultimate goal of ensuring the security and stability of the DNS. Example mentioned is simplified Chinese and Mandarin	
2.1.2 G	The selected IDN ccTLD string should be non--contentious within the territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string must be non--contentious within the territory. This is evidenced by support/endorsement from the Significantly Interested Parties (relevant stakeholders) in the territory. Concurrent requests for two strings in the same language and for the same territory will be considered competing requests and therefore to be contentious in territory. This needs to be resolved in territory, before any further steps are taken in the selection process.	ICANN must make sure there is consistency between the delegation of an ASCI ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD. Therefore, contentious requests should be resolved in the territory.	Ensure application of basic principle that IDN ccTLD and ASCII ccTLD should be treated similar
2.1.2 H	In addition to the general requirements for all labels (strings), the selected IDN ccTLD string must abide to the normative parts of RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892 and RFC 5893. All applicable technical criteria (general and IDN specific) for IDN ccTLD strings should be documented as part of the implementation plan. For reasons of transparency and accountability they should be made public prior to implementation of the overall policy and endorsed by the ccNSO.	It need to be ensured that technical criteria are still valid. It will also need to be reviewed whether the proposed mechanism with respect to including the technical criteria as part of the implementation is appropriate.	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and reconfirmed if deemed appropriate. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.
2.1.2 I	Confusing similarity of IDN ccTLD Strings.	As there is only one DNS environment and as domain name end-users/registrants are the same customers all over the internet eco-system – and has such have the same rights, the element of possible confusing	The confusing similarity review procedures need to be reviewed in depth. It needs to be done under a ccNSO PDP and if feasible the

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
		similarity between an applied-for TLD must be treated by ICANN the same way, independently from being a cc, g or an IDN TLD. This will ensure that the current discriminatory rules for the evaluation of IDN ccTLDs are modified and consequently, become in line with the provisions that are currently in place in other TLD environments. Those considerations apply also to the steps detailed under 2.1.3 "Procedures and Documentation".	ccNSO will need to coordinate with the GNSO work in this area. Mechanism to coordinate is through a coordination committee/working party. This model is light weight, without the burden of a Cross-community working group. The results will feed into each of the PDPs. Membership is from the ccNSO PDP and GNSO PDP WG membership with membership open to interested groups. Before becoming part of the ccNSO PDP WG proposals the results need to be accepted by the membership of the ccNSO PDP WG Once included in the total package it shall be treated in same manner as other proposals (subject to Council and Membership adoption). Rationale: Confusing similarity review is currently part of both of IDN ccTLD and new gTLD processes and policy proposals. Over time the methods, criteria and procedures have evolved differently. The ccNSO Proposals are part of the original recommended policy

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
			and need to be updated through a ccNSO PDP.
2.1.2 (F)	Where a language is expressed in more than one script in a territory, then it is permissible to have one string per script, although the multiple strings are in the same language.	Mixing between scripts within the same label should be restricted in case of letters have different contexts "RTL or LTR" Note that in principle registration policies are a local matter. That being said advising not to allow mixed scripting could be an option.	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and if deemed appropriate reconfirmed. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Membership in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.

TABLE 3: SECTION 2.1.3 Procedure and Documentation

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.3 - 2	IDN Table The IDN Table may already exist i.e. has been prepared for another IDN ccTLD or gTLD using the same script and already included in the IANA IDN Practices Repository. In this case the existing and recorded IDN Table may be used by reference.	Using the IDN Table prepared for another IDN cc or gTLD could be an option under specific conditions. When recommendation was developed Variant Management was not taken into consideration. Going forward it is clearly a topic that will need to be addressed and should be taken into consideration	Variant Management and RZ- Label Generation rules and related work on IDN Tables should be reviewed and included in the update of the ccNSO Policy. Work to be undertaken as (part of) ccNSO PDP. Rationale: In current proposal
2.1.3 - 2	Documentation of required endorsement / support for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties	In the Fast Track Process and underlying methodology the reference is to Local Internet Community, which was in use up- and until the Framework of Interpretation was adopted and implemented. Going forward the terminology should be used consistently across different ccTLD related policies. Ensure required documentation and terminology is used consistently across the ccTLD related policy documentation (RFC 1591& related Framework of Interpretation, ccPDP 3 and overall policy for selection of IDN ccTLD strings.	Review and update the current proposed policy to ensure consistent documentation and terminology.
2.1.3 - 2	Classification of input For procedural purposes the following cases should be distinguished […]. Notes and Comments In case where additional documentation is required: - Unanimity should NOT be required.	To be consistent with previously stated procedures, any issue must be sorted within the territory.	Review the clarifications provided in the text of ccPDP 2. Ensure consistency and clear basis for interpretation.

	- The process should allow minorities to express a concern i.e. should not be used against legitimate concerns of minorities - The process should not allow a small group to unduly delay the selection process.		
2.1.3.2	Stage 2 Validation of IDN ccTLD string To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent " Similarity Review Panel" to review the selected IDN ccTLD string for confusing similarity.	What will happen if the selected string has variances? Are all of the variances accepted or is only one accepted?	See next steps re: variance management
2.1.3	Stage 1 Documentation Designated Language	Should the documentation submitted to ICANN be written in English or could be written with the requested IDN string?	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.
2.1.3	stage2 in the "3. Validation of selected string"	Should the selected string (U-label) not show any confusion with previous approved (U-labels)? The confusing similarity review procedures should be reviewed and updated	See above with respect to section 2.1.2 I of proposed policy.

TABLE 4: SECTION 2.1.4 Miscellaneous Policy Proposals

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.4 C	Creation of list over time Experience has shown that entries on the ISO 3166-1 table change over time. Such a change can directly impact the eligibility for an IDN ccTLD. In order to record these changes, it is recommended that a table will be created over time of validated IDN ccTLDs, its variants and the name of the territory in the Designated Language(s), both in the official and short form, in combination with the two--letter code and other relevant entries on the ISO 3166-1 list. The purpose of creating and maintaining such a table is to maintain an authoritative record of all relevant characteristics relating to the selected string and act appropriately if one of the characteristics changes over time.	The update frequency caused issues in the past. It might be advisable to review it. It is questionable whether this mechanism still makes sense in the current context. Who is responsible for creating the table and what is the frequency for updating it? What is purpose?	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. Rationale: This element of the policy needs to be reviewed but was included at the suggestion of some GAC members at the time and adopted by the ccNSO members in 2013. Needs to be ensured that both GAC (members) and ccNSO Membership are able to express their views formerly.
2.1.4 E	Review of policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings It is recommended that the policy will be reviewed within five years after implementation or at such an earlier time warranted by extraordinary circumstances [...].	It would be advisable to review the policy whenever deemed appropriate. Considering the dynamic internet landscape, should any significant scenario change and/or arise, it would be quite challenging to wait 5 years to review the policy. Is review warranted every 5 years? What should be the scope of such a review? Should timing be better defined?. Is this a normal behaviour in any ICANN policy or it is a new mechanism for IDN policy, if it is specific to IDNs, 5 years may be too long, especially in the beginning.	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. Rationale: Adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.
2.1.4 G	Permanent IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel Due to the complex nature of IDN's and the sensitivities and interest involved in the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, it is recommended that under the overall policy a Permanent IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel is appointed to assist and	An advisory panel might have a role if it is made of true IDN experts within and outside the ICANN constituency community. Considering how challenging this could be, it would be recommendable	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP.

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	provide guidance to ICANN staff and the Board on the interpretation of the overall policy in the event the overall policy does not provide sufficient guidance and/or the impact of the policy is considered to be unreasonable or unfair for a particular class of cases. […].	to seek alternative channels to advise on possible issues and changes relating to the policy. Current practice around implementation includes public comments etc. In addition creating such a permanent advisory panel, could be prove not to be feasible in light of current workload and priorities of the ccNSO and other communinities	Rationale: Proposed panel was adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.

TABLE 5: Section 2.2 Proposals on the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.2 D	Voting	It is necessary to distinguish the case when IDN ccTLD and ccTLD managed by the same Registry (manager). Is it necessary in this case to include this IDN ccTLD as an individual member of ccNSO? Voting by emissary is limited to formal votes enumerated in Article 10 (was Article IX) of the ccNSO: see page 27 Board report)	No need to update or review the proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws. Only numbering of sections needs to be adopted. In general: section 2.2 of the recommended policy could be separated and submitted to the Board as proposed changes to section 10 of the current ICANN Bylaws.
2.2 A	Membership definition	It is recommended that the definition in Article IX section 4.1 (new Article 10) is updated to maintain the one-to- one correspondence between the IANA Root Zone Database and membership in the ccNSO.	Proposed Membership definition does not need to be updates for purposes of inclusion of IDNccTLDs in the ccNSO.

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
		The term "later variants" in the Bylaw definition refers to the heading "ccTLD Manager", which used to be "sponsoring organization" For example: **Delegation Record for .AC** (Country-code top-level domain) **ccTLD Manager**: Network Information Center (AC Domain Registry) **Administrative Contact:** Internet Manager Network Information Center (AC Domain Registry) **Technical Contact**: Administrator ICB Plc.	However should be updated to address concerns identified through ccNSO PDP 3, resulting from the latest Bylaw update of the definition in 2016.
2.2.C	Initiation of PDP	The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO representing at least ten **different Territories** present at any meeting or voting by e-- mail. ……" Although questioned the rationale is one vote per territory.	No need for additional review

TABLE 6: Other, additional topics

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
NA	Variant management	The element of "variant management" has become quite relevant in the overall IDN environment. Therefore, it is recommendable that any IDN string selection process takes it into account.	It needs to be included in proposed policy. It is suggested to launch a ccNSO PDP. The 2013 IDN ccTLD proposals includes a placeholder with the understanding at the time that further work needed to be done. Further, at the request of the ICANN Board of Directors the ccNSO will need to coordinate with the GNSO work in this area. Mechanism to coordinate is through a coordination committee/working party. This model is light weight, without the baggage of a Cross-community working group. The results will feed into each of the PDPs Membership is from the ccNSO PDP and GNSO PDP WG membership with membership open to interested groups. Before becoming part of the ccNSO PDP WG proposals the results need to be accepted by the membership of the ccNSO PDP WG Once included in the total package it shall be treated in same manner as

			other proposals (subject to Council and Membership adoption).
NA	Retirement of IDN ccTLD	The retirement of ASCII ccTLD is triggered by the removal of the country code form the ISO 3166-1 list. This may be caused by a significant change of name of the country or territory, which results in a need to change the two-letter code and removal of the former. Looking at the selection criteria, the question is which, if any, of the listed criteria, may/should cause the retirement of an IDN ccTLD, and cause the retirement policy to become applicable.	The ccNSO PDP on IDN ccTLD should be amended to include what will cause the retirement of an IDN ccTLD. Rationale: The retirement process will be defined through ccNSO PDP 3 will be applicable to both IDNccTLD and ASCII ccTLDs. The event leading up to the retirement of ASCII ccTLD is derived from RFC 1591 (removal of the country code form the ISO 3166-1 list of country & territory names). The overall policy on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings includes the criteria for selection of an IDN ccTLD string. The delegation, transfer and revocation are defined through RFC 1591 and interpreted through the FoI are applicable by the overall principles.

ANNEX A: Terms of Reference

Preliminary review IDN ccTLD recommended policy
TERMS OF REFERENCE PRT

1. **Context**

The ccNSO submitted the IDN country code policy development process (IDN ccPDP) Board Report in September 2013 to the ICANN Board of Directors to convey:

- the ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings),and
- the Recommendation regarding the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO.

The ccNSO members adopted the ccNSO Council Recommendation by electronic vote on 13 August 2013.

The recommended policy contains two parts:

- Proposals (at a high level) for the criteria and requirements for the IDN ccTLD string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures.
- Proposals to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO.

By mutual understanding, the ccNSO Council and the ICANN Board allowed the Fast Track Process to evolve to test and gain experience with the policy aspects pertaining to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process to further inform the overall policy, specifically with results of the different reviews of the Fast Track process[1]. The latest step was the inclusion of an evaluation of measures to mitigate risks pertaining to confusing similarity of IDN ccTLD strings by an independent panel. In the near future the Fast Track Process would need to be updated to include the outcome of the community discussions pertaining to the management of variant TLD's, in particular the delineation of technical, policy and operational aspects.

---

[1] See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-cctld-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf, general introduction page 4.

The ccNSO has requested the Board to agree to stop further evolution of the Fast Track Process and agree that all efforts pertaining to IDN ccTLDs should be focused on a review and - when considered necessary - adjustment of the 2013 IDN ccTLD policy recommendations,

- to limit further divergence between the overall policy, the Fast Track Process and other relevant policy initiatives, and
- to provide a solid policy foundation for the IDN ccTLD string selection process and

  to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO.

2. **Scope and Goals of the Preliminary Review**

The intent of the preliminary review of the ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings) and the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO is to identify issues and advise Council on:

- Whether additional work needs to be done on the proposed Bylaw changes included in the ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings) and the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, and way forward to include IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, based on the 2013 Policy recommendations as soon as possible.
- Scope delineation and mechanism proposals to review and - when considered necessary -update the 2013 Policy Recommendations, taking into account evolution of the Fast track Process, and other areas pertaining to the introduction and following introduction of IDN ccTLDs strings which require a recommended policy, for example variant management and retirement of IDN ccTLDs. The mechanisms could consist of an adviceto re-launch the PDP or to start a new PDP on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, taking into account the work done to date.
- Possible mechanisms to cooperate and/or coordinate efforts to harmonize the development processes, procedures and/or criteria pertaining to the selection of (IDN cc)TLD strings

3. **Out of Scope of the review**

The Review Team should not to propose solutions to the issues they have identified, nor propose updates or substantial changes to either the Fast Track Process, the ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings) and the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, or other policy or policy related documentation.

If, in the process of the review, the Review Team becomes aware of issues that are out of scope of the Preliminary Review but considered relevant for the future work in this or other areas pertaining to IDN ccTLDs, it will inform the ccNSO accordingly.

4. Preliminary Review Team (PRT)

4. 2. Membership of PRT

4.2.1   **Members and other participants of the PRT**

Membership of the PRT is open to representatives of (IDN) ccTLDs, participants from other stakeholder groups, observers and experts. There is no requirement for a ccTLD to be a member of the ccNSO. The PRT should have at least 5 members, who are representatives from (IDN) ccTLD managers. The members will be appointed by the ccNSO Council.

Members, participants, and experts commit to participate actively and regularly in the work and are expected to have at least a basic understanding of the reference material.

The names and affiliation of the WG members and other participants will be published on a dedicated page on the ccNSO website. The membership of the PRT will be subscribed to a mailing list, which will be archived after closure.

At any time WG members, participants, observers and experts may resign from the PRT, by informing the Chair of the PRT, who will then inform the ccNSO Council.

4.2.2 Participants and experts
In addition, the PRT is open to participants, who shall not be considered members of the PRT. Participants are entitled to participate on equal footing with members, unless the Terms of Reference state otherwise. The ccNSO Council will request the following groups to appoint at least one participant in accordance with their own rules and procedures:
- Each of the Regional Organisations as defined in Section 10.5 of the ICANN Bylaws;
- GAC
- GNSO
- SSAC

Experts to the WG

The Chair of the PRT may also invite and appoint experts as advisors. Experts shall not be considered members of the WG but are entitled to participate on an equal footing. The Chair will reach out to and invite representatives from the following entities:
- ICANN Organisation and PTI

4.2.3 Staff Support

ICANN will be requested to provide adequate staff support to the WG

4.2.4 Chair
The WG members shall nominate a chair and alternate chair from the members of the Working Group, who will be appointed by the ccNSO Council. The chair should be a member of the Working Group.

The Chair will manage the ongoing activities of the PRT and ensure an appropriate working environment by:

- Promptly sharing relevant information with the entire group.
- Planning the work of the PRT to meet the goals of the PRT in a timely manner and leading the WG through its discussions.
- Regularly assessing and reporting on the progress of the PRT to the Council and broader community.
- Keeping track of participation. Where a member does not regularly participate, the Chair will reach out to the member to engage that person. If, after a conversation that member does not regularly participates, the Chair will advise the Council, so that further steps can be taken to resolve the situation.

The Chair is the representative of the PRT. If the Chair of a WG is not a member of the ccNSO Council, the ccNSO Council will appoint a ccNSO Council liaison, to act as an intermediary between the PRT and the ccNSO Council, or invite the chair to Council meetings to regularly inform the Council on progress made, take questions and participate in any deliberations related to the PRT.

The chair will regularly inform the broader community on progress and seek (informal) feed-back from the community.

5. **Operations of the WG**

    5.1 **Working Method**

The first work item of the PRT is to develop and agree on its working methods that will guide how the WG intends to conduct its business. These working methods will be made publicly available and be guided by the following principles:

- The meetings will rotate from a timing perspective to share the burden as the membership may be distributed over different time zones.
- No firm decisions are taken during any single meeting without the substance of those decisions having been discussed and open for review / consideration by those that may not have been present during a first meeting.
- Efforts should be made to ensure that non-native English speakers can participate on an equal basis in the discussions

- The PRT will consider whether public comments and other input is appropriate, and at its reasonable discretion. The PRT is not obliged to include such comments or other input, including comments submitted by or input from any one individual or organisation.
- The Secretariat will set up conference calls, maintain mailing lists, etc. at the direction of the Chair of the WG.

5.2 Proposed Review Process

To achieve its goal the PRT is expected to:

1. Conduct a review of the relevant documentation referenced in Section 6 of these Terms of Reference, and other material considered relevant by the PRT.
2. Prepare a consultation document seeking wider community input.
3. Conduct a public session at ICANN65 (June 2019) that is intended to inform the community on progress and provide an opportunity to give feed-back and input to the process.
4. Produce an Advice to the ccNSO Council, which includes its findings and proposed mechanisms and next steps.

6 . Reference Material

- The ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings) and the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-26sep13-en.htm)
- IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan and related Guidelines (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/fast-track-2012-02-25-en)
- ccNSO Council Statements, Letters and related material:

    - https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/sataki-et-al-to-namazi-28feb19-en.pdf
    - https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/council-statement-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-26sep18-en.pdf

- Relevant ICANN Board Resolutions and related material:

    - Recommendations for Managing the IDN variant TLDs (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-03-14-en#2.a)

ANNEX B: Membership Preliminary Review Team

ccNSO appointed members

- Jean Nahum Constant
- Ajay Data (Chair)
- Abdalmonem Galia
- Kristina Hakobyan
- Anna Karakhanyan
- Sergio Karakozov
- Giovanni Seppia
- Aisha Al-Mamari
- Mohamed Salah Moselhi

Observers GNSO:

- Rubens Kuhl
- Maxim Alzoba
- Philippe Fouquart

Support Staff ccNSO:

- Joke Braeken
- Kimberly Carlson
- Bart Boswinkel

Support Staff GNSO:

- Ariel Liang
- Steve Chan