

ccPDP4-WG Work Document Section 2.1.1 Version 04 – 11 December 2020 Redline Version 04

1 The ccNSO Preliminary Review Team (PRT) conducted an analysis of the proposed overall IDN ccTLD policy
2 by comparing the proposed policy with current state of affairs under the Fast Track Process and also looking at
3 other developments. The findings were reported per main section of the proposed overall policy (**Table 1-6**
4 below), by:

- 5 1. **Section in Document.** Reference to the specific section in the 2013 Board Report
6 (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_41859/idn-ccpdp-board-26sep13en.pdf),
- 7 2. **Topic.** Description of the topic as included in that Board Report,
- 8 3. **Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list.** The PRT comment and/or rationale for review and
9 inclusion in the topics in the list, and
- 10 4. **Proposed next step.** The PRT advise to the Council on how to proceed to resolve the issues identified by
11 the RT.

12 For consideration by the WG is, with exception of the section in Board Report on confusingly similarity, the
13 deliberation on Variant Management and the de-selection of IDN ccTLD strings, to add two additional columns to the
14 tables:

- 15 5. **WG view wording needs to be adjusted?** Response would Y(es) or N(o)
- 16 6. **Proposed wording by WG.** The wording the WG proposes for the section

17 As noted in the Charter of the WG and Issue report the topics of confusingly similarity, Variant Management and the
18 de-selection of IDN ccTLD strings are dealt with through sub-groups who are expected to develop their own working
19 method and approach.

20 **Board report section 2. ccNSO Recommendation**

21

1 At its meeting on 10 April 2013 the ccNSO Council adopted all proposals contained in the Final Report as
2 submitted to the Chair of the ccNSO Council on 1 April 2013 (section 2 of the Final Report) and are deemed to
3 be the Council Recommendation and are presented as such.
4

5 **To be replaced in time with section on process**
6

7 ***2.1 Policy proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Criteria, Requirements and Processes***

9

10 **2.1.1 Overall Principles**

11
12 The purpose of the overarching principles is to set the parameters within which the policy recommendations have been
13 developed, should be interpreted and implemented. They take into account the experiences of the IDN Fast Track Process
14 and subsequent discussions. They have been developed to structure, guide and set conditions for the recommended policy,
15 its implementation and future interpretation.
16

- 17 **I. Association of the (IDN) country code Top Level Domain with a territory.** For purposes of this policy
18 “Territory” or “Territories” are defined as a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical
19 interest listed in Section 3 of the ‘International Standard ISO 3166, Codes for the representation of names of
20 countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes’ [ISO 3166-1:2020] or, in some exceptional cases,
21 e.g. grandfathered-in delegations, a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest
22 listed for an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element.
23

1 Under the current policy for the delegation of (ASCII) ccTLDs¹, the country codes associated with **Territories** are
 2 eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Only IDN ccTLD strings associated with a **Territory** are eligible to be delegated as a
 3 ccTLD.

4 **Comments and discussion ccPD4 WG:**

5

Section Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review / inclusion in list	PRT Proposed next step	WG view wording needs to be adjusted ?	Proposed wording by WG
2.1.1 (I)	See above.	<p>Ensure consistency with the delegation procedure for ASCII ccTLDs.</p> <p>Maintain basic principle that “IANA (ICANN) is not in the process to determine what is and what is not a country”.</p> <p>No review needed.</p>	No review needed.	Y	<p>Comment: Link was defined long back. Under 1 territory several IDNs possible. One single language might be spoken in various territories. Several languages in 1 territory is a common example. We have to discuss this carefully.</p> <p>Comment: Territories? No reference to countries? Refernece to verb “select”</p> <p>Comment: criteria section clarification on role of languages.</p>

¹ RFC 1591 as interpreted by the Framework of Interpretation (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_46435/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf)

					<p>Action: define what is meant by "territory". Include definition in terminology doc</p> <p>Revisit in future the verb</p> <p>Friendly amendment Jaap is included</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

II. (ASCII) ccTLD and IDN ccTLDs are all country code Top Level Domains. (ASCII) ccTLD and IDN ccTLDs are all country code Top Level Domains and as such are associated with a **Territory**. Whilst there may be additional, specific provisions required for IDN ccTLDs, due to their nature (for example criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string) all country code Top Level Domains should be treated in the same manner.

Comment ccPDP 4 WG: Section 2.1.1 (II) No comments from the Preliminary Review Team
Review terminology, to align with the terminology and defined terms of ISO 3166 Standard. This Standard is fundamental in this context.

Question: include a reference to outcome of the GAC WG Geographic Names? The GAC Geographic Names WG focused on use of geographic names as gTLDs, and use of geographic terms as Second Level Domains. This policy

1 focuses on ccTLDs which by definition are Geographic Names (see definition). The use of geographic names as second
2 level domains under ccTLDs is a local matter and outside the policy remit of the ccNSO.

3
4 **III. Preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS.** To the extent different and/or additional rules are implemented for
5 IDN ccTLDs, these rules should:

- 6 a. Preserve and ensure the security and stability of the DNS;
- 7 b. Ensure adherence with the RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892, RFC 5893
- 8 c. Take into account and be guided by the Principles for Unicode Code Point Inclusion in Labels in the DNS
9 Root (RFC 6912).

10
11 **Comments ccPDP4WG** Is this list complete? Should other references be included in this principle, bearing in mind the
12 purpose of this section?

13
14 As reminder from introduction to section 2.1.1:

15 The purpose of the overarching principles is to set the parameters within which the policy recommendations have
16 been developed, should be interpreted and implemented. They take into account the experiences of the IDN Fast
17 Track Process and subsequent discussions. They have been developed to structure, guide and set conditions for the
18 recommended policy, its implementation and future interpretation.

19
20 Reframing the question: Do the references as included set the parameters as intended?

21 This section may need to be revisited after completion of section on criteria. WG may or may not suggest to include a
22 reference to the IDN Guidelines and RZ-LGR.

1
2

Section Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review / inclusion in list	PRT Proposed next step	WG view wording needs to be adjusted ?	Proposed wording by WG
2.1.1(III)	See above	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.	Y	<p>The doc ref'd in line 5 is RFC 6912. Should we look into including RFC5894 and RFC5895?</p> <p>2 additional informational RFC's. Additional work on RZ-LGR was done in the meanwhile. Variants of TLDs. it also identifies if a TLD is technically valid, based on the criteria used to develop the technical doc or the LGR for the RZ IDN Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en [icann.org]</p> <p>Current applicable version is 3.0 Root Zone Label Generation Rules: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en [icann.org]</p> <p>The IDNA protocol is defined in RFCs 5890-93; in addition there are informational RFCs 5894-95 (implementation guidelines of sorts Refer in section 2.1.1 to basic documents that inform policy and provide basis for interpretation of policy Using implementation work in the principle document does not make sense</p> <p>Reference to IDN Guidelines to be dicussed further.</p>

3

d.

1

2 **From FIP version March 2019 (current version)**

3 **Section 3.5.1 (Technical String Criteria), page 11-12**

4 The string must meet the criteria of the current or any subsequent versions of the [ICANN Guidelines for the Implementation of](#)
5 [Internationalized Domain Names](#). This includes:

- 6 • All code points in a single string must be taken from the same script as determined by the [Unicode Standard Annex #24: Unicode Script](#)
7 [Property](#).

8 Exceptions to this guideline are permissible for languages with established orthographies and conventions that require the commingled use of
9 multiple scripts. However, even with this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed to coexist in a
10 single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding policy and character table are clearly defined. Further, the IDN Guidelines contain
11 a requirement for IDN registries to develop IDN Tables. The IDN Table(s) must be submitted to ICANN along with the request for an IDN ccTLD.

12 The IDN ccTLD requesters are encouraged to:

- 13 1. Use and refer to already existing IDN Tables
14 2. Cooperate in development of the IDN Table(s).

15 **Section 5.1.1 (Preparation Stage), page 19**

16 In the Preparation Stage, the requester undertakes preparatory work to enter the Fast Track Process. Primary preparation activities include
17 identification, selection, and development of:

- 18 • The language(s) and script(s) for the IDN ccTLD string(s),
19 • Selection of the string(s) representing the name of country or territory for the IDN ccTLD(s), and
20 • The development of the associated IDN Table(s) and identification of any potential variant characters. The IDN table(s) must be
21 submitted to ICANN as part of the required supporting documentation for the request.

1 **IV. Ongoing Process.** Requests for the delegation of IDN ccTLDs should be an ongoing process and requests
 2 CAN BE submitted at any time. Currently the delegation of a ccTLD can be requested at any time, once all
 3 the criteria are met.
 4

5 **Comments ccPDP4 WG:** Added the words “CAN BE”

6
 7 **V. Criteria determine the number of IDN ccTLDs.** The criteria to select the IDN ccTLD string should
 8 determine the number of eligible IDN ccTLDs per **Territory**, not an arbitrarily set number.
 9

10 **Comments ccPDP4 WG:**
 11

Section Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review / inclusion in list	PRT Proposed next step	WG view wording needs to be adjusted ?	Proposed wording by WG
2.1.1 (V)	See Above	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.	N	Comment: 15 scripts, 23 languages in India. Thankful to community and icann to support us. Not only languages and scripts. 100s of dialects under a language. Internet communication: best via own language/dialect/script. No restrictions in number of IDN ccTLDs. ICANN to review the number of IDN ccTLDs regularly. To be discussed with

					<p>the territory if IDN ccTLDs are not being used.</p> <p>Response: Part of the discussion around the de-selection of IDN ccTLDs. To be addressed by one of the sub-WGs</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

1