

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

Version 09 Redline

29 April 2021

1. Minimal Number of non-ASCII characters

An IDN country code Top Level Domain must contain at least one (1) non-ASCII character (i.e a character that is not included in ISO/IEC 646 Basic Character Set). To illustrate this criterion: For example, *españa* would qualify under this specific requirement and *italia* would not. Note that *españa* contains at least one (1) non-ASCII character (i.e a character that is not included in ISO/IEC 646 Basic Character Set¹ .

For more formal definitions of these terms, see RFC 5890.

WG discussion

WG preliminary agreed that reference to *españa* is an example and that should be clear from the text.

During first reading it was agreed to strike the reference to [a-z, 0-9].

During first reading it was suggested to strike the reference to U-Label and A-label. Need to be checked when discussing the Technical criteria, if (updated) reference needs to be included in this section.

The original text was: "A different way of expressing this is that the selected IDN ccTLD must be a valid U-Label that can also be expressed as an A-label. It cannot be a NR-LDH Label."

~~2. IDN ccTLD only for Territories.~~

~~A TLD string associated with a Territory can only be requested and shall be delegated as IDN country code Top Level Domains if and only if all criteria of this policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and other relevant policies for the delegation of ccTLDs are met.~~

¹ <https://www.iso.org/standard/4777.html>

1 **WG discussion**

2 The original section has become superfluous as the definition of Territory and Territories is now included in the principles. The statement as
3 proposed should be in the principles.

4

5

6 **3. Meaningfulness Criteria and related process and procedures**

7

8 **3.1 The IDN ccTLD string must be a Meaningful Representation of the name of a Territory.** The principle
9 underlying the representation of **Territories** in two letter (ASCII) **code elements** is the visual association
10 between the names of **Territories** (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their
11 corresponding **code elements**.

12 The principle of association between the IDN country code string and the name of a **Territory** should be
13 maintained. A selected IDN ccTLD string must be a meaningful representation of the name of the **Territory**. A
14 country code string is considered to be a **Meaningful Representation** if it is:

- 15 a) The name of the **Territory**; or
16 b) Part of the name of the **Territory** that denotes the **Territory**; or
17 c) A short-form designation for the name of the **Territory**, recognizably denoting the name.

18

19 **WG Comments and discussions**

20 Strike the footnote. Reference included in Terminology document

21 CH, as specific example was discussed as exception to the principle of visual association of the name of the Territory and the code
22 element. Note that the WG does not go into the merits of the ISO3166/MA decisions.

23

24

1 **3.2 A Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territory MUST be in a Designated Language of the**
2 **Territory.** The selected IDN ccTLD string should be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of the territory in
3 a **Designated Language** of that **Territory**. For this purpose, a **Designated Language**² is defined as: a language
4 that has a legal status in the **Territory** or that serves as a language of administration³.

5
6 The language is considered to be a **Designated Language** if one or more of the following requirements is/are
7 met:

- 8 1. The language is listed for the relevant **Territory** as an ISO 639 language in Part Three of the “Technical
9 Reference Manual for the standardization of Geographical Names”, United Nations Group of Experts on
10 Geographical Names (the UNGEGN Manual)
11 (<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm>).
- 12 2. The language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** as defined in section 3.7 of
13 ISO 3166-1 standard [2020].
- 14 3. The relevant public authority in the **Territory** confirms that the language is used in official communications
15 of the relevant public authority and serves as a language of administration.

16
17 Specific requirements regarding documentation of **Designated Languages** are included in the procedures and
18 documentation sections (*see below section 3.7, auxiliary numbering*).

² The limitation to Designated Language is recommended as criteria for reasons of stability of the DNS. According to some statistics currently 6909 living languages are identified. See for example: http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno_docs/distribution.asp?by=area. If one IDN ccTLD would be allowed per territory for every language this would potentially amount to 252*6909 or approximately 1.7 million IDN ccTLDs

³ The definition of **Designated Language** is based on: “Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names”, United Nations Group of Experts on Geographic Names, United Nations, New York, 2002 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/pubs/documents/Glossary_of_terms_rev.pdf. Note that in the Glossary the term “Official Language” is used. Experience has shown that, depending on the specific Territory, “Official Language” has a specific connotation, which sometimes creates confusion with the term “Official Lanaguage” as defined in the Glossary.

1 **WG Comments and discussion**

2 This section needs to be revisited once the Variant Sub-WG completed its work. The full WG needs to be aware of impact of variants on
3 criteria.

4 Should requirement of designation also apply to the script i.e an IDNccTLD string has to be in a Designated Language and Designated
5 Script?

6 Note that currently neither under the Fast Track Process nor in the 2013 proposed policy there is such requirement of designated script.
7 As a result if a Designated language is in multiple scripts, they should be granted accordingly. For every language-script combination,
8 you are eligible for 1 string. Only 1 IDN ccTLD string per designated language could be an issue. In Chinese two scripts for same
9 language: traditional chinese script and simplified script, resulting in two 2 IDN ccTLD strings. See section 3.3

10
11 What to do with the scripts of different languages that are similar? Arabic, Urdu. to be addressed in our discussions? Note that this was
12 discussed when the Fast Track process was designed (2007-2008). At that time people agreed that ultimately it is up to the
13 country/territory itself, to determine the script to be used. There may be cross-border issues, however this principle is at the core of the
14 ccTLDs: what is happening in the country, determines the outcome of the process. See section 4.1 below: In 2007-2008 this principle is
15 reflected in the required documentation etc. and was considered paramount with respect to selecting the representation of the name
16 of a country.

17
18 Unicode also lists scripts it encodes here: <https://www.unicode.org/Public/13.0.0/ucd/Scripts.txt> [unicode.org]

19
20 **3.3 Only one (1) IDN ccTLD string per Designated Language.** In the event that there is more than one
21 **Designated Language** in the **Territory**, one (1) unique IDN ccTLD for each **Designated Language** may be
22 selected, provided the **Meaningful Representation** in one **Designated Language** cannot be confused with an
23 existing IDN ccTLD string for that **Territory**.

24
25 Where a language is expressed in more than one script in a **Territory**, then it is permissible to have one string
26 per script, although the multiple strings are in the same **Designated Language**.

27
28 [Placeholder: revisit text on confusing similarlty after sub-group has concluded its work]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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) ccTLD's which are considered to be confusingly similar.

WG comments and Discussion

Notes and comments are not intended to be part of the policy itself. They are intended as a clarification and assist in (future interpretation of the policy itself.

Text on similarity needs to be revisit to avoid misunderstandings. Tone of words used in line 16 -17 above, 19 and 20 and notes and comments not consistent.

Discussion around if a language is expressed in more then one script in a Territory,m then persmissible to have one string per script, although the multiple strings are in the same language.

Example 1. For the chinese example. In fast track simplified and traditional chinese strings are separate, as different scripts, but not as variants.

If considered variants, then special mechanism needs to be introduced to grandfather the existing IDNccTLDs.

Latin generation panel lead. 200 languages, using lating script. No decision according to languages. Tried to process all languages using specific scripts. Wrote in proposal that the use of language is not important when creating TLDs. possibility to use a label which means something in a language, but not important to use languages in label definition

Language used in multiple scripts. Use of language may not be "official" in some cases. Any of the scripts in which the language is written? Only in certain scripts? Would there be a limitation on not just the language, but also on scripts?

1 The gvt decides what represents the country in written. (NOTE: GOVERNMENT DECIDES WHAT IS NAME OF COUNTRY OR TERRITORY)
2 There should be another doc defining the country or territory in different scripts. (NOTE 2: ISO 3166 contains names of Territories in
3 French or English, not in a designated language)(NOTE 3: see section 4 below with respect to the support required for the proposed
4 string)
5
6

7 **3.4 If the selected string is not the long or short form of the name of a Territory then evidence of**
8 **meaningfulness is required.** If the selected IDNccTLD string is the long or short form of the name of the
9 relevant **Territory** in the **Designated Language**, and is listed in the UNGEGN Technical Reference Manual for the
10 Standardization of Geographic Names, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007⁴, or a later version of that list, it is
11 considered to be a **Meaningful Representation**.
12

13 If the **Meaningful Representation** of the selected string is **NOT** listed in the UNGEGN Technical Reference
14 Manual for the Standardization of Geographic Names, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007, or a later version
15 of that list, then meaningfulness must be adequately documented. Adequate documentation **MUST** be
16 provided if one of the following cases applies:

- 17 i The selected IDNccTLD string is not the long or short form name of the **Territory** as included in the
18 UNGEGN Manual in the **Designated Language**,
- 19 or
- 20 ii The selected IDNccTLD string is an acronym of the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated Language**
- 21 or
- 22 iii The selected IDNccTLD string is the name of a **Territory** that does not appear in the UNGEGN Manual,
- 23 or
- 24 iv The selected IDNccTLD string is in a **Designated Language** that is not included in the UNGEGN Manual.

⁴ https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/pubs/documents/UNGEGN%20tech%20ref%20manual_m87_combined.pdf . Note that the UNGEGN Technical Reference Manual only contains the names of 192 Countries, which is a sub-set of all the Territories listed under the ISO 3166 standard.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

If such documentation is required, the documentation needs to clearly establish that:

- The meaning of the selected string in the **Designated Language** and English and
- That the selected string meets the meaningfulness criteria.

Specific requirements regarding documentation to demonstrate the **Meaningful Representation** are included in the procedures and documentation recommendations (see section 3.5 and 3.7 below).

3.5 Documentation of the meaningfulness of the selected IDN ccTLD string

The selected IDN ccTLD string(s) must be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of the corresponding **Territory**. A string is deemed to be meaningful if it is in the **Designated Language** of the **Territory** and if it is:

- 1 The name of the **Territory**; or
- 2 A part of the name of the **Territory** denoting the **Territory**; or
- 3 A short-form designation for the name of the **Territory** that is recognizable and denotes the **Territory** in the selected language.

The meaningfulness requirement is verified as follows:

1. If the selected string is listed in the UNGEGN Manual, then the string fulfills the meaningfulness requirement.
2. If the selected string is not listed in the UNGEGN Manual, the requester must then substantiate the meaningfulness by providing documentation from an internationally recognized expert or organization.

ICANN should recognize and accept documentation from one of the following experts or organizations as internationally recognized:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

- a. National Naming Authority – A government recognized National Geographic Naming Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented. The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) maintains such a list of organizations at: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/publications.html> [unstats.un.org]
- b. National Linguistic Authority – A government recognized National Linguistic Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented.

In the exceptional circumstance where there is no access to a National Naming Authority nor to a National Linguistic Authority for the **Territory**, assistance may be requested from ICANN to identify and seek reference to an expert or organization to provide the required documentation. This documentation will be considered acceptable and sufficient to determine whether a string is a **Meaningful Representation** of a **Territory** name.

WG Comments and Discussion

Are all authorities required to provide documentation? Originally they are intended as alternatives.
What is the logic behind a, b, c? Should be allowed that a ccTLD operator appoints an expert in the region or territory. Depend on the opinion of the expert to provide answers. For example the ccTLD Operator could appoint a linguistic expert. That case is missing.
Additional comment on point c: there is a qualifier that implies that c can only happen if a and b fail. A ccTLD operator may want to appoint an expert in addition to a naming authority. There are cases where an internationally recognized expert is brought in, in addition. Skill sets are equally relevant.
The language proposed I result form discussions from 2007 to 2009. Not ethe requirement is limited to the IDNccTLD string itself. It was also agreed that the request process should NOT be limited to existing ccTLD managers. In addition the process should involve the SIP of aTerritory (see section 4.2 below). For that reason, the lsit of experts was limited. Second reason: This is about the name of the territory. In principle, support of relevant government needed for what is considered a designated language for the name of a

1 **Territory**. Same kind of mechanism. What is and what is not a **Designated Language** is first of all a matter of the relevant government, and not
2 by a ccTLD appointed expert.
3 Qualifier for the icann agreed expert. Only can be appointed if a and b fail. Seems to preclude the ability to do a or b AND c.
4 This was to ensure that in principle the decision was made in **Territory**, and with the support of a government.
5 It should be a and b. Not only c. then you have a capture issue as well.
6 Option c only applies if a and b fails. Avoid situation that in case a or b lack for a Territory, the Territory is not eligible for an IDN ccTLD.
7 Note that section c has been replace by adjusted text to make it clearer this is exceptional.

8

9 From the 6 April meeting:

10 Question: Who determines who is the authority? Response: Is determined in-territory. The national naming authorities or national
11 linguistic authorities. Follows basic principle that IANA is the business to determine what is or what is not a country.

12 Question: Are there any examples of appealing in court the decision of such authority? (based on Fast track experience). Response
13 there have been cases, but never real issues.

14 Its clear, of course, that the pertinent Territory itself determines as per its processes, who the pertinent "Naming Authority" is, but
15 my question is, is there something in ccNSO, some sort of accreditation step like what happens in GAC, where a Nation establishes
16 its credentials to be able to join GAC, and then GAC makes a decision of whether or not to allow membership? For example, is it
17 that the pertinent Territories' ccTLD manager informs ccNSO who that Naming Authority is and that fact remains stable until
18 officially changed again after a similar process?

19 RESPONSE: NO, the ccNSO veriifies membership, but that is it. `The ccNSO was never intended to certify whether a Naming
20 Authroirity is the appporiate authority. This is internal matter, including the government (through the SIP).

21

22

23

24

1 *3.6 Notes and Comments*

2 ICANN should include an example of the documentation that demonstrates the selected IDN ccTLD string(s) is a
3 **Meaningful Representation** of the corresponding **Territory** in the implementation plan.
4

5 ICANN should include a procedure in the implementation plan, including a timeframe, to identify expertise
6 referred to or agreed as set out in the final paragraph of section 3.5 above.
7

8 **WG Comments and Discussion**

9 Explicit reference to ICANN. Should be IFO?

10 Response: Policies developed by the ccNSO are directed at ICANN. Secondly, this policy is about the selection of an IDNccTLD string, which is
11 outside the remit of the IANA Naming Function Operator (IFO, PTI or IANA). The review and processing of the selected strings are conducted
12 by an ICANN function, not by PTI (IFO or IANA). IANA processes become relevant after the string selection process has been completed and the
13 IDNccTLD will be delegated, transferred, revoked or retired, according to the existing policies, or as under development under ccPDP3)
14

15 *3.7 Documentation Designated Language*

16 The requirements for allowable languages and scripts to be used for the selected IDN ccTLD string is that the
17 language must be a **Designated Language** in the **Territory** as defined in section (see above). The language
18 requirement is considered verified if one of the following conditions is met:

- 19 i. If the language is listed for the relevant **Territory** as an ISO 639 language in Part Three of the *Technical*
20 *Reference Manual for the standardization of Geographical Names, United Nations*
21 *Group of Experts on Geographical Names* (“UNGEGN Manual”)
22 (<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm>);
23 or
24 ii. If the language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** in ISO 3166-1;
25 or

1 iii. If the relevant public authority of the **Territory** confirms that the language is used or serves as follows,
2 (either by letter or link to the relevant government constitution or other online documentation from an
3 official government website):

- 4 - Used in official communications by the relevant public authority; or
- 5 - Serves as a language of administration.

6 Further, the documentation MUST include a reference to the script or scripts in which the **Designated Language** is
7 expressed and which MUST be listed in the script charts of the latest version of UNICODE.

9 **WG Discussion and Comments**

10 Use another standard to limit the scope ? in a future new version of unicode, adds a new word. But what if this applies as a TLD and
11 is not allowed in the IDN standard? To revisit later. Take into account the other script-related requirements. This is not the only
12 requirement.

13 Note IDNA is not about unicode. IETF is tracking the first versions of unicode. Currently processing v11 of Unicode.
14 see: <https://www.iana.org/assignments/idna-tables-11.0.0/idna-tables-11.0.0.xml>

15 Does proposed format work (v07 of document) ? Need for a reference to a script. Is this a way to reference to a script?

16 As far as script names are concerned. ISO15924 standard used for script names. Unicode also lists scripts. The challenge in
17 referring to unicode: it does not get automatically adopted in IDNA standard. If the reference to unicode version is not correct.
18 Would a reference to the IDNA tables themselves work? Are scripts listed there? As a set of characters. Would also resolve other
19 concern probably. Refer to the IDNA2008 standard as based on the latest version of unicode.

20 Latest unicode version processed for IDNA2008.

22 **From discussion of 20 April 2021**

23 Line 6-8: does this now capture what has been discussed at the previous meeting?

24 Strike “have been applied”?

1 Refer to code table of IDNA2008. This is updated per unicode table. If unicode is updated, that is updated too.
2 Comment: That unicode tables are updates does not mean anything for IDNA2008. Not slavely following what is in unicode. Should first be
3 interpreted by the people that do the standard. Sometimes unicode is changing attributes to characters that makes them either valid or not
4 valid to be used in IDNA2008. Current IETF version is lagging behind the unicode version. If you follow what is in unicode blindly, you make
5 existing labels no longer valid, or the other way around. Have a critical eye.
6 Question: Does IDNA2008 include a list of scripts that can be used?
7 Response: No. big difference with 2003. Algorithm to look at attributes of the unicode characters. No single table. Changes all the time.
8 Suggestion: Wait for the VM sub group. The overarching question: What is the sole source to validate TLD tables? Candidate is the RZ-LGR.
9 Derived from IDNA2008 but further. Universe of codepoints that could be used for TLD lables. If this PDP accepts RZ-LGR as sole source, we
10 need to revise this small section later
11 Response this could be put in parking lot. But the issue we wanted to address is whether we should use a designated script.
12 Group agreed this was not the most appropriate way to go. But some languages are expressed in 1 or multiple scripts or writing systems. Set of
13 characters. Would your suggestion address this concern?
14 Response: ok. Delete “which is processed for IDNA2008”
15 Note: danger. It has been processed by IDNA2008 algorithm. You want to go through this review before you do the RZ-LGR. These are
16 candidates. There might be other rules that need to be applied too. It kind of limits, but not completely.
17 Note: Unicode is a necessary but not sufficient condition. Scripts processed by IETF. if RZ-LGR is adopted as the condition to move forward,
18 then either the Maximal Starting Point or RZ-LGR would be the relevant reference points.
19 Remark: a script is only eligible if it appears in the latest version of unicode that has been processed.
20 Note: this is not about characters. This is to address “if an application comes in with a designated language to refer to a script”.
21
22 Note: The sole purpose of this section of the proposals is to identify and include a relevant point of reference to scripts which are used to
23 express a Designated Language. The requirement with respect to IDNA 2008 etc.
24 Is dealt with in another section of the document (section 5) relevancy of RZ-LGR in this context is dealt with by the Sub-Group VM.
25

26 *3.8 Notes and Comments*

27 ICANN should include an example of the documentation that the selected language(s) is considered designated
28 in the Territory should in the implementation plan.
29
30

1 **WG Discussion and Comments**

2 Include Designated Script Criteria?

3 **Question: should “IDNccTLD String must be in Designated Script” be introduced as additional criteria?**

4 **Conclusion:** Update section 3 to include reference to a script, as being required in the documentation provided by the national naming
5 authority or the national linguistic authority. Further discussion on 6 April.

6
7
8 Observations:

9 IDNccTLDs strings are in scripts/ writing system and character. In principle without meaning, hence script should be focus area and
10 designate which one could be used.

11 Some languages are written in two or more scripts, examples are listed in for instance the Ethnologue, which is maintained by SIL
12 (also organization that maintained ISO639-3 (<https://www.ethnologue.com/language/ywa>)). To process designate the script or
13 should all scripts be allowed?

14
15 Language determine the related writing system/script and the number is limited. Vice versa, some scripts are used as writing
16 system for 200 or more languages. In Fast Track and proposed text this relation is implied, by requiring a reference to the
17 language, (NOTE staff: this could be made more explicit to clarify what is intended, for example,

18
19 It was also suggested that the current practice, to be liberal, and accept selected strings based on languages. Languages are the
20 means of communication and inclusive on a Territory basis. However set clear and strict criteria with respect to the requirements
21 of the strings.

22 WG discussions

23 Not clear what designated script means. The phrase is arbitrary. What was intended is that in some countries a language can be written
24 in various scripts. When a country shifted from one script to another. From the government perspective, the use of a language, is under
25 a certain script. However, older population might still use the old script. That gets reduced over time, as the government shifts to the
26 new script. Designated script is script suggested for use by a designated language by a government. Potential confusion for the
27 audience.

28 As discussed previously. If you do not put a limit to the number of languages, you can easily end up in a situation which is not
29 manageable. According to 639-3 standard: 7000+ languages listed. Potentially 1.5 million TLDs.

30 Designated = official language, external definition. UNEG.

1 Further what is and what is not an official/designated language is a matter for in-territory. ICANN nor the the ICANN community
2 should not be put in the position to tell “you have the wrong name”. Matter for government and other significantly interested parties to
3 determine the right string.
4

5 Connect the 2 terms (script/language). Should solve the issue, and question raised about recognised by ICANN. Documentation should
6 include language and script and reference. Potentially include “if there is more than 1 script, reference to the script. ISO15something, or
7 other existing standard where the script is mentioned.”

8 If you include the link regarding change of script, is it a condition for the de-selection of the string. Around 150 scripts in unicode. When
9 a territory applies a string for a particular language, does the application need to be limited to the scripts in that territory? Or any of the
10 scripts in the unicode? Not every language is written in every script. See example Wolof (senegal). Not implied script, to have Wolof for
11 instance in Chinese Current language does not imply that restriction. Do we want to make script relevant to the language? Or arbitrary
12 choice. There are implications. If icann receives a string for a particular country, supported by the government, it should be processed.
13 Fast track demonstrated that this approach works. We take the same approach here, with some small refinements
14

15 Conclusion: Update section 3 to include reference to a script, as being required in the documentation provided by the national naming
16 authority or the national linguistic authority. Further discussion on 6 April.
17
18

19 **4.Required SUPPORT for proposed string**

20
21 **4.1 The selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be non-contentious within the Territory.** The selected IDN ccTLD string
22 must be non-contentious within the **Territory**. The non-contentiousness is evidenced by a statement of
23 support/endorsement/non-objection by the **Significantly Interested Parties⁵** in the **Territory**.

⁵ The concept Significantly Interested Parties is derived from RFC 1591 and used as detailed in the Framework of Interpretation by the FOIWG (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_46435/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf). Accordingly: The FOIWG interprets “Significantly Interested Parties” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to include, but not be limited to: a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. To be considered a Significantly Interested Party, any party other than the manager or the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated

1
2 If during the process for selecting and IDN ccTLD string concurrent requests for the same or more IDN ccTLD
3 strings in the same **Designated Language** for the same **Territory** are submitted, they shall be considered
4 competing requests and are therefore deemed to be contentious within the **Territory**. Before any further steps
5 are taken in the selection process, this issue needs to be resolved in **Territory**, before proceeding with any of
6 the requests. If a concurrent request for an IDNccTLD string is received after the validation of the first requested
7 IDNccTLD string has been completed and the requested IDNccTLD is published (see section 10, below), this
8 second request shall be considered erroneous and section **Change, withdrawal or termination of the request**
9 (section 12 below) applies.

10
11 **WG Comment and discussion**

12 Question: What does “non-controversial” mean. Does that mean “rough consensus”? There is no definition. Response: if there is
13 no counter-voice. Question and note: string needs to be non-contentious for SIP the significantly interested parties. Wonders
14 about the direction of language. Consensus would be received better. Response see FOI for definition etc. Question: How to define
15 contentious? What is the rule? Response: **included how non-contentiousness is evidenced**. It is an internal matter.

16 If you look at definition of significantly interested parties, it includes a refernce to “government”. If a government or territorial
17 authority objects, it is contentious. Similar to the manner delegations are dealt with.

18 Competing requests - are we talking about the same IDNs for the territory or about IDNs in the same language? What is meant by
19 concurrent requests?

20 This is about how two or more IDN ccTLD string in the same Desiganted Language/script combination for the one Territory are
21 requested. Logically, thsio could be extended to the situation that this may also occur for two IDNccTLD stings from two different

with the ccTLD must demonstrate that it is has a direct, material and legitimate interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s). The FOIWG interprets the requirement for approval from Significantly Interested Parties (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for delegations and transfe

1 Territories. However taken into account both strings MUST be a Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territories,
2 concurrent request from from two different Territories is very unlikely.

3 Question: Duration of concurrent. Is this limited to the string selection process or does it also include the delegation process? Until
4 what time is the second request concurrent? If the string evaluation for one string has been concluded, but not been delegated, is it
5 still concurrent? To what point can someone request for a concurrent IDN ccTLDare string?

6 With respect to the question up to when request of IDNccTLD strings are concurrent.

7 As the competing strings need to be non-contentious , among others evidenced by documented support/ endorsement/non-
8 objection of the government the issue should be resolved in the **Territory** to avopid ICANN will be put in a position to mediate in
9 Territory

10 Question: I absolutely understand, that this is not the issue of ICANN/IANA, but can we get the list of disputed territories? Maybe
11 from UN? Examples: Crimea, Transnistria, Karabach

12 Response: “territories” in this policy has a very specific, defiend meaning, which is directly related to the iso3166 standard. The
13 examples are given are not included and related to the list. What is meant with “disputed”? If a country would vanish or change its
14 name, it could impact in the sense of de-selection of the IDN ccTLD string. If a Territory is not included in the standard, therefore
15 not eligible.

16 Since there’s no IDN ccTLD without an ISO3166 ccTLD, the parties in the territory should be known? This is why ‘territory’ might
17 be misunderstood. There will always be a relevant government or public authority and they must be involved in the process. At a
18 minimum they must express their non-objection. Hence the negative phrasing. Requiring explicit Support for a proposed
19 IDNccTLD string might be considered counterproductive, as some authoristies may not feel to be in a position to explicitly express
20 support, but may not-object.

21 Observation: possible contention at the horizon. Going back to FOI. when the SIP were adopted as the concept, how their collective
22 wisdom was captured as consensus or non objection. Include reference to FOI.
23 From discussion 20 April 4.1.

24 Non-objection included. Some governments will have an issue with explicitly expressing support or endorsing a string, but they do not
25 mind non-objection.

1 Line 5-11 has been amended to reflect the timing of the concurrent request. Reference to significantly interested parties (SIP) in the
2 footnote from the framework of interpretation (FoI)
3 Michael” shouldn't "... for selecting and IDN ccTLD string ..." be ".. for selecting an IDN ccTLD string ..."
4 typo: receveid => received
5
6 Resolve must / should. Mixture of language.
7 Question: if there is a request that is being processed and a second request comes in, both are on hold. Each of the parties asked to solve
8 this internally. Is it ok to inform the others about the other request?
9 Response: within the territory SIP includes the government. You do not want a fight between 2 governmental agencies. All parties
10 should be informed of concurrent requests.
11 Note that once the conflict is resolved, 1 will withdraw and the other application moves forward.
12 Question: what happens if variants will be enabled in future. Is it clear enough?
13 Resonse: all should be revisited once the recommendations by the sub-groups are ready.

18 4.2 Documentation of required endorsement / support/non-objection for selected string by **Significantly Interested** 19 **Parties**

20
21 4.2.1 Definition of Significantly Interested Parties. Significantly Interested Parties include but are not limited to:

- 22 a) the government or territorial authority for the **Territory** associated with the IDN ccTLD string and
- 23 b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others in the
24 **Territory** that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest.

25
26 To be considered a **Significantly Interested Party**, any party other than the government or territorial authority
27 for the **Territory** associated with the selected IDN ccTLD must demonstrate that it is has a direct, material,
28 legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the proposed IDN ccTLD(s).

1 Requesters should be encouraged to provide documentation of the support of stakeholders for the selected
2 string, including an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the selection of the proposed string via a public
3 process. “Stakeholders” is used here to encompass **Significantly Interested Parties**, “interested parties” and
4 “other parties.”

5 4.2.2 Classification of input

6 For procedural purposes the following cases should be distinguished:

- 7 • Request for the full or short name of **Territory** (as defined in Section 3, reference needs to be updated in
8 final version).
- 9 • Other cases, where additional documentation is required.

10 In both cases the relevant Government / Public Authority needs to be involved and at a minimum its non-
11 objection should be documented.

12 *4.3 Notes and Comments*

13 In case where additional documentation is required:

- 14 - Unanimity should NOT be required.
- 15 - The process should allow minorities to express a concern i.e. should not be used against legitimate
16 concerns of minorities
- 17 - The process should not allow a small group to unduly delay the selection process.

18
19
20 ICANN should include an example of the documentation required to demonstrate the support or nonobjection
21 for the selected string(s) in the implementation plan.

22 **WG Comments and Discussions**

23 No comments first reading
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Variants PLACEHOLDER: SUB-GROUP

Note that the criteria and process and procedures of this section shall be reviewed and updated by one of the sub-groups

To date (March 2013) identifying the issues pertaining to the management of variant TLD's are still under discussion by the community, in particular the delineation of technical, policy and operational aspects. For this reason, policy recommendations pertaining to the management of variant IDN ccTLDs, if any, are not included, but will be added at a later stage.

5 GENERAL STRING REQUIREMENTS AND THEIR VALIDATION

5.1 Technical Criteria

The selected IDN ccTLD string must abide by all Technical Criteria for an IDN TLD string. In addition to the proposed 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.

Validation that a string meets the technical criteria is a process step and shall be conducted by an external, independent panel. The recommended procedure is described in Section 2.1.3, Processes and Documentation.

1
2 The method and criteria for the technical validation should be developed as part of the implementation plan and
3 are a critical part of the review process. For reasons of transparency and accountability they should be made
4 public prior to implementation of the overall policy and endorsed by the ccNSO.
5

6 **WG Comments and discussion**

7 Comment: after RZ-LGR is considered and agreed, it needs to be added to the technical criteria.

8 DNS Stability Panel (DSP)

9 To be revisited next week.

10 Actual technical criteria to be documented as part of the implementation plan. Who will define them? The current group, another group?

11 Response: Current practice is that the implementation plan is up to icann org, and then consultation with the community

12 To be revisited.

13 The more you add to the policy, the less timeless it will become. Things might evolve. To be taken into account.

14 Question: what does independent review mean?

15 Response: recommendation is having a technical panel or a similarity review panel. One and the same panel at the moment. It is up to

16 We leave it up to icann for cost-saving following the regular procedure.

17 Jiankang: page 25. Line 1. Change to "any".

18 Bart: it has to meet "all" criteria. That is the idea?

19 Michael: I agree. "all" should be "any" in line 2

20 Jaap: fails to meet any

21 Anil: applicant informed about non compliance?

22 Bart: cannot be changed "on the fly". Process is terminated if it does not meet the criteria. Should perhaps be made more explicitly, when
23 the termination section applies.
24

25 26 **5.2 Confusing Similarity (From section 2.1.2) (to be reviewed by 3rd Sub-Group)**

27 Note that the criteria and process and procedures of this section shall be reviewed and updated by one of the
28 sub-groups
29

1 **6. TECHNICAL Validation and CONFUSING SIMILARITY Processes and Procedures (From section**
2 **2.1.3)**

3 Staff Note: The original text was structured in such a way that combining the text in criteria section and Processes
4 and Procedures, is difficult to combine in a consistent manner.

5
6 *b. Independent Reviews*

7 **6.1 General description of Technical and string confusion review**

8
9 It is recommended that ICANN appoint the following external and independent Panels:

- 10 • To validate the technical requirements ICANN should appoint a “Technical Panel⁶” to conduct a technical
11 review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.
- 12 • To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent
13 “ Similarity Review Panel” to review the selected IDN ccTLD string for confusing similarity.
- 14 • To allow for a final validation review relating the confusing similarity, and only if so requested by the
15 requester, ICANN should appoint, an external and independent “ Extended Process Similarity Review
16 Panel.”

17 As part of the implementation planning the details of the roles and responsibilities of the panels and its
18 membership requirements should be developed in conjunction with the development of the methods and

⁶ Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

1 criteria for assessing the technical⁷ and confusing similarity⁸ validity of the selected IDN ccTLD strings and details
2 of the reporting as foreseen for the validation processes.

3 4 **6.2 Process for Technical Validation**

- 5 1. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request, ICANN staff will submit the selected IDN
6 ccTLD string to the “Technical Panel” for the technical review.
- 7 2. The Technical Panel conducts a technical string evaluation of the string submitted for evaluation. If
8 needed, the Panel may ask questions for clarifications through ICANN staff.
- 9 3. The findings of the evaluation will be reported to ICANN staff. In its report the Panel shall include the
10 names of the Panelists and document its findings, and the rationale for the decision.

11
12 Usually the Panel will conduct its review and send its report to ICANN staff within 30 days after receiving the
13 IDN ccTLD string to be evaluated. In the event the Panel expects it will need more time, ICANN staff should be
14 informed accordingly. ICANN staff shall inform the requester accordingly.

15
16 4 If according to the technical review the string meets all the technical criteria the string is technically validated.
17 If the selected string fails to the the technical criteria, the requested string is not-valid under the policy. ICANN
18 staff shall inform and notify the requester accordingly and section **Change, withdrawal or termination of the**
19 **request** (section 12 below) applies.

20 21 **6.3 Process for confusing similarity validation (to be reviewed by 3rd sub-group confusing similarity)**

22

⁷Reference needs to be updated

⁸Reference needs to be updated

1 **From Section 2.1.3 , 2013 Report to the Board**

2 **7 Stage 1: String Selection stage in Territory**

3 **7.1 1. General Description**

4 The string selection stage is a local matter in Territory and should ideally involve all relevant local actors in
5 Territory. The actors in Territory must:

- 6 1. Identify the script and language for the IDN Table and prepare this Table if necessary,
- 7 2. Select the IDN ccTLD string. The selected string must meet the meaningfulness and technical
8 requirements and should not be confusingly similar.
- 9 3. Document endorsement /support of the relevant stakeholders in Territory for the selected string, and
- 10 4. Select the intended IDN ccTLD string requester before submitting an IDN ccTLD string for validation. In
11 cases where the string requester is not yet selected, the relevant public authority of the Territory may act as
12 nominee for the to be selected string requester.

13
14 *Notes and Comments*

15 As stated, the string selection stage is a local matter in Territory and should ideally involve all relevant local
16 actors in Territory. Typically, this would include:

- 17 • The IDN ccTLD string requester. This actor initiates the next step of the process, provides the necessary
18 information and documentation, and acts as the interface with ICANN. Typically this actor is the expected
19 IDN ccTLD manager.
- 20 • The relevant public authority of the Territory associated with the selected IDN ccTLD.
- 21 • Parties to be served by the IDN ccTLD. They are asked to show that they support the request and that it
22 would meet the interests and needs of the local Internet community.

23
24 Additionally, these actors may wish to involve recognised experts or expert groups to assist them to select the
25 IDN ccTLD string, prepare the relevant IDN Table or assist in providing adequate documentation.
26

1 Further, and at the request of the actors in Territory ICANN may provide assistance to them to assist with the in-
2 Territory Process.
3

4 **8. 2. Detailed aspects String Selection Stage**

5 8.1 IDN Table

6 As part of the preparation in territory an IDN Table, or any later variant for the name designating such a table,
7 must be defined. The IDN Table needs to be in accordance with the requirements of the policy and procedures
8 for the IANA IDN Practices Repository⁹. The IDN Table may already exist i.e. has been prepared for another IDN
9 ccTLD or gTLD using the same script and already included in the IANA IDN Practices Repository. In this case the
10 existing and recorded IDN Table may be used by reference. If the same script is used in two or more territories,
11 cooperation is encouraged to define an IDN Table for that script. ICANN is advised either to facilitate these
12 processes directly or through soliciting relevant international organisation to facilitate.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Section in original	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust wording?	Comments WG/Updated wording
---------------------	-------	---	--------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

⁹ <http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html>

Document					
2.1.3 - 2	<p>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.</p>	<p>Using the IDN Table prepared for another IDN cc or gTLD could be an option under specific conditions.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Variant Management and RZLabel 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</p>		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9. Stage 2: Validation of IDN ccTLD string (From Section 2.1.3 , 2013 Report to the Board)

9.1 1. General description

The String Validation stage is a set of procedures to ensure all criteria and requirements regarding the selected IDN ccTLD string (as listed in Section 3 of the Report) have been met. Typically this would involve:

- The IDN ccTLD string requester. This actor initiates the next step of this stage of the process by submitting a request for adoption and associated documentation.

- 1 • ICANN staff. ICANN staff will process the submission and coordinate between the different actors
2 involved.
- 3 • Independent Panels to review the string (Technical and Similarity Panels).
4

5 The activities during this stage would typically involve:

- 6 1. Submission of IDN table.
- 7 2. Submission of selected string and related documentation.
- 8 3. Validation of selected IDN ccTLD string:
 - 9 a. ICANN staff validation of request. This includes
 - 10 i. Completeness of request
 - 11 ii. Completeness and adequacy of Meaningfulness and Designated Language
12 documentation
 - 13 iii. Completeness and adequacy of support from relevant public authority iv.
14 Completeness and adequacy of support from other Significantly Interested Parties
 - 15 b. Independent Reviews.
 - 16 i. Technical review
 - 17 ii. String Confusion review
- 18 4. Publication of selected IDN ccTLD string on ICANN website
- 19 5. Completion of string Selection Process
- 20 6. Change, withdrawal or termination of the request.
- 21
- 22

23 ***9.2 2. Detailed aspects String Validation Stage***

24 ***1. Submission of IDN Table***

1 As part of the validation stage an IDN Table needs to be lodged with the IANA IDN Repository of IDN Practices,
2 in accordance with the policy and procedures for the IANA IDN Practices Repository¹⁰.

3 4 5 9.3

6 2. Submission procedure for selected string and related documentation This part of the process is considered a
7 matter of implementation.

8 9 9.4

10 3. Validation of selected string

11 *a. ICANN staff validation of the request*

12 After the requester has submitted a request for an IDN ccTLD string, ICANN should at least validate that:

- 13 • The selected IDN ccTLD refers to a territory listed on ISO 3166-1 list
- 14 • The selected string (A-label) does not exist in the DNS, nor is approved for delegation to another party,
- 15 • The selected string (U-label) contains at least one (1) non-ASCII character.
- 16 • The required A-label, U-label, and corresponding Unicode points to designate the selected IDN ccTLD
- 17 string are consistent.
- 18 • Documentation on meaningfulness is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
- 19 • Documentation on the Designated Language is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
- 20 • Documentation to evidence support for the selected string is complete and meets the criteria and
- 21 requirements and is from an authoritative source.
- 22

¹⁰ <http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html>

1 If one or more elements listed are not complete or deficient, ICANN shall inform the requester accordingly. The
 2 requester should be allowed to provide additional information, correct the request, or withdraw the request
 3 (and potentially resubmit at a later time). If the requester does not take any action within 3 months after the
 4 notification by ICANN that the request is incomplete or contains errors, the request may be terminated by
 5 ICANN for administrative reasons.

6

Section in original document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust wording?	Comments WG / Updated wording
2.1.3	Stage 1 <u>Documentation Designated Language</u>	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	Stage 2 in the “ <u>3. Validation of selected string</u> ”	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.		

8 If all elements listed are validated, ICANN shall notify the requester accordingly and the Technical Validation
 9 Procedure will be initiated.

10

1 If ICANN staff anticipates issues pertaining to the Technical and String Confusion Review during its initial review
2 of the application, ICANN staff is advised to inform the requester of its concerns. The requester will have the
3 opportunity to either:

- 4 1. Change the selected string, or
- 5 2. Tentatively request two or more strings as part of the application including a ranking of the preference to
6 accommodate the case where the preferred string is not validated.
- 7 3. Withdraw the request, or
- 8 4. Continue with the request as originally submitted.

9
10 Details of the verification procedures and additional elements, such as the channel of communication, will need
11 to be further determined. This is considered a matter of Implementation planning.

12 9.4

13 *b. Independent Reviews*

14 **General description of Technical and string confusion review**

15 Staff Comment: Note some of the topics in this section from Section 2.1.3 , 2013 Report to the Board will be
16 reviewed and updated by sub-group.
17

18 **10 Publication of IDN ccTLD string**

19 After successful completion of the request validation procedure and the IDN ccTLD string is valid according to both
20 technical and string similarity review procedures, ICANN shall publish the selected IDN ccTLD String publicly on its
21 website.
22
23
24
25

1 **11. Completion of IDN ccTLD selection process**

2 Once the selected IDN ccTLD string is published on the ICANN website, and the IDN ccTLD selection process is
3 completed, delegation of the IDN ccTLD string may be requested in accordance with the current policy and practices
4 for the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs. ICANN shall notify the requester accordingly.

5

6 **12. Change, withdrawal or termination of the request**

7 ICANN staff shall notify the requester of any errors that have occurred in the application. These errors include, but are
8 not limited to:

- 9
- 10 • The selected string is already a string delegated in the DNS, or approved for delegation to another party.
 - 11 • Issues pertaining to the required documentation.
 - 12 • The country or territory of the request does not correspond to a listing in the ISO3166-1 list or the European
13 Union.
 - 14 • If in accordance with the independent review procedure the selected string is not valid.

15 If such errors emerge, ICANN staff should contact the requester, who should be provided the opportunity to:

- 16 • Amend, adjust or complete the request under the same application in order to abide to the criteria, or
- 17 • Withdraw the request.

18

19 If the requester has not responded within 3 calendar months of receiving the notice by ICANN staff, the request
20 will be terminated administratively.

21 Details of the procedures and additional elements, such as the channel of communication, will need to be
22 further documented. This is considered a matter of Implementation planning.

23

1 **13 Miscellaneous part of proposals**

2 **From Section 2.1.4 , 2013 Report to the Board**

3
4
5
6 **13.1 A. Delegation of an IDN ccTLD must be in accordance with current policies, procedures and practices for**
7 **delegation of ccTLDs**

8 Once the IDN ccTLD string has been selected and the String Validation Stage has been successfully concluded,
9 the delegation of an IDN ccTLD shall be according to the policy and practices for delegation of ccTLDs. This
10 means that the practices for re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs apply to IDN ccTLDs.
11

12 **13.2 B. Confidentiality of information during due diligence stage, unless otherwise foreseen.**

13 It is recommended that the information and support documentation for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string is
14 kept confidential by ICANN until it has been established that the selected string meets all criteria.
15

16 **13.4 C. Creation of list over time**

17 Experience has shown that entries on the ISO 3166-1 table change over time. Such a change can directly impact
18 the eligibility for an IDN ccTLD. In order to record these changes, it is recommended that a table will be created
19 over time of validated IDN ccTLDs, its variants and the name of the territory in the Designated Language(s), both
20 in the official and short form, in combination with the two-letter code and other relevant entries on the ISO 3166-
21 1 list. The purpose of creating and maintaining such a table is to maintain an authoritative record of all relevant
22 characteristics relating to the selected string and act appropriately if one of the characteristics changes over time.
23

1
2
3
4
5

13.5 Notes and comments

As noted above the ISO 3166-1 is not only relevant for the creation of a ccTLD. Once an entry is removed from the list of country names, the ccTLD entry in the root zone database may need to be adjusted/removed to maintain parity between the ISO 3166 list and the root-zone file¹¹.

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust text?	Updated text/comments WG
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	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		

¹¹ See: <http://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html>

	<p>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.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

13. 6D. Transitional arrangement regarding IDN ccTLD strings under the Fast Track IDN ccTLD Process

1. Closure of Fast Track Process. Upon implementation of the policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs by ICANN, the policy for selection of IDN ccTLDs only applies to new requests, unless a requester indicates otherwise.
2. If an IDN ccTLD string request submitted under the Fast Track Process is still in process or has been terminated due to non-validation of the string, the requester may within three months after implementation of the policy request a second, final validation review by the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel .

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

13. 7 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 is also recommended that the ICANN Board of Directors should initiate such a review including consulting the ALAC, ccNSO and GAC on the Terms of Reference for the review.

In the event such a review results in a recommendation to amend the policy, the rules relating to the country code Policy Development Process as defined in the ICANN Bylaws should apply.

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust text?	Updated text/comments WG
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	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. Rationale: Adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.		

		<p>should be the scope of such a review? Should timing be better defined?.</p> <p>Is this a normal behavior 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.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

13. 8 F. Verification of Implementation

It is anticipated that some parts of the recommendations and process steps will need to be further refined and interpreted by ICANN staff before they will be implemented. It is further anticipated that this will be done through an implementation plan or similar planning document. It is therefore recommended that the ccNSO monitors and evaluates the planned implementation of recommendations and the ccNSO Council reviews and approves the final planning document, before implementation by staff.

13. 9 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 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.

1 The IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel members should consist of one member from ALAC, two members from the
 2 ccNSO, two members of the GAC, one member of SSAC. The ICANN Board should appoint the members of the
 3 Panel nominated by the related Supporting Organisation and Advisory Committees

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust text?	Updated text/comments WG
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 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	<p>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 to seek alternative channels to advise on possible issues and changes relating to the policy.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP.</p> <p>Rationale: Proposed panel was adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.</p>		

	unreasonable or unfair for a particular class of cases. [...].	workload and priorities of the ccNSO and other communities			
--	--	--	--	--	--

1
2
3
4
5
6

TABLE 6: Other, additional topics

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step	Adjust Text?	Updated text/comments WG
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	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		

		retirement policy to become applicable.	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 FOL are applicable by the overall principles.		
--	--	---	---	--	--

1
2