**ccPDP WG Discussion and review of proposed policy IDNccTLD string selection section 5-9**
version 04
15 July 2021
REDLINE
**From Section 2.1.3, 2013 Report to the Board**


## Section 5.  Two-Step Process
Under the overall policy a two-stage process is recommended for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string:
Step 1: String selection stage in Territory
Step 2: Validation of IDN ccTLD string


The policy recommendations on process, procedures and required documentation, if any, will be described both at a general level and in a more detailed fashion for both stages.


**WG Comment/Discussion**
WG members on the 1 June 2021 call agreed with two step approach.


### 5.1 Step (was Stage) 1: String Selection in Territory
*5.1.1 General Description*
The string selection stage is a local matter in Territory and should ideally involve all relevant local actors in Territory. The actors in Territory must:
1. Select the IDN ccTLD string. The selected string must meet the meaningfulness requirements, including the requirement of Designated Language and technical requirements and should not be confusingly similar.
2. Identify the Designated Language and script in which is it is expressed and prepare the IDNTable if necessary (to be revisited after the sub-group on Variant Management has completed its work)

3. Document endorsement /support of the relevant stakeholders in Territory for the selected string, and
4. Select the intended IDN ccTLD string requester before submitting an IDN ccTLD string for validation. In cases where the string requester is not yet selected, the relevant public authority of the **Territory** may act as nominee for the to be selected string requester.

WG Comments and Discussion
Text agreed upon attendees 6 July 2021 meeting
One of the requirements was for the IDN ccTLD string to be in a designated language. Reference to the script in which it is expressed
Would that suffice at this stage? This needs to happen in the territory
Remark: would come later, at the validation. The RZ-LGR will provide you with the script.

Proposal is to change the text accordingly. Need to identify the designated language for the IDN ccTLD string

Comment on what was said. Makes sense to keep the relation. "Prepare this table as necessary". But the is not the responsibility of thse who select the string. If a table has not been prepared yet, they could initiate the process?

Response: assume so. Needs to be a mechanism by which the SIP where there is no table, should be able to apply and/or initiate the process. Is that a correct understanding?
Sarmad: Should it also refer to the string itself, in addition to the IDN table?
Should the wording identify the script and language of the IDN ccTLD string AND the IDN table, rather than just the table
Response: combining 1 and 2


*Notes and Comments*
As stated, the string selection stage is a local matter in **Territory** and should ideally involve at a minimum:
- The IDN ccTLD string requester. This actor initiates the next step of the process, provides the necessary information and documentation, and acts as the interface with ICANN. Typically this actor is the expected to become the IDN ccTLD manager.

- **Significantly Interested Parties.**
  - The relevant public authority of the **Territory** associated with the selected IDN ccTLD.
  - any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others in the **Territory** that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the potential IDNccTLD.

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

Further, and at the request of the actors in **Territory**, ICANN may assist them with the in-Territory Process.

WG Comments and Discussion
Who are the parties to be served? How do we identify them?
SIP have been defined in the previous section (section 2.1.1 of the consolidation versions November 2020 - May 2021)
Drift of the argument to stay the same, but include a reference to the text previously used, for consistency.
Local internet community: replaced by "significantly interested parties" (SIP). used in cc policies.
Question: When and by whom will be verification be defined? Response: this is part of stage 2, required verification of the documentation, technical checks, confusing similarity. Not clear from the text yet however.

*5.1.2 Detailed aspects String Selection Stage*

**1 IDN Table**

As part of the preparation in territory an IDN Table, or any later variant for the name designating such a table, must be defined. The IDN Table needs to be in accordance with the requirements of the policy and procedures

1     for the IANA IDN Practices Repository[1]. The IDN Table may already exist i.e. has been prepared for another IDN

2     ccTLD or gTLD using the same script and already included in the IANA IDN Practices Repository. In this case the

3     existing and recorded IDN Table may be used by reference.  If the same script is used in two or more territories,

4     cooperation is encouraged to define an IDN Table for that script. ICANN is advised either to facilitate these

5     processes directly or through soliciting relevant international organisation to facilitate

6

7 Staff note:

8 Please note the following background material, which may be relevant in this context:

9     1. Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names | Version 3.0

10       ([https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-guidelines-2011-09-02-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-guidelines-2011-09-02-en))

11     This document supersedes version 2.2 of these Guidelines to reflect the IDNABIS revision ("IDNA2008") of the initial IDNA

12     protocol ("IDNA2003"). It was prepared by members of the IDN Guidelines Revision Working Group

13     (of gTLD and ccTLD registries with IDN experience)

14

15     2. Procedures for the IDN Repository ( [https://www.iana.org/help/idn-repository-procedure](https://www.iana.org/help/idn-repository-procedure)) The Repository of IDN

16     Practices was created to support the development of the internationalized domain names (IDNs) by promoting the

17     sharing of registry IDN policies. The policies are referred to as "Label Generation Rulesets" (LGRs), and historically as

18     "IDN tables" or "variant tables."

19

20 WG Comment and discussion

21 The WG discussed some aspects of the IDN Table section. However, it was agreed to await the results of the Variant Management Sub-Group

22 and then revisit this section.

23

24 Detailed aspects:

---

[1] [http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html](http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html)

When we list the IDN table, do we need to clarify the context?  Is it related to the review of the string? The string being applied for? Second level registrations? If it is for the string being applied for, further discussion needed. Relation with RZ-LGR. Also linked to review of the string. Comment: IDN table is mainly for RZ-LGR. Not for second level domains. Chinese LGR. Japan, Korea, China all use hang characters. Second level table is based on chinese comment. Different environment, different language. You cannot apply idn table for RZ-LGR to 2nd level registrations. Good experience for using the table. 20 years. Do not use another table

Question: is the idn table that has been developed in China for the chinese language included in the IANA IDN repository? We also have our idn table in the iana repository. CDNC chinese variant table Is that also the Table used for second level labels? Jiankang: yes. Bart: were there any issues/concerns with submitting this in the repository? Jiankang: already submitted. No concerns. Put in practice for many years. Has proven to be successful Question: any advice? Response: depends on language. Japanese characters also use hang characters. Same for korea. Top level domains have formed the same group. Discussed this together. See for reference: https://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables Staff observation: potential overlap. VM-group to come up with a recommendation, to ensure consistency. : language and script. Suggestion for VM-group Reference to IDN Table to be deleted in next version

Staff : text on page 4,5 is faded. Make a reference and a transposition table from this text to the previous text which was agreed upon already.

**Deleted: ¶**

As part of the in territory step the following documentation should be prepared. The WG has already discussed the requirements of the documentation: see consolidated version.

*Documentation of required endorsement / support for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties*

Definition of Significantly Interested Parties.

Classification of input

1
2  *Notes and Comments*
3
4  *Documentation of the meaningfulness of the selected IDN ccTLD string*
5
6  *Notes and Comments*
7
8  *Documentation Designated Language*
9
10  *Notes and Comments*
11
12  **Documentation of required endorsement / support/non-objection for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties**
13
14  3.2.1  Definition of Significantly Interested Parties. Significantly Interested Parties include but are not limited to:
15    1. the government or territorial authority for the **Territory** associated with the IDN ccTLD string and
16    2. any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others in the **Territory**
17       that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest.
18
19  To be considered a **Significantly Interested Party**, any party other than the government or territorial authority for
20  the **Territory** associated with the selected IDN ccTLD must demonstrate that it is has a direct, material, legitimate
21  and demonstrable interest in the operation of the proposed IDN ccTLD(s).
22
22  Requesters should be encouraged to provide documentation of the support of stakeholders for the selected string,
23  including an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the selection of the proposed string via a public process.
24  "Stakeholders" is used here to encompass **Significantly Interested Parties**, "interested parties" and "other parties."

**3.2.2 Classification of input**

For procedural purposes the following cases should be distinguished:

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

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

**3.2.3 Notes and Comments.** In case where additional documentation is required:

- Unanimity should NOT be required.
- 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.

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

**WG Comments and Discussions**
No comments

**2.5 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:

- 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]
- 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 exemple the ccTLD Operator could appoint a linguistic expert. That case is missing.

1   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
2   addition to a naming authority. There are cases where an internationally recognized expert is brought in, in addition. Skill sets are equally relevant.
3   The language proposed I sresult form discussions from 2007 to 2009.  Not ethe requirement is limited to the IDNccTLD string itself. It was also agreed that
4   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).
5   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
6   for what is considered a designated language for the name of a
7   **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 by a ccTLD
8   appointed expert.
9   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. This was to ensure that in
10  principle the decision was made in **Territory**, and with the support of a government.
11  It should be a and b. Not only c. then you have a capture issue as well.
12  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.
13  Note that section c has been replace by adjusted text to make it clearer this is exceptional.
14
15  From the 6 April meeting.
16  Question: Who determines who is the authority? Response: Is determined in-territory. The national naming authorities or national linguistic
17  authorities.   Follows basic principle that IANA is the business to determine what is or what is not a country.

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

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

24  RESPONSE: NO, the ccNSO veriifies membership, but that is it. `The ccNSO was never intended to certify whether a Naming  Authroirity is the
25  appporiate authority. This is internal matter, including the government (through the SIP).
26
27

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

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

**WG Comments and Discussion**
Explicit reference to ICANN. Should be IFO?
Response: Policies developed by the ccNSO are directed at ICANN. Secondly, this policy is about the selection of an IDNccTLD string, which is outside the remit of the IANA Naming Function Operator ( IFO, PTI or IANA).  The review and processing of the selectied strings are conducted by an ICANN function, not by PTI (IFO or IANA). IANA processes become relevant after the string selction process has been completed and the IDNccTLD will be delegated, tranfered, revoked or retired, according to the existing policies, or as under development under ccPDP3)

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

1. If the language is listed for the relevant **Territory** as an ISO 639 language in Part Three of the *Technical Reference Manual for the standardization of Geographical Names, United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names* ("UNGEGN   Manual") (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm);
   or
2. If the language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** in ISO 3166-1;
   or
3. If the relevant public authority of the **Territory** confirms that the language is used or serves as follows, (either by letter or link to the relevant government constitution or other online documentation from an official government website):
   a.  Used in official communications by the relevant public authority;

or

    b. Serves as a language of administration.


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


**WG Discussion and Comments**
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 is not allowed in the IDN standard? To revisit later. Take into account the other script-related requirements. This is not the only requirement.
Note IDNA is not about unicode. IETF is tracking the first versions of unicode. Currently processing v11 of Unicode.
see: https://www.iana.org/assignments/idna-tables-11.0.0/idna-tables-11.0.0.xml
Does proposed format work (v07 of document) ? Need for a reference to a script. Is this a way to reference to a script?
As far as script names are concerned. ISO15924 standard used for script names. Unicode also lists scripts. The challenge in referring to unicode: it does not get automatically adopted in IDNA standard. If the reference to unicode version is not correct. Would a reference to the IDNA tables themselves work? Are scripts listed there? As a set of characters. Would also resolve other concern probably. Refer to the IDNA2008 standard as based on the latest version of unicode.
Latest unicode version processed for IDNA2008.

From discussion of 20 April 2021.
Line 6-8: does this now capture what has been discussed at the previous meeting?
Strike "have been applied"?
Refer to code table of IDNA2008. This is updated per unicode table. If unicode is updated, that is updated too.
Comment: That unicode tables are updates does not mean anything for IDNA2008. Not slavely following what is in unicode. Should first be interpreted by the people that do the standard. Sometimes unicode is changing attributes to characters that makes them either valid or not 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 existing labels no longer valid, or the other way around. Have a critical eye.
Question: Does IDNA2008 include a list of scripts that can be used?
Respense: No. big difference with 2003. Algorithm to look at attributes of the unicode characters. No single table. Changes all the time.

**5.2. Stage 2: Validation of IDN ccTLD string**

*5.2.1 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.
- ICANN staff. ICANN staff will process the submission and coordinate between the different actors involved.
- Independent Panels to review the string (Technical and Similarity Panels).


The activities during this stage would typically involve:

1. Submission of IDN table.
2. Submission of selected string and related documentation.
3. Validation of selected IDN ccTLD string:

> **Commented [MOU1]:** To be revisited after VM subgroup completed its work. Expect text proposal VM

a. ICANN staff validation of request. This includes
   i. Completeness of request
   ii. Completeness and adequacy of Meaningfulness and Designated Language documentation
   iii. Completeness and adequacy of support from relevant public authority iv. Completeness and adequacy of support from other Significantly Interested Parties

b. Independent Reviews.
   i. Technical review
   ii. String Confusion review

4. Publication of selected IDN ccTLD string on ICANN website

5. Completion of string Selection Process

6. Change, withdrawal or termination of the request.


### *5.2.2 Detailed aspects String Validation Stage*

**A. Submission of IDN Table**

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

B. **Submission procedure for selected string and related documentation** This part of the process is considered a matter of implementation.

---

[2] http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.2"
**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.01"
**Commented [MOU2]:** Needs to be revisited after VM subgroup has completed its work.
**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.02"
**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.2"
**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0"

1. **C. Validation of selected string**
2. *a. ICANN staff validation of the request*
3. After the requester has submitted a request for an IDN ccTLD string, ICANN should at least validate that:
4. • The selected IDN ccTLD refers to a **Territory** ~~listed on ISO 3166-1 list~~
5. • The selected string (A-label) does not exist in the DNS, nor is approved for delegation to another party,
6. • The selected string (U-label) contains at least one (1) non-ASCII character.
7. • The required A-label, U-label, and corresponding Unicode points to designate the selected IDN ccTLD string are
8.    consistent.
9. • Documentation on **Meaningfulness** is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
10. • Documentation on the **Designated Language** is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
11. • Documentation to evidence support for the selected string is complete and meets the criteria and requirements
12.    and is from an authoritative source.
13.
14. Need to include validation of variants of selected string. To be suggested by VM and discussed by Full WG.
15.
16. If one or more elements listed are not complete or deficient, ICANN shall inform the requester accordingly. The
17. requester should be allowed to provide additional information, correct the request, or withdraw the request (and
18. potentially resubmit at a later time). If the requester does not take any action within 3 months after the notification
19. by ICANN that the request is incomplete or contains errors, the request may be terminated by ICANN for
20. administrative reasons as provided in section 8 below .
21.
22. **WG Comments and discussion**
23. Should the documentation submitted to ICANN be written in English or could be written with the requested IDN string?
24. During meeting views in support of both approaches:
25. To promote multilingualism, including IDNs request and relevant documentation should be allowed to be submitted in Designated language.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering
Formatted: English (US)
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold

1 At eh other end strong opposition: may create ambiguity in application. One cannot expect ICANN and external panelist to master all
2 Designated Languages possible, nor should be the burden for a validated translation be on ICANN. Need to accept that English is the lingua
3 franca of the Internet
4
5 Possible solution: request and documentatation may be submitted in Designated Language together with authticated translation. However in
6 validation and processing English documentation will prevail for purpose of IDNccTLD selection process
7
8

| 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 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 | Stage 2 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. | | |

10 If all elements listed are validated, ICANN shall notify the requester accordingly and the Technical and Confusing
11 Similarity Validation Procedure will be initiated.
12

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

1. Change the selected string,

   or

2. Tentatively request two or more strings as part of the application including a ranking of the preference to accommodate the case where the preferred string is not validated,

   or

3. Withdraw the request,

   or

4. Continue with the request as originally submitted.

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

**b. Independent Reviews**

**I.    General description of Technical and string confusion review**

Staff Comment: Note some of the topics in this section from Section 2.1.3 , 2013 Report to the Board have already  been reviewed. The sections on cofsing similarity wil be reviewed and updated by the confusing similarity sub-group .

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

- To validate the technical requirements ICANN should appoint a "Technical Panel[3]" to conduct a technical review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.

---

[3] Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

- {PLACEHOLDER: To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent Panel(s)}

## II.    Process for Technical Validation

1. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request (see section 7.2.2 3.a above), ICANN staff will submit the selected IDN ccTLD string to the "Technical Panel" for the technical review.
2. The Technical Panel conducts a technical string evaluation of the string submitted for evaluation. If needed, the Panel may ask questions for clarifications through ICANN staff.
3. The findings of the evaluation will be reported to ICANN staff. In its report the Panel shall include the names of the Panelists and document its findings, and the rationale for the decision.

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

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

WG Comments and Discussion
Step 1 Selection IDN ccTLD string needs to happen in the country/territory.
Step 2 is Validation. Section 5.2.1. Is a high-level process and milestone description of the validation process.
Section 5.2.2. Goes into the details of the validation process.
Line 9-15: no questions or comments
Line 18-25: no questions or comments

Sarmad asking a question regarding staff role

Bart: up to the VM group what they will propose. To be proposed in future.
Sarmad: looking at the original string in context of RZ-LGR and what the variant strings are. Share that those are potentially 2 different steps in the process
Bart: we should not preempt the outcome of the VM subgroup


**III.    Process for confusing similarity validation (to be reviewed by 3rd sub-group confusing similarity)**


## Section 6. Publication of IDN ccTLD string

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

WG Comments and Discussion

Under Fast Track Process the selected string is posted (called: "primary string(s) represent the string that the requester now may seek for IDN ccTLD delegation"). For current publication see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/string-evaluation-completion-2014-02-19-en

Comment on terminology used on website: Note that the string passed all validation steps. Seeking delegation is next phase. Also note that  "variants identified by the requester (applicant)" has a very spefic meaning: Accoring to tht text "they will be allocated to the requester in order to be reserved to the entitled manager for potential future delegation in the DNS root zone".

Question from meeting 6 July: should under the policy both the selected string and variants be posted. If variants to be posted: all allocatable or other sub-set? To be proposed by VM subgroup. Note that set of allocatable strings could be huge.

Question: IRP

Is there a need for a complaint process? Once the TLD string is published,and before putting the string into the zone?
Note: IDN string selection happens in country and support needs to be documented including by the relevant governmental authority. This is therefore first and foremost an internal matter. Also note that validation ois looking at the string itself i.e whether

the requirements and criteria for an IDNccTLD string have been met. Unclear who should complain if published. Non-SIP? Other governments, parties from outside the Territory

Possibly complaint period by the general public? Is decision final?
You question the role of government or relevant public authorities.
Noted to be revisited later i.e case for a stress test / possibly case for IRP?

## Section 7. Completion of IDN ccTLD selection process

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


**WG Comments and Discussion**
No comments raised meeting 6 July 2021


## Section 8.  Change, withdrawal, or termination of the request

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

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

Formatted: English (US)

Deleted:

Formatted: Indent: Left:  0"

Deleted:  re-delegation

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

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

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

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

WG Comments and Discussion
No comments raised meeting 6 July 2021

### Section 9. Miscellanous

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

**A. Delegation of an IDN ccTLD must be in accordance with current policies, procedures and practices for delegation of ccTLDs**

Once the IDN ccTLD string has been selected and the String Validation Stage has been successfully concluded, the delegation of an IDN ccTLD shall be according to the policy and practices for delegation of ccTLDs. This means that the practices for (delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs apply to IDN ccTLDs.

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

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

**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.

*C.1 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 file[4].

| 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 | The update frequency caused issues in the past. It might be advisable to review it.<br><br>It is questionable whether this mechanism still makes sense in the current context. | Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP.<br><br>Rationale: This element of the policy needs to be reviewed but was | | |

---

[4] See: http://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html

| | 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. | Who is responsible for creating the table and what is the frequency for updating it? What is purpose? | 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 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

1

**D. 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 .

**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 | It would be advisable to review the policy whenever deemed appropriate. Considering the dynamic internet landscape, should any significant scenario | Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. | | |

| | such an earlier time warranted by extraordinary circumstances […]. | 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 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. | Rationale: Adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**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.

**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.

The IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel members should consist of one member from ALAC, two members from the ccNSO, two members of the GAC, one member of SSAC. The ICANN Board should appoint the members of the 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 | 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. | Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP.

Rationale: Proposed panel was adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 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. […]. | 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 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- | The ccNSO PDP on IDN ccTLD should be amended to include what will cause the retirement of an IDN ccTLD.<br><br>Rationale: The retirement process will be defined through ccNSO PDP 3 will be applicable to both | | |

| | | 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. | IDNccTLD and ASCII ccTLDs.<br><br>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. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

1
2
3