

1 **ccPDP WG Discussion and review of proposed policy IDNccTLD string selection section 5-9**

2 version 07

3 25 August 2021

4
5 **Section 9. Miscellaneous**

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

7
8 **A. Delegation of an IDN ccTLD must be in accordance with current policies, procedures and practices for delegation of ccTLDs**

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

13
14 **WG Comments and Findings**

15 No comments. **Text** accepted

16
17 **B. Confidentiality of information during due diligence stage (read: validation Stage), unless otherwise foreseen.**

18
19 It is recommended that the information and support documentation for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string is
20 kept confidential by ICANN until it has been established that the selected string meets all criteria.

21
22 **WG Comments and Findings**

23 Reason for including this originally: with the publication of the IDN ccTLD string, the selection process is concluded and the
24 delegation can then be requested. During the validation parties involved in validation should be enabled to community
25 confidentially and ask questions on specifics and provide additional information and explanations. The results of the process,
26 and for example panel findings will be published, as such clear that the request has been made.

27 **Question: when will it become public? Response: after validation has been completed.**

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: g

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

1 The approach is very similar to current practices with around delegation and transfers etc. of (IDN)ccTLD, which were re-
2 confirmed in the FoI. Publication is relevant from an accountability perspective. ▲
3 WG agreed with proposal on 2 August meeting.

4 **C. Creation of list over time**

5 Experience has shown that entries on the ISO 3166-1 table change over time. Such a change can directly impact
6 the eligibility for an IDN ccTLD. In order to record these changes, it is recommended that a table will be created
7 over time of validated IDN ccTLDs, its variants and the name of the territory in the Designated Language(s), both
8 in the official and short form, in combination with the two letter code and other relevant entries on the ISO 3166-
9 1 list. The purpose of creating and maintaining such a table is to maintain an authoritative record of all relevant
10 characteristics relating to the selected string and act appropriately if one of the characteristics changes over time.
11

12 *C.1 Notes and comments*

13 As noted above the ISO 3166-1 is not only relevant for the creation of a ccTLD. Once an entry is removed from
14 the list of country names, the ccTLD entry in the root zone database may need to be adjusted/removed to maintain
15 parity between the ISO 3166 list and the root-zone file¹.
16

17 **WG Comments and Findings**

18 At its 17 August meeting the members of the WG present agreed to strike section 9 C.
19 Arguments, taking into account discussions from the previous meeting and some additional comments. Main raison for the creation of
20 this recommendation at the time, were the dates. The original proposals were developed in the 2010-2011 era. Discussion of use of
21 country and territory names as gTLDs. See AGB at the time. Some references included to the Applicant Guide Book used to be in the
22 text. Timeline was included. Looked also at SubPro WT5. adjustment of policies for the upcoming gTLD round. For historical reasons,
23 adoption of a list, disappeared, following adoption of AGB and WT5. WT5 recommendations and the original recommendations in AGB
24 exclude all country and territory names in all languages from use as a gTLD, unless there is support from the relevant governmental
25 authority. There is still a grey area, but that will not be addressed by the creation of a list. Historical reason for such a list is gone.
26
27

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri)

Deleted: g

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

¹ See: <http://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html>

1 Are there existing lists? Yes, 5 lists. Will record IDN ccTLD names or their variants. For instance: IANA Root Zone Database. This is policy
2 in action. ccTLDs, gTLDs. What is the added value of an additional list? None ... Seen the fact that there are existing lists, the historical
3 reasons for having such a list no longer exist, and the maintenance of such a new list is a true challenge. Example discussed was “
4 reserved names”. What should happen with them? High cost, implications of reserving names, especially when open-ended. Needs to
5 be litigation-proof.
6
7 Line 21 on page 2. Staff also included the arguments from the discussion at the previous meeting.
8 Questions or comments?
9
10 Taking all the arguments into account, and seeing the divergence in this group at the previous meeting, staff prepared an overview of
11 the existing lists.
12 Question on line 15. How can it have an impact on non-ccTLD policies?
13 Response: Currently, non-ccNSO policy means GNSO policies. If we build a list, it may directly impact what is allowed under the new
14 gTLD process. If you carve out certain aspects, it may impact what has been developed under SubPro. Grey area around IDN strings with
15 3 characters. Allowed currently under subPro. There is no clean delineation between the 2. The world was easy with only 2-char codes.
16 Clearly ccTLDs. With the arrival of IDN ccTLDs, this distinction became blurred.
17 Question: distinction between IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD?
18 Response: if the name of the country or territory is listed in iso 3166. Keep in mind, that at the time when this was created, there was
19 no such exclusion. This was pre-AGB, pre-SubPro WTS.
20
21 Question to the group: Are you in favour of removing item c? Line 6-11.
22 2 in favour, some not in favour.
23 Comment: .id has submitted 2 years ago an IDN application. But was rejected. Language is still not an official language. Important that
24 we refer to ISO3166.
25 Observation: But this list has nothing to do with the iso list. Independent. Completely different.
26 Comment: more of a question. What harm is done by keeping the list, other than the possibility of ambiguity with the ISO list. This list
27 has also the variants, which are not going to be listed elsewhere.
28 Response: will need to be maintained. Independent of the creation of a new list. But why maintain a list, if there are so many lists?
29 Effort needed.
30 Question: is there another place where an authoritative list continues to exist? Variant, territory, ccTLD

1 Response 1: root zone.
2 Response 2: ICANN does maintain a list of IDN ccTLDs. Variants for IDN TLDs (gTLDs and ccTLDs): need to develop a mechanism. Talking
3 to IANA too. How to maintain the list? ccTLDs maintained. Variants maintained once policy is approved and implemented. Independent
4 of this list.
5 Comment: Need to be conservative. Is there is something currently that is authoritative, do not remove it unless the new authoritative
6 list is in place. Expecting policies to be created in the future, seems risky. Worried about utility going away, before a replacement is
7 found
8 Response 1: this list does not exist yet. This was an idea in 2011, but was never implemented.
9 Response 2: my point too. There is currently no such a list.
10 Question: the iana list includes idn ccTLDs and variants? Only idn ccTLDs, and the process for including variants is not yet defined?
11 We could instead of creating a list, maintain a record of the validated idn ccTLDs and variants. Refer to iana list, and say we expect them
12 to included the variants too?
13 Response: there are no variants yet. Not yet delegated.
14 Even before delegation, ICANN maintains a list of validated IDN ccTLDs. There will be a mechanism, for dealing with VM, once the policy
15 has been adopted.
16 Staff in chat:
17 • list of IDN ccTLDs successfully delegated. <https://data.iana.org/TLD/tlds-alpha-by-domain.txt>
18 • List of successfully validated TLDs: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/string-evaluation-completion-2014-02-19-en>
19 There could be validated TLDs, which are not yet delegated.
20 Comment: reading number c as “what is possible”, already maintained by iso3166 list. Comment. Section 6 which we discussed
21 previously is about the publication of the validated IDN ccTLD string. The VM-group will come up with a recommendation to include
22 variants. Will be addressed in the future
23 All members present agreed with striking lines 6-11 after discussion.

24
25
26 **Staff Note: Creation of list over time**

27 **1. Historical reason to create list over time has disappeared.** When proposal was developed in 2011 timeframe there was an intense
28 discussion in ICANN community around the use of country and territory names as gTLDs. For an in depth overview the WG is referred to
29 the sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Final report of the CCWG on use of Country and Territory Names (

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,9 cm, Tab stops: 2,53 cm, List tab + Not at 1,27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

1 <https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/ccwg-ctn-final-paper-15jun17-en.pdf> and results of the SubPro WT5
2 discussions concluded in October 2019 and included in the GNSO SubPro Final Report Annex J.
3 (<https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/final-report-newgtld-subsequent-procedures-pdp-18jan21-en.pdf>)
4

5 **2. Existing lists.** Currently various, authoritative lists are already available and in use in the context of IDNccTLDs. Each of the lists
6 records aspects, but is not complete as they rely on the data provided by external (local) sources. The lists are:

- 7 - ISO 3166 standard part 1: list of countries, sub-divisions and other areas of geopolitical interest.
- 8 - ISO 3166 standard part 3: defines codes for country, sub-divisions and other areas of geopolitical interest which have been
9 deleted from ISO3166 since its first publication in 1974.
- 10 - UNGEGN List of Country Names: List of Country names which includes the name of countries, with national official names and in
11 the 6 official UN languages ([https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf)
12 [docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf))
- 13 - ISO639-3 and related the Ethnologue, listing the living languages of the world: <https://www.ethnologue.com/browse/names>
- 14 - IANA Root Zone Database (<https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db>)

15
16 **3. Added value of a new list.** To ensure value of such a newly to be created list: its purpose and the rules need to be clearly defined. If
17 purpose is not defined i.e the issue that needs to be addressed and the use of such a list. This can range from providing a non-
18 authoritative overview to creating a list of reserved names and strings, which can be very large. Depending on its purpose defining the
19 purpose and associated rules to include and maintain the entries is directly related to the purpose of such a list it may have direct
20 impact on other non-ccNSO policies. As this is not in the mandate of the wg group, it should be raised with the ccNSO Council.
21

22 **4. Maintenance of list over time.** As noted the operational issues of maintenance may be prohibiting: the more information included
23 the more resources are needed to maintain and the more detailed the rules have to be to avoid ambivalence. Related, the size of the
24 list may be prohibitive: as said if the proposal is to include the names of Territories in all languages and their variants (per script), the
25 number of entries will be in order of the millions. As a second order issue of such a large repository is correctness at a certain point tin
26 time of the entries. This is specifically an issue if the requestors or ccTLD Manager of the selected IDNccTLD string will be required to
27 provide updates to the entries, particularly if there is hardly any incentive for them to do so.
28

29 Section was introduced in 2011 as part of protection of country and territory names and related to the discussion at that time on
30 use of countryand territory names as gTLD's.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,9 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

1
2 Nowadays (2021) First question to ask if it still makes sense to create a new list over time?

3 Question: who maintains this list? Response: unclear

4 Maintenance is very important. The discussions in SubPro did not have much to do with country code, but more regarding
5 politics. For example, all kind of claims were made about the ISO-list, which had nothing to do with the ISO 3166, and related it
6 puts maintenance at risk. Therefore to avoid furuter issue the purpose of such a list should be well defined purpose and scope. If
7 it is agreed to create a list as part of the process You need a supposedly neutral list. Purpose of such a list should be well-
8 defined.

9 There is an additional issue which is related and that is the potential scale of such a list. One could end up with a list of millions of
10 names. Currentluy roughly 250 country codes in the ISO list and each country code multiplied by all living languages, and then
11 again with variants. Currently around 7000 living languages, and number of variants is unknown. It seems easy to include this as a
12 requirement, but it is an immense task to maintain, and without any clear purpose and for what purpose

13 Question: Who would create and maintain the list? If the 2-letter code ceases to exist in the iso list? Guess that is easy to track?
14 ISO 3166 part 3 includes the historical data.

15
16 Note: the proposal was made at the time when the discussion around the Applicant Guide Book (second round of new GTLDs)
17 was not clear on whether country and territory names could be used as gTLDs. Following closure there were 2 WGs. A CCWG and
18 SubPro WT5 to provide more clarity on the use of 2-letter codes and the use of country and territory names. The historical need
19 for such a list has gone.

20
21 Question: does applicant or icann staff include entries? What is the relevance of this table?

22 Response: This is a proposal in the original 2013 policy. The list itself has never been created. It was a proposal at the very end of
23 the process. This group is reviewing the 2013 proposals.

24
25 Note: If any changes are made to the ISO list, which triggers the retirement, that is something to record and keep for future
26 reference. But not a table. To discuss later when we come to the selection of idn strings.

27 Response: this is good point. De-selection is already covered for ASCII ccTLDs.

28 Added Staff Note: Again what is purpose of maintaining of list of retired ccTLDs? Currently: in principle once a country code is
29 removed from the ISO3166 list, for example as a result of significant rename of the country, then the original country code may be
30 used again as a ccTLD.

Deleted: d

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
30

Question: If there is a change to the delegated string, someone would complain, if it is an issue. Otherwise no benefit to this list
There is a path for complaints?

Response: not really. If there is a significant name change, which results in a change in the string, the original ASCII cctld will disappear and a new ascii 2-letter code will be assigned by the ISO3166 MA. This would trigger the removal and retire process. The retirement is recorded in the iana reports, which are publicly available. Regarding variants: to be discussed once it is clear what triggers the de-selection. See retirement process: once you define the retirement trigger event, the idn cctld will be removed, together with its variants (staff observation)

Question: concern regarding not understanding line 25. what characteristics?

Response: not sure. Unclear already 10 years ago. But senses this does not withstand the time.

Question: Assuming ISO3166 maintains its own change record. Is there a need to duplicate that effort?

Response: Assumption is correct history is recorded in part 3 of the standard. No point in maintaining the history of what is not authoritative.

Additional point made: just follow the standard, and create a layer on top of that?

Response: this again raises the question about maintenance etc. and purpose

Additional note: part 3 includes all the retired codes. The officially assigned codes, Reserved codes which are not official. Easy to find.

Question: what if a designated language of a territory changes?

Response: not clear. This is part of the de-selection sub-group to discuss and check what the impact is.

Comment: maintain it, if it is useful for reference. So far we do not have an existing mechanism. Easy.

Response: what would be the difference between that list, and the existing iso3166? That one is maintained.

Additional comment: including reference to idn. Not sure iso3166 has that.

Response: risk of duplication. Possibility of confusion among stakeholders. Records should be clean, in one location, and useful to all.

Comment: proposal to create a list is ill-defined. Not clear what it will be used for. List of IDNs exist; delegation are in the iana database.

Deleted: 0

1
2 Concluding comment: revisit this element during the next meeting. This was the 1st meeting. Arguments have been recorded.

3
4 Question: potentially you can create it from the iana list, correct? The proposed list does not have any additional characteristics?

5 Response: probably not.

6
7 **Action item**

8 secretariat to verify what is recorded and what is not. Elements not in ISO3166-list.

9
10
11 **D. Transitional arrangement regarding IDN ccTLD strings under the Fast Track IDN ccTLD Process**

- 12 1. Closure of Fast Track Process. As of the moment ccPDP4 has been fully implemented and is available for
13 processing requested selected IDNccTLD strings, the Fast Track Process must be closed for new selected
14 IDNccTLD string requests.
- 15 2. If at the time the IDNccTLD request process based on ccPDP4 becomes available, IDN ccTLD string
16 requests which are still in the Fast Track Process must be completed through the Fast Track Process.
17 Completion results either in publication of the selected IDNccTLD string in accordance with section 5.6.4
18 of the FIP, or results in the withdrawal of the request by the requestor or in termination of the request by
19 ICANN in accordance with section 5.4 of the Final Implementation Plan².
- 20 3. All IDNccTLD strings that have been validated under the Fast Track Process, will be deemed to be
21 validated under the IDNccTLD policy for the selection of IDNccTLD strings, and are grandfathered. The

² <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf> . From the FIP: "Several of the steps in the Request Submission for String Evaluation (Stage 2) allow for a requester to withdraw a request. It is also possible that ICANN will terminate a request if the request contains certain errors." In addition several circumstances are listed in the FIP, which trigger a termination by ICANN, for example, according to Section 5.6.3 "If the requester has not notified ICANN within three (3) calendar months after the date of notification by ICANN of DNS Stability Panel findings, the Termination Process will be initiated. See section 5.4 "

Deleted: ¶



1 recommendations under this policy development process with respect to the de-selection of IDNccTLD
2 strings shall be applicable to the grandfathered IDNccTLD strings.

3 4. Transitional arrangement with respect to variants will be proposed by the VM sub-group.

5 **WG Comments and Findings**

6 From 17 August meeting: 4 scenarios last time, that should be included. Staff drafted some text around the 4 scenarios. Number 4 is the
7 easiest one. VM sub-group will address this. The other 3 will run through them sequentially .

8
9 Any comments or questions Scenarion1? Closure of the FTP (Fast Track Process)

10 We should rephrase. "this policy shall be the only one available to submit a request." something along those lines.

11 Comment intention is that once the policy is operational and becomes operational, no new strings can be requested through the FTP.
12 Agreement with the idea. But the wording should be clearer.

13
14 Scenario 2 If you look at the Fast Track Implementation Plan (FTIP), there is the administrative clause where there is a natural end of the
15 FTP foreseen.

16
17 Action: pdate the text ahead of the next meeting.

18
19
20 Note that to date over 60 IDN cctld strings that have been delegated as result of the fast track process. Clear that transitional
21 arrangement is needed. This also needs to be updated with a section on the Variant Management. Just a transitional
22 arrangement to ensure that those idn cctlds that have been delegated as a result of the Fast Track Process, are not affected by
23 this policy. In addition, when this policy comes into effect, requests that are pending under the FTP, should run through that
24 process (in case the procedures differ). Empty the FTP channel, and then close it.

25
26 What to do with variants for the existing IDN ccTLDs? To be discussed by VM-sub group.

27
28 Note: this clause as is does not put a time-bound on the applicant. Not clear if the transition can apply for 1 or even 10 years.
29 Applications can take multiple years.

Deleted: as well

Formatted

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2,54 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,27 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

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
30

Response: good point. Perhaps we should leave this to implementation? To be included as an element for further discussion.
Comment: section D will not impact already delegated idn cctld strings, nor the currently pending applications. Include both. New application and cctld string which is already delegated. This sentence needs to be rephrased. "Applications" or "under application". Let's limit the scope.

Bart: section to be revisited. With the following scenarios in mind:

- Scenario 1: Transitional arrangement. Regarding idn cctlds still under FTP
- Scenario 2: idn cctld strings that were granted under FTP, and that have been delegated. Not affected by overall policy. Grandfathered
- Scenario 3: what to do with variants?

Comment: variants delegated under the FTP. not mentioned here
Response: No variants have been delegated under FTP rules

2nd Reading 14 September 2021

Item D.1: agreed, no comments

Item D.2. No comments

Item D 3.

Comment: There are some scenarios which have been raised by the Technical Study Group as well. Overlaps with number 4. Idn cctlds that could potentially be variant tlds, but that have been delegated as synchronous tlds. No discussion happened yet. Grandfathered? Or ? once that discussions happens, flag this to be addressed

Response: Variants not part of FTP, even though there is a link, simply separate idn ccTLDs. Perhaps good to make a note and to revisit this with the full WG.

Comment: Agree, wait for more clarity. Add as a note.

Question, Comment: Do not understand first question, how it could impact number 3.

Response: if synchronous IDNccTLDs are grandfathered as is, then the variant rules, or the recommendation applied on variant TLDs would apply to each of them separately. But if they would be considered variants would be different , if they would be considered variants.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,9 cm, Tab stops: 2,54 cm, List tab + Not at 1,27 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,27 cm

Formatted: Superscript, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

1 Comment: need a policy that distinguishes what was delegated under Fast Track Process, and what is the variant. Confusing.

2 Comment: First VM-subgroup to finish its work

3 Comment: line 13. Selection policy. Process, but not for this selection. Wording should be clearer

4 Deselection is just defining the trigger events. The retirement policy itself has already been approved and is applicable to all ccTLDs, including IDNccTLDs. Once the trigger event has been defined, the de-selection/removal/retirement process applies. This is only the de-selection itself. The recommendations on the de-selection of the string.

5 Comment: de-selection is an action, not a policy. If it is a policy with special wording, it should be capitalised.

6 Response: external event which triggers the application of the retirement policy

7 NOTE: Impact of VM on transitional arrangement will be discussed after the VM sub-group has completed its work.

14 E. Review of policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings

15 It is recommended that the policy will be reviewed within five years after implementation or at such an earlier
16 time warranted by extraordinary circumstances. It is also recommended that the the ccNSO Council initiates such
17 a review by launching a review group who will be tasked to review the ascertain whether the policy needs to be
18 updated and advise the ccNSO Council on the proposed method for such an update. The scope and working
19 method of such a review must be determined by the ccNSO after consulting relevant stakeholders, and take into
20 account the experience with the ccPDP4 process and relevant circumstances and developments with respect to
21 IDN_TLDs

22
23 In the event such a review results in a recommendation to amend the policy, the rules relating to the country code
24 Policy Development Process as defined in the ICANN Bylaws should apply.

26 **WG Findings and comments**

27 **Item 5: review of the policy.**

28 Notion of a review, to be triggered by the ICANN Board, with a review Team which operates with ToR.

29 Question: why 5 years?

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,27 cm, Right: 0 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,27 cm

Deleted: ot

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

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

Response: at the time (2011) it seemed to be logical, but could also be 10 years

Question: If event which triggers the review of the policy. But what if there is no trigger, no complaints?

Response: valid question for the group

Question to group: First, do you agree to include a Review Mechanism? Yes

Regular review? Yes

Terms to be discussed at the next meeting (5 years, or different proposal)

This is done by a WG, which has Terms of Reference (ToR), to be defined under auspices of the ICANN BoD

Broader review, and then a PDP?

Comment: ccNSO itself can make a review and determine whether adjustments are necessary to the policy.

Response: policy would say that ccNSO would need to organise issue report and review.

Comment: ccNSO itself. Preferred option

Note: ccNSO Council and Board can always start a PDP. Regular review, whenever needed. Through mechanism of a PDP. The review itself is the Issue Report. Policy directed at the ccNSO. In the review, interested SO/ACs need to be consulted - if willing.

2nd Reading 14 September 2021

Amended text was adopted.

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.

Comments and Findings

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Superscript, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), English (US)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Bold, Highlight

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

Recommendation directed at ccNSO and ICANN. Ensure that implementation is coordinated between ICANN and ccNSO, and members of the ccPDP4 WG could be consulted when needed.

~~**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~~

~~**Comments and Findings WG**~~

~~Developed in the 2011 era. Since then, significant progress has been made with respect to the link between policy development and implementation. Further developed in GNSO area. ccNSO has gained lot of experience in context of implementation and updates Fast Track process.~~

~~Question: why permanent?~~

~~Response: to ensure that it always exists. Taken into context from 2011.~~

~~Advise to strike this. Rely on the ability to review the process by the ccnsocouncil.~~

~~Comment: no need to have this permanent. Sees a need for an implementation WG that includes original people that created the policy, and that could help with the interpretation.~~

~~Response: This suggestion is captured under F and will be under auspices of the ccNSO Council, that will consult with the community. All decisions subject to membership approval. Captured under F.~~

~~Question: is there something similar?~~

~~Response: no such thing for ccTLDs.~~

~~Members attending 14 September meeting agreed with proposed text (1st reading).~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, English (US)

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1,26 cm

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Highlight

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 unreasonable or unfair for a particular class of cases. [...].	<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 workload and priorities of the ccNSO and other communities</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>	Strike	<p>Comment: need to be understood of adopted review. Any additional need?</p> <p>See how work RZ-LGR and variants was brought to attention of ccNSO (and GNSO) through the ICANN board of directors Need for addiotnal panel?</p>

Deleted:

Deleted: g

Deleted: f

Deleted: \

Deleted: ABB

1
2
3
4
5