

Policy proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Process

Version 02
27 May 2021

Table of contents

0. Overall Principles
1. Criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings
 - 1.1 Minimal Number of non-ASCII characters
 - 1.2 Meaningfulness Criteria and related process and procedures
2. Required SUPPORT for IDNccTLD string
 - 2.1 The selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be non-contentious within the Territory
 - 2.2 Documentation of required endorsement / support/non-objection for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties
3. Variants
4. TECHNICAL & OTHER STRING REQUIREMENTS AND THEIR VALIDATION
 - 4.1.1 Technical Criteria
 - 4.2 TECHNICAL and CONFUSING SIMILARITY Validation Processes and Procedures

Annex A: Transposition table version

Section 0. Overall Principles

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

- I. **Association of the (IDN) country code Top Level Domain with a territory.** For purposes of this policy “Territory” or “Territories” are defined as a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed in Section 3 of the ‘International Standard ISO 3166, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes’ [ISO 3166-1:2020] or, in

some exceptional cases, e.g. grandfathered-in delegations, a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed for an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element.

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

WG Comments and discussion

Comment: Link was defined long back. Under 1 territory several IDNs possible. One single language might be spoken in various territories. Several languages in 1 territory is a common example. We have to discuss this carefully. Comment: Territories? No reference to countries? Reference to verb “select” Comment: criteria section clarification on role of languages.

Action: Define what is meant by “territory”. Include definition in terminology doc
Revisit in future the verb. Friendly amendment Jaap is included

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

WG Comments and Discussion

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

Question: include a reference to outcome of the GAC WG Geographic Names? The GAC Geographic Names WG focused on use of geographic names as gTLDs, and use of geographic terms as Second Level Domains. This policy focuses on ccTLDs which by definition are Geographic Names (see definition). The use of geographic names as second level domains under ccTLDs is a local matter and outside the policy remit of the ccNSO.

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

- III. Preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS.** To the extent different and/or additional rules are implemented for IDN ccTLDs, these rules should:
- a. Preserve and ensure the security and stability of the DNS;
 - b. Ensure adherence with the RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892, RFC 5893
 - c. Take into account and be guided by the Principles for Unicode Code Point Inclusion in Labels in the DNS Root (RFC 6912).

WG Comments and Discussions

Is this list complete? Should other references be included in this principle, bearing in mind the purpose of this section?

As reminder from introduction to section 2.1.1:

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

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

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

The doc ref'd in line 5 is RFC 6912.

Should we look into including RFC5894 and RFC5895?

2 additional informational RFC's. Additional work on RZ-LGR was done in the meanwhile. Variants of TLDs. it also identifies if a TLD is technically valid, based on the criteria used to develop the technical doc or the LGR for the RZ IDN Guidelines: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en> [icann.org]

Current applicable version is 3.0 Root Zone Label Generation

Rules: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en> [icann.org]

The IDNA protocol is defined in RFCs 5890-93; in addition there are informational RFCs 5894-95 (implementation guidelines of sorts)

Refer in section 2.1.1 to basic documents that inform policy and provide basis for interpretation of policy Using implementation work in the principle document does not make sense

Reference to IDN Guidelines to be discussed further

For reference of future discussion a relevant excerpt from the FIP version March 2019 (current version) is included

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

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

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

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

The IDN ccTLD requesters are encouraged to:

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

Section 5.1.1 (Preparation Stage), page 19

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

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

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

WG Comments

Added the words “CAN BE”

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

WG Comments

Comment: 15 scripts, 23 languages in India. Thankful to community and icann to support us. Not only languages and scripts. 100s of dialects under a language. Internet communication: best via own language/dialect/script. No restrictions in number of IDN ccTLDs. ICANN to review the number of IDN ccTLDs regularly. To be discussed with the territory if IDN ccTLDs are not being used.

Response: Part of the discussion around the de-selection of IDN ccTLDs. To be addressed by one of the sub-WGs

Section 1. Criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings

1.1 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 Set² .

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."

~~1.2 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.~~

WG discussion

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

1.2. Meaningfulness Criteria and related process and procedures

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

² <https://www.iso.org/standard/4777.html>

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

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

WG Comments and discussions

Strike the footnote. Reference included in Terminology document
CH, as specific example was discussed as exception to the principle of visual association of the name of the Territory and the code element. Note that the WG does not go into the merits of the ISO3166/MA decisions.

1.2.2 A Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territory MUST be in a Designated Language of the Territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string should be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of the territory in a **Designated Language** of that **Territory**. For this purpose, a **Designated Language**³ is defined as: a language that has a legal status in the **Territory** or that serves as a language of administration⁴.

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

- a) 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

³ 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

⁴ 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.

Experts on Geographical Names (the UNGEGN Manual)
(<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm>).

- b) The language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** as defined in section 3.7 of ISO 3166-1 standard [2020].
- c) The relevant public authority in the **Territory** confirms that the language is used in official communications of the relevant public authority and serves as a language of administration.

Specific requirements regarding documentation of **Designated Languages** are included in the procedures and documentation sections (*see below section 2.7*).

WG Comments and discussion

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

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

What to do with the scripts of different languages that are similar? Arabic, Urdu. to be addressed in our discussions? Note that this was discussed when the Fast Track process was designed (2007-2008). At that time people agreed that ultimately it is up to the 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 ccTLDs: what is happening in the country, determines the outcome of the process. See section 4.1 below: In 2007-2008 this principle is reflected in the required documentation etc. and was considered paramount with respect to selecting the representation of the name of a country.

Unicode also lists scripts it encode

here: <https://www.unicode.org/Public/13.0.0/ucd/Scripts.txt> [unicode.org]

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

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

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

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 revisited to avoid misunderstandings. Tone of words used in version 05 line 16 -17 above, 19 and 20 and notes and comments not consistent.

Discussion around if a language is expressed in more than one script in a Territory, then permissible 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 Latin 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?

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

1.2.4 If the selected string is not the long or short form of the name of a Territory then evidence of meaningfulness is required. If the selected IDNccTLD string is the long or short form of the name of the relevant **Territory** in the **Designated Language**, and is listed in the UNGEGN Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographic Names,

Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007⁵, or a later version of that list, it is considered to be a **Meaningful Representation**.

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

1. The selected IDNccTLD string is not the long or short form name of the **Territory** as included in the UNGEGN Manual in the **Designated Language**,
or
2. The selected IDNccTLD string is an acronym of the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated Language**
or
3. The selected IDNccTLD string is the name of a **Territory** that does not appear in the UNGEGN Manual,
or
4. The selected IDNccTLD string is in a **Designated Language** that is not included in the UNGEGN Manual.

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 2.5 and 2.7 below).

1.2.5 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:

⁵https://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. 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 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

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 appointed expert.

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 principle the decision was made in **Territory**, and with the support of a government.

It should be a and b. Not only c. then you have a capture issue as well.

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.

Note that section c has been replace by adjusted text to make it clearer this is exceptional.

From the 6 April meeting.

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

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

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 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 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 ccNSO who that Naming Authority is and that fact remains stable until officially changed again after a similar process?

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

1.2.6 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 selected strings are conducted by an ICANN function, not by PTI (IFO or IANA). IANA processes become relevant after the string selection process has been completed and the IDNccTLD will be delegated, transferred, revoked or retired, according to the existing policies, or as under development under ccPDP3)

1.2.7 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?

Response: No. big difference with 2003. Algorithm to look at attributes of the unicode characters. No single table. Changes all the time.

Suggestion: Wait for the VM sub group. The overarching question: What is the sole source to validate TLD tables? Candidate is the RZ-LGR. 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 need to revise this small section later

Response this could be put in parking lot. But the issue we wanted to address is whether we should use a designated script.

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 characters. Would your suggestion address this concern?

Response: ok. Delete "which is processed for IDNA2008"

Note: danger. It has been processed by IDNA2008 algorithm. You want to go through this review before you do the RZ-LGR. These are candidates. There might be other rules that need to be applied too. It kind of limits, but not completely.

Note: Unicode is a necessary but not sufficient condition. Scripts processed by IETF. if RZ-LGR is adopted as the condition to move forward, then either the Maximal Starting Point or RZ-LGR would be the relevant reference points.

Remark: a script is only eligible if it appears in the latest version of unicode that has been processed.

Note: this is not about characters. This is to address “if an application comes in with a designated language to refer to a script”.

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 express a Designated Language. The requirement with respect to IDNA 2008 etc. are dealt with in another section of the document (section5) relevancy of RZ-LGR in this context is dealt with by the Sub-Group VM.

1.2.8 Notes and Comments

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

WG Discussion and Comments on inclusion additional criteria Designated Script

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

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

Observations. IDNccTLDs strings are in scripts/ writing system and character. In principle without meaning, hence script should be focus area and designate which one could be used. Some languages are written in two or more scripts, examples are listed in for instance the Ethnologue, which is maintained by SIL (also organization that maintained ISO639-3 (<https://www.ethnologue.com/language/ywa>)). To process designate the script or should all scripts be allowed?

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

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

WG discussions

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

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 manageable. According to 639-3 standard: 7000+ languages listed. Potentially 1.5 million TLDs.

Designated = official language, external definition. UNEG.

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

Connect the 2 terms (script/language). Should solve the issue, and question raised about recognised by ICANN. Documentation should include language and script and reference. Potentially include "if there is more than 1 script, reference to the script. ISO15 something, or other existing standard where the script is mentioned."

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 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 scripts in the unicode? Not every language is written in every script. See example Wolof (senegal). Not implied script, to have Wolof for instance in Chinese Current language does not imply that restriction. Do we want to make script relevant to the language? Or arbitrary choice. There are implications. If icann receives a string for a particular country, supported by the government, it should be processed. Fast track demonstrated that this approach works. We take the same approach here, with some small refinements

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

Section 2 Required SUPPORT for IDNccTLD string

2.1 The selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be non-contentious within the Territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string must be non-contentious within the **Territory**. The non-contentiousness is evidenced by a statement of support/endorsement/non-objection by the **Significantly Interested Parties**⁶ in the **Territory**.

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

WG Comment and discussion

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

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

⁶ The concept Significantly Intersted 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 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 transfers

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

This is about how two or more IDN ccTLD string in the same Designated Language/script combination for the one Territory are requested. Logically, this could be extended to the situation that this may also occur for two IDNccTLD strings from two different Territories. However taken into account both strings MUST be a Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territories, concurrent request from from two different Territories is very unlikely.

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

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

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

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

Response: "territories" in this policy has a very specific, defined meaning, which is directly related to the iso3166 standard. The examples are given are not included and related to the list. What is meant with "disputed"? If a country would vanish or change its 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 not eligible.

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

Observation: possible contention at the horizon. Going back to FOI. when the SIP were adopted as the concept, how their collective wisdom was captured as consensus or non objection. Include reference to FOI.

From discussion 20 April 4.1.

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

Line 5-11 has been amended to reflect the timing of the concurrent request. Reference to significantly interested parties (SIP) in the footnote from the framework of interpretation (FOI) Michael" shouldn't "... for selecting and IDN ccTLD string ..." be "... for selecting an IDN ccTLD string ..."

typo: received => received

Resolve must / should. Mixture of language.

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 this internally. Is it ok to inform the others about the other request?

Response: within the territory SIP includes the government. You do not want a fight between 2 governmental agencies. All parties should be informed of concurrent requests.

Note that once the conflict is resolved, 1 will withdraw and the other application moves forward.

Question: what happens if variants will be enabled in future. Is it clear enough?

Response: all should be revisited once the recommendations by the sub-groups are ready.

2.2 Documentation of required endorsement / support/non-objection for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties

2.2.1 Definition of Significantly Interested Parties. Significantly Interested Parties include but are not limited to:

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

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

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

2.2.2 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.

2.2.3 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

Section 3 Variants PLACEHOLDER

Note that the criteria and process and procedures shall be prepared by the sub-group Variant Management

Section 4 TECHNICAL & OTHER STRING REQUIREMENTS AND THEIR VALIDATION

4.1.1 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.

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

WG Comments and discussion

Comment: after RZ-LGR is considered and agreed, it needs to be added to the technical criteria. DNS Stability Panel (DSP). To be revisited next week.

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

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

To be revisited. The more you add to the policy, the less timeless it will become. Things might evolve.

To be taken into account. Question: what does independent review mean?

Response: recommendation is having a technical panel or a similarity review panel. One and the same panel at the moment. It is up to We leave it up to icann for cost-saving following the regular procedure.

page 25. Line 1. Change to "any".

It has to meet "all" criteria. That is the idea? I agree. "all" should be "any" in line 2

Suggestion: fails to meet any

Q: Will applicant informed about non compliance?

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

4.1.2 Confusing Similarity (From section 2.1.2) (to be reviewed by 3rd Sub-Group) Note that the criteria and process and procedures of this section shall be reviewed and updated by one of the sub-groups

4.2 TECHNICAL and CONFUSING SIMILARITY Validation Processes and Procedures

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

4.2.1 General description of Technical and string confusion review

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

- To validate the technical requirements ICANN should appoint a “Technical Panel” to conduct a technical review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.
- {PLACEHOLDER: To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent Panel(s)}

4.2.2 Process for Technical Validation

1. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request (see below section) , 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

⁷ Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

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.

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