ISSUE REPORT
country code Policy Development Process 4
on the development of policy recommendations
for the (de-)selection of IDN ccTLD strings

14 May 2020
Bart Boswinkel
Issue Manager ccPDP4

Table of Content

1. Background and Introduction

1.1 Background

In September 2013 the ccNSO submitted the IDN country code policy development process (ccPDP2) Board Report to the ICANN Board of Directors. The recommended policy ccPDP2 contains two parts:

- Proposals (at a high level) for the criteria and requirements for the IDN ccTLD string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures.
- Proposals to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

By mutual understanding, the ccNSO Council and the ICANN Board allowed the Fast Track Process to evolve, to test and gain experience with the policy aspects pertaining to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process. The aim was to further inform the overall policy, specifically with results of the different reviews of the Fast Track process[1]. The latest step in the evolution of the Fast Track Process was the introduction of the community developed Guideline with regard to the Risk Mitigation Panel and related process.

In March 2019 the ccNSO Council tasked a team (Preliminary Review Team or PRT) to review ccPDP2 in light of the impact of the following related processes on the recommended policies:

- The evolved Fast Track Process,
- The request of the ICANN Board of Directors with respect to IDN Variants and
- Other relevant developments such as retirement of the (IDN) ccTLDs
- The short term need to allow IDN ccTLD Managers to become members of the ccNSO.

The PRT was requested to advise the Council on whether or not to launch an additional Policy Development Process to address open issues, if any, or take other steps.

Based on its high-level analysis, the PRT identified various issues with the recommended policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and advised Council to launch a ccNSO Policy Development Process (ccPDP4) to address the various issues it had identified, including the de-selection of IDN ccTLD strings. With respect to the recommendations in ccPDP2 pertaining to the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs, the PRT did not identify any issues and therefore advised the ccNSO Council to request a change of Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws and Annex B. The Final Report of the PRT is included as part of ANNEX A of this Issue Report.

At its meeting on 22 August 2019, the ccNSO Council adopted the recommendations of the PRT. To implement these recommendations, the ccNSO Council requested the ICANN Board of Directors to agree to take no additional steps with respect to ccPDP2 and to stop the evolution of the Fast Track Process[2]. In October 2019, the ICANN Board confirmed and agreed with this approach[3].

Since March 2019, and following the initial discussions of the ccNSO Council, input and feedback was sought from the community at the Kobe (ICANN64), Marrakesh (ICANN65) and Montreal (ICANN66) meetings. The community present at these meetings concurred with the view that (IDN) ccPDP4, should be launched and focus should be limited to the Items identified by the ccNSO Preliminary Review Team, namely on the (de-)selection of IDN ccTLD strings and management of variants of

[1] See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-cctld-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf, general introduction page 4.

[2] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-04sep19-en.pdf.

[3] https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-sataki-31oct19-en.pdf

selected IDN ccTLD strings. The community also concurred and re-confirmed the ccPDP2 recommendations to amend Article 10 and Annex B to allow the inclusion of IDN ccTLD Managers in the ccNSO on equal footing.

At its December 2019 meeting, and in accordance with Annex B section 1 of the ICANN Bylaws, the ccNSO Council appointed the Issue Manager and requested an Issue Report, which should address the following topics:

1. Whether or not the ccNSO should initiate the ccNSO Policy Development Process on the (de)selection of IDN ccTLD strings (ccPDP4) and other areas listed in the Final Report of the Preliminary Review Team and, with respect to the de-selection be guided by and build-upon the process for the retirement of ccTLDs.
2. Whether or not to convene a taskforce or use other method to address these issues.

In addition, if the conclusion of the Issue Report is to initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process, the ccNSO Council requests that the Issue Report include a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP outlined in Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws (PDP Time Line).

1.2 Introduction

The ICANN Bylaws (Annex B) require the Issue Manager to recommend to the ccNSO Council whether or not to initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process. To determine whether or not to initiate such a Policy Development Process, the following elements need to be considered:

1. The Issue identified and its scope (section 2.1)
2. Whether the Threshold criteria are met (section 2.2):
    - The proposed issue raised for consideration;
    - The identity of the party submitting the issue;
    - How that party is affected by the issue;
    - Support for the issue to initiate the PDP.
3. Opinion of ICANN's General Counsel (section 2.3). According to Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws it is required that the Issue Report shall include an opinion of ICANN's General Counsel as to whether the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO. In coming to this opinion, the General Counsel shall examine whether or not the identified PDP Issue:
    - is within the scope of ICANN's Mission;
    - is within the scope of the ccNSO;
    - implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy; and
    - is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making. (See section 2.4. below).

In section 2.5, the recommendation of the Issue Manager is included to initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process to address the issues identified by the PRT. For avoidance of doubt, as part of the recommendations, the question whether Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws applies to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes is again included. This question and response were part of the Issue Manager's Final Report in 2009[4] and adopted by the ccNSO Council[5] .

[4] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_10985/final-issues-report-idn-ccpdp-02apr09.pdf
[5] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_10976/resolutions-initiation-idn-ccpdp-07apr09.pdf

The required assessment whether the ICANN Board of Directors will adopt the proposed policy recommendations (Annex B section 3 ICANN Bylaws) is included in section 3.

The relevant background material and reference material is listed in section 5. The required Tentative Timeline for the ccPDP is set out in section 6, based on the methodology proposed in section 4 (the ccNSO Council is advised to convene a Working Group).

Finally, this report includes two (2) Annexes: Annex A maps the findings of the PRT to the proposed policy (as documented in the Board Report) and Annex B is the proposed Charter for the ccPDP4 WG.

2. Should Council Initiate ccNSO Policy Development Process 4?

2.1 Summary of the issues raised in the PRT Final Report

This section contains a summary of the main topics to be addressed as suggested by the PRT in its Final Report as adopted by the ccNSO Council. The detailed results of the PRT are mapped against section 2 the Board Report IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process[6], which contains the recommended policies on the IDN ccTLD String Selection Criteria, requirements and Processes (section 2.1) and Policy Proposals on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO (section 2.2). This overview is included as Annex A. Note that for reference and to provide context, section 1 of the Board Report is included. Further, note that - per advice of the PRT - section 2.2 and as resolved by the ccNSO Council section 2.2 of the Board Report are not part of the proposed ccPDP4. Finally, note that the PRT also stressed the need to:

1. Include "variant management" as was also requested by the ICANN Board of Directors, and
2. Define the events which would cause the retirement policy as developed under the ccNSO Policy Development Process pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs (ccPDP3 part 1) to become effective.

2.2 PDP Initiation Threshold Criteria

The proposed issues raised for consideration

The issues raised for consideration are set out in the Final Report of the ccNSO PRT. The PRT identified various issues with respect to the recommended policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings (ccPDP2) and advised Council to launch a ccNSO Policy Development Process (ccPDP4) to address the various issues it has identified, including the de-selection of IDN ccTLD strings (see section 2.2 below and Annex A, which include the overview of the issues related to the original policy proposals).

The identity of the party submitting the issues

In April 2019 the ccNSO Council adopted the Terms of Reference of the Preliminary Review Team and its membership. Purpose of the PRT was to identify and advise Council on:

- The need for additional guidance on the proposed Bylaw changes included in the ccNSO Recommendation to resolve policy issues pertaining to the selection of IDN country code Top Level Domains strings (IDN ccTLD strings) and the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO (ccPDP2),

[6] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_41859/idn-ccpdp-board-26sep13-en.pdf

- If so, delineate the scope and propose a mechanism to review and - when considered necessary - update the 2013 Policy Recommendations with respect to the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, taking into account the evolution of the Fast track Process, and other areas pertaining to the introduction and following introduction of IDN ccTLDs strings which require a recommended policy, for example variant management and retirement of IDN ccTLDs.

After a high-level review and consultation of the community, the PRT advised the ccNSO Council to:

1. Launch a new ccNSO PDP in accordance with Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws to address the limited set of issues identified by the PRT (see Table 1 – 3 and 5 and 6 of the PRT report). In some areas a more detailed approach is proposed (confusing similarity review and variant management) to ensure a possible mechanism to optimise and streamline the efforts to harmonize the development processes, procedures and/or criteria pertaining to the selection of IDN (cc)TLD strings.
2. After consulting the ccTLD community, propose to the ICANN Board of Directors to amend Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO as foreseen in 2013. The RT notes that the proposed ccNSO membership definition should be reviewed and updated to also address the issue identified by the ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group and the ccNSO Council.

How that party is affected by the issue

The PRT noted that ccTLD Managers, and their respective Significantly Interested Parties[7] including but not limited to governments, are affected because the introduction of IDN ccTLDs will fundamentally change the way in which users in their territory are able to use the DNS to navigate the internet.

Support for the issue to initiate the PDP

There is significant support in the ccTLD community (especially amongst those that do not use Latin script) for policy to be developed in respect to the delegation of IDN ccTLDs. This policy is intended to replace the Fast Track Process, which was developed in the first half year of 2008 and became effective in 2009, and was developed by the broader community assuming that it would be replaced by a formal policy developed following the formal process of the ccNSO PDP[8]

2. 3 Opinion ICANN's General Counsel

ICANN Bylaws Annex B, Section 2 specifies that every ccNSO Issue Report shall include "an opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO."
<http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#AnnexB>

The opinion of the ICANN General Counsel is that the development of policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs is within the scope of the ccNSO and the ICANN policy process.

[7] See Framework of Interpretation section 5 (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_46435/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf) .

[8] See Resolution of the ICANN Board of Directors November 2007 on International Domain Names (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2007-11-02-en#_Toc55609363).

In reaching the determination on the question of scope, the ICANN Bylaws specify that the following considerations should be examined:

1) whether the issue is within the scope of ICANN's Mission;
2) whether analysis of the relevant factors according to Article 10, Section 6(b) and Annex C affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope of the ccNSO;
3) whether the PDP implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy;
4) whether the issue is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making.

These considerations support the appropriateness of policy development on IDN ccTLDs being conducted within the framework of the ccNSO PDP. The selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs is within ICANN's mission to coordinate at the overall level the Internet's domain name system, which includes coordinating the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the DNS.

Additionally, the issue proposed for policy development is within the scope of the policy areas identified in Bylaws, Annex C, which states that "The ccNSO's policy role should be based on an analysis of the following functional model of the DNS: (1) Data is registered/maintained to generate a zone file, (2) A zone file is in turn used in TLD name servers. The proposed PDP falls into the data entry function at the root level. Annex C identifies the ccNSO PDP in the "policy role" for such data entry function at the root zone level <http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#AnnexC>.

The selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs does implicate existing ICANN policy, and policy on the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs is likely to have lasting value and applicability as it will help provide a framework for future decision-making on such matters.

2.4 Recommendations of Issue Manager

According to the Bylaws (Annex B section 2.e), the Issue Manager is required to make a Recommendation as to whether the Council should move to initiate the PDP to address the issues that have been raised.

As part of the request of the Issue report, the ccNSO Council asked the Issue Manager:

1. Whether or not the ccNSO should initiate the ccNSO Policy Development Process on the (de)selection of IDN ccTLD strings (ccPDP4) and other areas listed in the Final Report of the Preliminary Review Team and, with respect to the de-selection be guided by and build-upon the process for the retirement of ccTLDs.
2. Whether or not to convene a taskforce or use other method to address these issues.

Applicability of Article 10 to IDN ccTLDs

Under the Bylaws (Article 10 Section 4.1) and for the purposes of Article 10, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain[9] .

[9] Section 10.4 (a), final part: "*For purposes of this Article 10, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain, or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.*"
Note that the definition was changed as part of the Bylaw change per 1 October 2016. The ccPDP3 Retirement WG noted that the definition has become vaguer and the change process was not really clear.

All of the work undertaken to date to create and evolve the Fast Track Process and the ccPDP2 by the ccNSO, the GAC and others, and all references to IDN ccTLDs by the ICANN Board, have referred specifically to IDN ccTLDs being ccTLDs. To date IDN ccTLDs are delegated to entities or organisations that are referred to in the IANA Rootzone database under the heading of "ccTLD Managers" and, hence, IDN ccTLDs and IDN ccTLD Managers fall under the policy overview of the ccNSO as defined in Article 10 and ANNEX B And C of the ICANN Bylaws.

As advised by the PRT - following the Recommendation under ccPDP2 – the ccNSO Council has requested the Board a change of the ICANN Bylaws to clearly define the term member of the ccNSO to ensure the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO.[10]

Should the ccNSO Council initiate the IDN ccPDP to develop policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs?

Based on a review of the issues raised in the PRT Final Report, considering that the Threshold Criteria are met, and taking into account General Counsel's opinion, the Issue Manager recommends that the ccNSO Council initiates ccNSO Policy Development Process 4 to develop policy for the (de-)selection and delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of IDN ccTLDs.

3. Uncertainty of ICANN Board adoption of proposed recommended policy

According to Bylaws Annex B section 2.g) the Issue Manager is required to advise as to whether the ccPDP is likely to result in a policy that will be approved by the ICANN Board. To date, no substantive discussions on these issues have taken place. However, the Board has indicated at various instances that the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process should be replaced by a policy developed through the ccNSO Policy Development Process. At this stage in the process it is uncertain if and to what extent the ICANN Board is likely to approve i.e. adopt the outcomes of the ccPDP4.

4. Methodology

4.1 Task force or other method?

The Bylaws allow the ccNSO Council to appoint a task force or, alternatively, use another method to address the issues identified. The Task Force is described in Annex B and tasked to gather information, documenting the positions of the various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, and to facilitate meaningful and informed deliberation by the Council on the issue(s).

To convene a Task Force, the Council must:

i. Identify Task Force members (including the required participation of two Representatives of the Regional Organizations and formally request the GAC participation);
ii. Develop a charter or terms of reference that must specify:
    a. The issues to be addressed by the Task Force;
    b. The time line to be followed by the Task Force;
    c. Any specific instructions for the Task Force, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.

[10] https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/sataki-to-botterman-07feb20-en.pdf

Alternatively, in the event the ccNSO Council does not convene a Task Force:

i. Each Regional Organization must, within the time designated in the PDP Time Line, appoint a representative to solicit the Region's view on the issue;
ii. The Council must formally request the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice; and
iii. The Council may take other steps to assist in the PDP, for example, appointing particular individual(s), to gather information and to assist the Issue Manager.

Given the issue(s) to be resolved and the cross cutting interests involved, and taking into account the experiences gained with Working Groups and in cross SO/AC cooperation, the Issue Manager has concluded that any potential benefits of appointing a Task Force are not outweighed by its inherent limitations, and advises the ccNSO Council not to appoint a Task Force, but, instead, to appoint one (1) working group with its own charter, working method and schedule.

It is further advised that under this specific ccPDP, two(2) sub-groups should be formed to develop recommendations with respect to the review of strings on confusing similarity (sub-group 1) and pertaining to variant management (sub-group 2). The Issue Manager has noted the need to coordinate the policy development efforts in these two areas with the GNSO and allow for a light weight coordination, not overburdening the full working group.

4.2 Working group and its charter

The purpose of the working group is to propose and report on a feasible policy for the (de)selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs, based on the recommendations from ccPDP2 and review these recommendations and amend, delete or add recommendations to address the issues identified by the PRT in its final report. The working group should also take into account the Fast Track Implementation Plan and related documents, and the work that has been done with respect to IDN TLD Variants and Root Zone-Label Generation Rule (RZ-LGR) that is relevant with respect to IDN ccTLDs. The Council should invite the ALAC, GAC, and GNSO to participate in and appoint participants to this Working Group. The SSAC and technical community should also be invited to participate in the working group. The Issue Manager further recommends that an expert on standardization and relevant ICANN staff members are invited. The draft charter for the Working Group is included as Annex B.

If the WG is established, it is strongly advised to create at least two sub-groups: one focusing on the review of the confusing similarity evaluation and the 2nd on the development of recommendations for the Management of Variant IDN ccTLD. Creating sub-groups would allow a more focused approached and lightweight coordination of the efforts under ccPDP4 with the GNSO efforts in these areas.

Members, participants, experts and observers of the working group may - in addition to participating in the working group itself - participate in one or both of the two sub-groups identified. In addition, members, participants, experts and/or observers may select to participate in one or both sub-groups only, in which case the rules for membership should apply for such limited membership of the WG to the extent reasonable.

5. Background Material and references

In preparing the Issue Report, proposing the timeline for conducting each stage of ccPDP4 and as reference for the ccPD4 WG, if appointed, the Issue Manager has taken into consideration and was guided by the following documents:

- RFC 1591 (https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt)

- ISO 3166 standard (http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes)
- The ccNSO Framework of Interpretation working group Final Report, (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf)
- The Fast Track Implementation Plan and related documents, latest version (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/fast-track-2012-02-25-en)
- The draft policy for the selection IDN ccTLD strings (September 2013) (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-26sep13-en.htm)
- The Final Report of the IDN policy preliminary review team (June 2019) (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/final-report-idn-prt-29jul19-en.pdf)
- The Board resolution on IDN (cc)TLD Variants (14 March 2019) (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-03-14-en#2.a) requesting the ccNSO to work on Variant Management and related relevant material (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en)
- Relevant resolutions of the ICANN Board of Directors as documented in the report
- Relevant correspondence between the ccNSO and ICANN Board of Directors.

6. Structure of ccNSO PDP and tentative minimum timeline

6.1 Structure of the ccNSO Policy Development Process

At a high level and based on the description of the ccNSO Policy development Process in Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws, 8 phases should be distinguished. However, the last three phases (see below table Basic Schedule Phase 6, 7 and 8) - as of the Board vote up until implementation - are beyond the control of the ccNSO. The first four are:

A. **Initiation of ccPDP.** According to the ICANN Bylaws Annex B, section 3, the Council will need to vote on whether to initiate the PDP on the issues as defined. The basic document or this phase is the Issue Report.
B. **Comments Issue Report.** If the Council decides to initiate the ccPDP, the first step is to seek comments on the issue(s) as defined in the Issue Report. Comments will then be compiled by the Issue Manager and, together with the Issue Report, used as starting point for developing the recommendations.
C. **Preparing Recommendations.** Within the scope defined in the Issue Report and taking into account the comments received, community members will develop the recommended policy in the manner as determined by the ccNSO Council (through a Task force or in another way). The recommendations will be included in the Initial Report that will be open for public comments. These comments will be reviewed and the appropriate comments, to be determined by the Issue Manager, will be added to the Initial report, to create the Final report.
D. **Decision making on Recommendations by ccNSO.** Based on the Final Report the Council shall work towards achieving recommendations to be submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors for adoption. The process would require support of the recommended policy by a supermajority (66% or more) of the members of the ccNSO who at the end of the process lodge a vote.

6.2 Basic Schedule and Tentative Timeline

Assuming the ccNSO PDP4 will be structured as proposed in this Issue Report, the tentative minimal timeline for these phases is listed below. This timeline is based on experience to date with the previous

ccNSO PDPs and working groups like the ccNSO Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOI WG) and Delegation and Redelegation WG (DRD WG).

Assuming the scope of this ccNSO PDP is focused, i.e. has a relatively limited scope, the ccPDP will take at a minimum 20 months. However, the actual duration will be determined by the duration of the effective active discussion/work period. For purposes of this timeline it is estimated that the WG will take 6 months to deliver its Initial Recommendations and 2 months for community members to comment (minimum of 2 public consultations). Experience has shown that actively discussing an issue at WG level from start to finish in 6 months is optimistic.

Basic Schedule

Phase	**Description**	**Expected starting date and minimal duration if applicable.**	**Cumulative Timeline**
Phase 1: Initiation of ccPDP	Decision of Council to initiate PDP and launch Phase 2 by call for volunteers	May 2020	May – mid-July 2020
Phase 2: Comments on Issue PDP	Publish Issue report, call for volunteers, inform SO/ACs etc.	May 2020 Minimum 2 months	May- July 2020
Phase 3: Preparing Recommendations	Preparing Initial and Final proposals by WG, including at a minimum one (1) Public Comment on combined output	Minimal duration 12 months: - WG preparation, Initial Report 6 Months - Public comment 2 months - Draft Final Report 2 Months - Public comments 2 months	July 2020 – July 2021
Phase 4: decision making (Council and Members).	Decision making procedures and requirements as prescribed for the Council and Members	Expected duration: at a minimum 2 months, maximum 4 months. Start post ccNSO members meeting	August 2021-December 2021
Phase 5: Submission Board report	Issue manager and Council to prepare Board report	0.5 Month	January 2022
Phase 6: Board vote			
Phase 7: Supplemental Recommendation			
Phase 8: Implementation			

The Issue Manager recommends that public consultation periods and requests for input, including the intermediate results of the working group, should be sought as much as feasible in conjunction with physical face–to–face meetings.

Accordingly, the tentative timeline to conduct the ccPDP4 is the following:

Step	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
1	**Draft Issue Report**		Issue Manager	May 2020	To be presented to the ccNSO Council prior to ICANN68
2	**Formal Initiation of ccPDP 4**		ccNSO Council	May 2020	ccNSO Council vote
3		**Public notification of Initiation of IDN ccPDP**	Issue Manager	May – August 2020	Notification of initiation of the ccPDP4 to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Open comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line) and at a minimum 40 days.
4		**Notification of and appointment by Regional Organisations of a representative**	Issue Manager	June 2020	Each representative of a Regional Organisation shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager as part of and within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.
5		**Formal request to Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice**	ccNSO Council	June 2020	
6		**Formation of Working Group under ccPDP**	ccNSO Council	June- July 2020	As part of the ccPDP4, create a Working Group will be established
8		**Interim Papers**	ccPDP4 WG	February 2021	Various papers (sub) WG to be concluded at ICANN70 to be initially presented at ccNSO meeting & other stakeholders
10	**Initial Report**		ccPDP4 WG	April 2021	Combined version of Interim papers. Public

Step	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
					comment period of at least 40 days
11	**Draft Final Report**		ccPD4 WG & Issue Manager	June 2021	Publication Final Report of containing the recommendations to resolve issues as identified in Issues report, public comment of 40 days
17	**Adoption Process**				Adoption process ccNSO, including ccNSO membership vote.
		Adoption Final Report by WG	Issue Manager	July 2021	Ensure the Final Report reflects consensus of the WG on recommended policy
18		**Submission of Final Report to the ccNSO Council**	Issue Manager	August 2021	Preferably in time for ICANN's community forum FY 21
19		**Invite the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice**	ccNSO Council	August 2021	Preferably in time for ICANN's community forum FY 21
20		**ccNSO Council Adoption of Final Report**	ccNSO Council	September 2021	After GAC has had opportunity to Advise or share its opinion.
21		**First round ccNSO members vote**	ccNSO Members	To be completed post AGM 2021	Note: the first round of members vote is subject to quorum rule (at least 50 %) of the members need to have cast a vote.
		Council decision to adopt Board Report	ccNSO Council	December 2021	Board report needs to include the results of members vote.
22	**Submission Board report**	**Board Report**	ccNSO Council	January 2022	

ANNEX A: Mapping of PRT Findings against Board Report

Introduction

According to its Terms of Reference (see: Annex A of the Final Report of the ccNSO IDN PRT), the Preliminary Review Team (hereafter: PRT) was tasked to identify potential issues with respect to the two parts of the ccNSO Overall IDN ccTLD recommended policy:

- Proposals (at a high level) for the criteria and requirements for the IDN ccTLD string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures.
- Proposals to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO.

Specifically, the review team had to identify issues and advise Council on:

- Whether additional policy work needs to be done on the Bylaw changes to enable inclusion of IDN ccTLD Managers as members of the ccNSO;
- Delineate the scope and mechanism to conduct the review and - when considered necessary - update the 2013 Policy Recommendations, taking into account evolution of the Fast track Process, and other areas pertaining to the introduction and following introduction of IDN ccTLDs strings, which require a recommended policy, for example variant management and retirement of IDN ccTLDs.
- Advise on possible mechanisms to cooperate and/or coordinate efforts to harmonize the development processes, procedures and/or criteria pertaining to the selection of IDN (cc)TLD strings, specifically with respect to variance management and confusing similarity review of requested strings.

As required the PRT conducted an analysis of the proposed overall IDN ccTLD policy by comparing the proposed policy with current state of affairs under the Fast Track Process and also looking at other developments. The findings were reported per main section of the proposed overall policy (**Table 1-5** below), by:

1. **Section in Document.** Reference to the specific section in the 2013 Board Report (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_41859/idn-ccpdp-board-26sep13-en.pdf),
2. **Topic.** Description of the topic as included in that Board Report,
3. **Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list**. The PRT comment and/or rationale for review and inclusion in the topics in the list, and
4. **Proposed next step.** The PRT advise to the Council on how to proceed to resolve the issues identified by the RT.

Mapping the Board Report and PRT Findings
The text of the Board report is presented in 10 points font.

Board report section 1. Background and Introduction
In 2007 the ccNSO membership, other ccTLD managers and ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) identified a number of policy questions, which were submitted to the ICANN Board

of Directors[11]. It was clear that the development of the required policy for IDN ccTLDs to resolve the identified issues was likely to take at least 2 years. Also, it was clear that such a time frame was a major concern for countries and territories that had expressed a pressing need for an IDN ccTLD. As a result, the concept of a fast track approach emerged. In those discussions it was thought that it might be possible to find a method to allow the introduction of a limited number of IDN ccTLDs while the overall policy was being developed.

At its meeting on 2 October 2007[12] the ccNSO Council requested an Issue Report to establish whether the ccNSO should launch a policy development process for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLD strings. In parallel to the launch of the IDN ccPDP, the ccNSO Council, together with other ICANN supporting organizations and Advisory Committees, advised the ICANN Board to set-up an Internationalized Domain Name Working Group to develop a methodology for the introduction of a limited number of IDN ccTLDs. This resulted in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process, which was launched on 16 November 2009[13] .

In April 2009, the ccNSO Council initiated the IDN ccPDP, and, in accordance with the advise of the IDN ccPDP Issue Manager, appointed two working groups, each with its own charter, working method and schedule[14]:

- The purpose of the first working group (IDN ccPDP WG 1) is to study and report on a feasible overall policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs. The working group should take into account and be guided by the joint GAC-ccNSO Issues Paper and comments received on that document, the Final Report of the IDNC Working Group and the associated Fast Track Implementation Plan and experience with the Fast Track Process.
- The purpose of the second working group is to report on changes to Article IX of the ICANN bylaws to include IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO. This is necessitated by the delegation of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process and in future under the policy recommended by WG 1.

The IDN ccPDP WG 1 focused on, without limitation, the proposals and recommendations of the IDNC Working Group and the Implementation Plan based on the work of the IDNC WG. It also has taken into account the experiences under and reviews of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. The IDN ccPDP WG 2 focused on, without limitation, examination of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws and associated Annexes (Annex B and C of the ICANN Bylaws). It has further taken into account the proposals and recommendations of IDN ccPDP WG 1.

As both working groups have undertaken their activities within the framework of the IDN ccPDP, the limitations on the scope of a ccPDP, in particular as defined by Article IX and Annex B and C of the ICANN Bylaws, are applicable to the WG's work in a similar manner.

The IDN ccPDP WG 1 published its Final Paper including its recommendations for the overall policy in December 2012.[15] The recommendations contained in the Final Paper were integrated in the Interim Report[16]. Taking into account the public comments received on this Report, these recommendations were updated and then included in the Final Report, which was submitted to the ccNSO Council. The members and other participants of WG 1 are listed in Annex A.

---

[11] http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/ccnso-gac-issues-report-on-idn-09jul07.pdf
[12] http://ccnso.icann.org/about/minutes/ccnso-council-call-02oct07.pdf
[13] http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-16nov09-en.htm
[14] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-07apr09.pdf
[15] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-recommendations-idn-cctld-selection-21dec12-en.pdf
[16] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/idn-ccpdp-05feb13-en.htm

The IDN ccPDP WG 2 has published its recommendations in its Final Paper in November 2012.[17] The recommendations have been integrated in the Interim and Final Report of the Issue Manager. In addition to the recommendations by the WG, proposed changes to Article IX and Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws have been included in the Interim Report and following reports. The members and other participants of WG 2 are listed in Annex B.

As a result of the adoption of the Final Report by the ccNSO Council, the recommendations of working groups 1 and 2, are referred to in this Report as policy proposals, i.e. as proposals which are part of the ccNSO Recommendation.

The ccNSO Recommendation pertaining to the selection of IDN ccTLD strings (section 2.1) includes overarching principles (section 2.1.1), and criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings (section 2.1.2). This part of the Recommendation also contains proposed procedures and documentation (section 2.1.3) and some miscellaneous procedural proposals (section 2.1.4). In each of the sub sections, the policy proposals are listed first. Additionally, and only in some instances, informative notes and comments from WG 1 are included. These notes and comments are not part of the policy proposals themselves but are included to provide depth and colour to the proposals for implementation purposes and future use.

With regard to the part of the ccNSO Recommendation related to the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, the policy proposals are listed in this Report in section 2.2. This includes the proposals themselves as well as the proposed changes to Article IX, and Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws (marked yellow).

The final section of the Board Report itself (section 3) contains a description of the IDN ccPDP process to date.

In accordance with section 14 of ANNEX B to the ICANN Bylaws, this Board Report must also contain the Final Report submitted to the Council and the Members' Report. As the policy proposals in this Report (ccNSO Recommendation) are the same as the recommendations in the Final Report and the policy proposals in the Members Report, and in order to limit the size of this Report the full Reports are not included, but a link to the Reports (Annex C and Annex D).

Finally, a copy of the formal notification, dated 3 April 2013, to the chair of the GAC and invitation to provide advise or opinion is also included (Annex E). This notification and invite are required according to section 10 of the ccNSO PDP rules.

Board report section 2. ccNSO Recommendation

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

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

2.1.1 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

[17] http://ccnso.icann.org/node/35859

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.** Under the current policy for the delegation of (ASCII) ccTLDs, the two letter ASCII codes associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard are eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Only the same territories shall be eligible to select IDN ccTLD strings.

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 listed on the ISO 3166-1 list. 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.

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:
- Preserve and ensure the security and stability of the DNS;
- Ensure adherence with the RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892, RFC 5893 and ICANN IDN guidelines.
- Take into account and be guided by the Principles for Unicode Code Point Inclusion in Labels in the DNS Root[18].

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

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.

Comments PRT
TABLE 1: SECTION 2.1.1 Overall Principles

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.1 (I)	Association of the (IDN) country code Top Level Domain with a territory. Under the current policy for the delegation of (ASCII) ccTLDs, the two letter ASCII codes associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166--1 standard are eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Only the territories listed in	Ensure consistency with the delegation procedure for ASCII ccTLDs. Maintain basic principle that "IANA (ICANN) is not in the process to determine what is and what is not a country". No review needed.	No review needed.

[18] https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-dns-zone-codepoint-pples/ .

	ISO3166-1 shall be eligible to select IDN ccTLD strings		
2.1.1 (III)	Preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS. To the extent different, additional rules are implemented for IDN ccTLDs these rules should […].	As the DNS must remain unique and stable, ICANN must ensure full consistency of rules across all TLDs when it comes to their delegation.	No review needed.
2.1.1 (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	Any criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD must be based on the link between the IDN ccTLD and the Territory for which it is proposed. Agreed: the criteria are defined in section 2.1.2	No review needed.

Board report section 2.1.2 Criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string

A. An IDN country code Top Level Domain must contain at least one (1) non-ASCII character. For example, *españa* would qualify under these criteria and *italia* would not. *españa* contains at least one other character other than [-, a-z, 0-9], while still being a valid top-level domain name.

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.

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

B. Eligibility only if the name of territory listed on ISO 3166. To be eligible for a IDN ccTLD string, a country, territory, dependency or other area of particular geopolitical interest (hereafter referred to as: Territory or Territories) must be listed on the 'International Standard ISO 3166, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes', or, in some exceptional cases a two letter ASCII (letters a-z) code associated with the Territory already assigned as a ccTLD and listed as an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element[19].

C. 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[20].
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

[19] In exceptional cases code elements for Territory names may be reserved for which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in ISO 3166 part 1, but for which an interchange requirement exists. See Section 7.5.4 ISO 3166 – 1 : 2006.

[20] See ISO 3166-1: 2006 Section 5.1

Territory. A country code string is considered meaningful 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.

D. 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 is defined as a language that has a legal status in the Territory or that serves as a language of administration (hereafter: Designated Language)[21].

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.

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

1. 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 (the UNGEGN Manual) (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm).
2. The language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant Territory in ISO 3166-1 standard under column 9 or 10.
3. 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 recommendations.

E. If the selected string is not the long or short form of the name of a Territory then evidence of meaningfulness is required. Where the selected string is the long or short form name of the relevant Territory in the Designated Language as listed in the UNGEGN Manual, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007, or later versions of that list it is considered to be meaningful.

Where the selected string is not listed in the UNGEGN then meaningfulness must be adequately documented. This is the case when:

(i) The selected string is not part of the long or short form name of the Territory in the UNGEGN Manual in the Designated Language or
(ii) An acronym of the name of the Territory in the Designated Language or
(iii) the Territory or the Designated Language do not appear 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.

[21] 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.

Specific requirements regarding documentation of the Meaningful Representation are included in the procedures and documentation recommendations.

F. 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 language.

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.

G. The selected IDN ccTLD string should be non-contentious within the territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string must be non-contentious within the territory. This is evidenced by support/endorsement from the Significantly Interested Parties (relevant stakeholders) in the territory.

Concurrent requests for two strings in the same language and for the same territory will be considered competing requests and therefore to be contentious in territory. This needs to be resolved in territory, before any further steps are taken in the selection process.

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

I. Confusing similarity of IDN ccTLD Strings. A selected IDN ccTLD string should not be confusingly similar with:

1. Any combination of two ISO 646 Basic Version (ISO 646-BV) characters[22] (letter [a-z] codes), nor
2. Existing TLDs or Reserved Names as referenced in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook[23]

[22] International Organization for Standardization, "Information Technology – ISO 7-bit coded character set for information interchange," ISO Standard 646, 1991

[23] Version 2012-06-04, section 2.2.1.2.1 Reserved Names.

The following supplemental rules provide the thresholds to solve any contention issues between the IDN ccTLD selection process and new gTLD process:

- A gTLD application that is approved by the ICANN Board will be considered an existing TLD unless it is withdrawn.

- A validated request for an IDN ccTLD will be considered an existing TLD unless it is withdrawn.

A selected IDN ccTLD string is considered confusingly similar with one or more other string(s) (which must be either Valid-U-labels or any a combination of two or more ISO 646 BV characters) if the appearance of the selected string in common fonts in small sizes at typical screen resolutions is sufficiently close to one or more other strings so that it is probable that a reasonable Internet user who is unfamiliar with the script would perceive the strings to be the same or confuse one for the other[24].

The review of whether or not a selected IDN ccTLD string is confusingly similar is a process step and should be conducted externally and independently. The recommended procedure is described in Section 2.1.3, Processes and Documentation.

The method and criteria to assess confusing similarity should be developed as part of the implementation planning. For reasons of transparency and accountability they should be made public prior to implementation of the overall policy and endorsed by the ccNSO.

The assessment of confusing similarity of strings depends on amongst other things linguistic, technical, and visual perception factors, therefore these elements should be taken into consideration in developing the method and criteria.
Taking into account the overarching principle to preserve and ensure the security, stability and interoperability of the DNS, the method and criteria for the confusing similarity assessment of an IDN ccTLD string should take into account and be guided by the Principles for Unicode Point Inclusion in labels in the DNS Root[25].

Notes and Comments

The rule on confusing similarity originates from the IDN WG and Fast Track Implementation Plan and was introduced to minimize the risk of confusion with existing or future two letter country codes in ISO 3166-1 and other TLDs. This is particularly relevant as the ISO 3166 country codes are used for a broad range of applications, for example but not limited to, marking of freight containers, postal use and as a basis for standard currency codes.

The risk of string confusion is not a technical DNS issue, but can have an adverse impact on the security and stability of the domain name system, and as such should be minimized and mitigated.

The method and criteria used for the assessment cannot be determined only on the basis of a linguistic and/or technical method of the string and its component parts, but also needs to take into account and reflect the results of scientific research relating to confusing similarity, for example from cognitive neuropsychology[26].

J. Variants PLACEHOLDER

---

[24] Based on Unicode Technical Report #36, Section 2: Visual Security Issues

[25] https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-dns-zone-codepoint-pples/

[26] See for example, M. Finkbeiner and M. Coltheart (eds), Letter Recognition: from Perception to Representation. Special Issue of the Journal *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 2009

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

Comments PRT Section 2.1.2

TABLE 2: SECTION 2.1.2 Criteria for the selection of an IDN ccTLD String

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.2 C	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. 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 meaningful 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.	ICANN must ensure consistency between the policy to assign an ASCI ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD. In detail, the "meaningful representation" criteria should be crystal clear when it comes to territories that have multiple, official languages. To what extent does the selected IDN ccTLD string need to be (remain?) to be recognised as a ccTLD even if you do not know the language?	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.
2.1.2 E	If the selected string is not the long or short form of the name of a Territory then evidence of meaningfulness is required. Where the selected string is the long or short form name of the relevant Territory in the Designated Language as listed in the UNGEGN	ICANN must make the "meaningfulness" criteria crystal clear as in the past ICANN had inconsistent approaches for the evaluation of the "adequate documentation". This applies also to the case when one territory has more than one designated language.	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	Manual, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007, or later versions of that list it is considered to be meaningful. Where the selected string is not listed in the UNGEGN then meaningfulness must be adequately documented […].	Furthermore, the procedure should foresee an appeal step in case the selected string is not accepted because of not being "meaningful".	criteria used in the Fast Track Process.
2.1.2 F	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 language. 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) ccTLDs which are considered to be confusingly similar.	It is recommendable that any future IDN ccTLD policy addresses carefully – and with the support of linguist experts – the option of languages that are expressed in more than one script as well as the rules to be produced in case the same registry manages the ccTLD in ASCII and its variant in other script. At present, ICANN approach is not consistent and that may jeopardise the ultimate goal of ensuring the security and stability of the DNS. Example mentioned is simplified Chinese and Mandarin	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and if deemed appropriate reconfirmed. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.
2.1.2 G	The selected IDN ccTLD string should be non--contentious within the territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string must be non--	ICANN must make sure there is consistency between the delegation of an ASCI ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD. Therefore,	Ensure application of basic principle that IDN ccTLD and ASCII ccTLD should be treated similar

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	contentious within the territory. This is evidenced by support/endorsement from the Significantly Interested Parties (relevant stakeholders) in the territory. Concurrent requests for two strings in the same language and for the same territory will be considered competing requests and therefore to be contentious in territory. This needs to be resolved in territory, before any further steps are taken in the selection process.	contentious requests should be resolved in the territory.	
2.1.2 H	In addition to the 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.	It need to be ensured that technical criteria are still valid. It will also need to be reviewed whether the proposed mechanism with respect to including the technical criteria as part of the implementation is appropriate.	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and reconfirmed if deemed appropriate. Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.
2.1.2 I	Confusing similarity of IDN ccTLD Strings.	As there is only one DNS environment and as domain name end-users/registrants are the same customers all over the internet eco-system – and has such have the same rights, the element of possible confusing similarity between an applied-for TLD must be treated by ICANN the same way, independently from being a cc, g or an IDN TLD.	The confusing similarity review procedures need to be reviewed in depth. It needs to be done under a ccNSO PDP and if feasible the ccNSO will need to coordinate with the GNSO work in this area. Mechanism to coordinate is through a coordination

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
		This will ensure that the current discriminatory rules for the evaluation of IDN ccTLDs are modified and consequently, become in line with the provisions that are currently in place in other TLD environments. Those considerations apply also to the steps detailed under 2.1.3 "Procedures and Documentation".	committee/working party. This model is light weight, without the burden of a Cross-community working group. The results will feed into each of the PDPs. Membership is from the ccNSO PDP and GNSO PDP WG membership with membership open to interested groups. Before becoming part of the ccNSO PDP WG proposals the results need to be accepted by the membership of the ccNSO PDP WG Once included in the total package it shall be treated in same manner as other proposals (subject to Council and Membership adoption). Rationale: Confusing similarity review is currently part of both of IDN ccTLD and new gTLD processes and policy proposals. Over time the methods, criteria and procedures have evolved differently. The ccNSO Proposals are part of the original recommended policy and need to be updated through a ccNSO PDP.
2.1.2 (F)	Where a language is expressed in more than one script in a territory, then it is permissible to have one string per script, although	Mixing between scripts within the same label should be restricted in case of letters have different contexts "RTL or LTR"	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP and if deemed appropriate reconfirmed.

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	the multiple strings are in the same language.	Note that in principle registration policies are a local matter. That being said advising not to allow mixed scripting could be an option.	Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Membership in 2013. They are very similar to the criteria used in the Fast Track Process.

Board report section 2.1.3 Procedures and Documentation

Under the overall policy a two-stage process is recommended for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string:

Stage 1: String selection stage in Territory
Stage 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.

Stage 1: String Selection stage in Territory

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. Identify the script and language for the IDN Table and prepare this Table if necessary,
2. Select the IDN ccTLD string. The selected string must meet the meaningfulness and technical requirements and should not be confusingly similar.
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.

Notes and Comments

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

- 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 IDN ccTLD manager.
- The relevant public authority of the Territory associated with the selected IDN ccTLD.
- Parties to be served by the IDN ccTLD. They are asked to show that they support the request and that it would meet the interests and needs of the local Internet community.

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 provide assistance to them to assist with the in-Territory Process.

2. Detailed aspects String Selection Stage

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 for the IANA IDN Practices Repository[27]. The IDN Table may already exist i.e. has been prepared for another IDN ccTLD or gTLD using the same script and already included in the IANA IDN Practices Repository. In this case the existing and recorded IDN Table may be used by reference.
If the same script is used in two or more territories, cooperation is encouraged to define an IDN Table for that script. ICANN is advised either to facilitate these processes directly or through soliciting relevant international organisation to facilitate.

27 http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html

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

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

a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the IDN ccTLD string and
b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others 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 country or territory associated with the selected IDN ccTLD must demonstrate that it is 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."

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 E).
- 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.

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 non-objection for the selected string(s) in the implementation plan.

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 country or territory. A string is deemed to be meaningful if it is in the designated language of the country or territory and if it is:
1 The name of the country or territory; or
2 A part of the name of the country or territory denoting the country or territory; or
3 A short-form designation for the name of the country or territory that is recognizable and denotes the country or 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 the following experts or organizations as internationally recognized:

a. National Naming Authority – a government recognized National Geographic Naming Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the country or 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: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/nna.html
b. National Linguistic Authority – a government recognized National Linguistic Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the country or territory for which the selected string request is presented.
c. ICANN agreed expert or organization – in the case where a country or territory does not have access to one of the Authorities listed before, it may request assistance from ICANN to identify and refer a recognized expert or organization. Any expertise referred from or agreed to by ICANN will be considered acceptable and sufficient to determine whether a string is a meaningful representation of a Territory name.

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, including a timeframe, to identify expertise referred to or agreed as set out above under c. in the implementation plan.

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 2.1.2 D. The language requirement is considered verified as follows:

- 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
- If the language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant Territory in the ISO 3166-1 standard under column 9 or 10; or
- 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):
    - Used in official communications by the relevant public authority; or
    - Serves as a language of administration.

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.

Stage 2: Validation of IDN ccTLD string

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:
    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.

2. Detailed aspects String Validation Stage

1. 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[28].

2. Submission procedure for selected string and related documentation

This part of the process is considered a matter of implementation.

3. Validation of selected string

a. ICANN staff validation of the request

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

- The selected IDN ccTLD refers to a territory listed on ISO 3166-1 list
- The selected string (A-label) does not exist in the DNS, nor is approved for delegation to another party,
- The selected string (U-label) contains at least one (1) non-ASCII character.

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

- The required A-label, U-label, and corresponding Unicode points to designate the selected IDN ccTLD string are consistent.
- Documentation on meaningfulness is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
- Documentation on the Designated Language is complete and meets the criteria and requirements.
- Documentation to evidence support for the selected string is complete and meets the criteria and requirements and is from an authoritative source.

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

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

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.
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

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[29]" to conduct a technical review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.

- To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent " Similarity Review Panel" to review the selected IDN ccTLD string for confusing similarity.

- To allow for a final validation review relating the confusing similarity, and only if so requested by the requester, ICANN should appoint, an external and independent " Extended Process Similarity Review Panel."

As part of the implementation planning the details of the roles and responsibilities of the panels and its membership requirements should be developed in conjunction with the development of the methods and criteria for assessing the technical[30] and confusing similarity[31] validity of the selected IDN ccTLD strings and details of the reporting as foreseen for the validation processes.

29 Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

30 See section 2.1.2 H above

31 See 2.1.2 I above

Process for Technical Validation

1. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request, 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 conduct 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 it will need more time, ICANN staff will be informed. ICANN staff shall inform the requester accordingly.

4 If according to the technical review the string meets all the technical criteria the string is technically validated. If the selected string does not meet all the technical criteria the string is not-valid. ICANN staff shall inform and notify the requester accordingly.

Process for confusing similarity validation

1. After completion of the Technical Validation ICANN staff will submit the selected IDN ccTLD string to the String Similarity Panel for the confusing similarity string evaluation.
2. The Panel shall conduct a confusability string evaluation of the string submitted for evaluation. The Panel may ask questions for clarification through ICANN staff.
3. The findings of the evaluation will be reported to ICANN staff. In the report the Panel will include the names of the Panelists, document the decision and provide the rationale for the decision. Where the string is considered to be confusingly similar the report shall at a minimum include a reference to the string(s) to which the confusing similarity relates and examples (in fonts) where the panel observed the similarity.

ICANN staff shall inform and notify the requester accordingly.

Usually the Panel will conduct 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 it will need more time, ICANN staff will be informed. ICANN staff shall inform the requester accordingly.

4 a. If according to the review, the Panel does not consider the string to be confusingly similar, the selected IDN ccTLD is validated.

4 b. If according to the review the selected IDN ccTLD string presents a risk of string confusion with one particular combination of two ISO 646 Basic Version (ISO 646-BV) characters and this combination is according the ISO 3166 standard the two-letter alpha-2 code associated with same Territory as represented by the selected string, this should be noted in the report. ICANN staff shall inform the requester accordingly.

If, within 3 months of receiving the report the requestor shall confirm that:

(i) The intended manager and intended registry operator for the IDN ccTLD and the ccTLD manager for the confusingly similar country code are one and the same entity; and

(ii) The intended manager of the IDN ccTLD shall be the entity that requests the delegation of the IDN ccTLD string; and

(iii) The requester, intended manager and registry operator and, if necessary, the relevant public authority, accept and document that the IDN ccTLD and the ccTLD with which it is confusingly similar will be and will remain operated by one and the same manager, and

(iv) The requester, intended manager and registry operator and, if necessary, the relevant public authority agree to specific and pre-arranged other conditions with the goal to mitigate the risk of user confusion as of the moment the IDN ccTLD becomes operational;

then the IDN ccTLD string is deemed to be valid.

If either the requester, intended manager or the relevant public authority do not accept the pre-arranged conditions within 3 months after notification or at a later stage refutes the acceptance, the IDN ccTLD shall not be validated.
Alternatively, the requester may defer from this mechanism and use the procedure as described under 4 c.

4c.
i. If according to the review the selected IDN ccTLD string is found to present a risk of string confusion, ICANN staff shall inform the requester in accordance with paragraph 3 above. The requester may call for an Extended Process Similarity Review and provide additional documentation and clarification referring to aspects in the report of the Panel. The requester should notify ICANN within three (3) calendar months after the date of notification by ICANN, and include the additional documentation. After receiving the notification from the requester, ICANN staff shall call on the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel (EPSRP).
ii. The EPSRP conducts its evaluation of the string, based on the standard and methodology and criteria developed for it, and, taking into account, but not limited to, all the related documentation from the requester, including submitted additional documentation, IDN tables available, and the finding of the Similarity Review Panel. The EPSRP may ask questions for clarification through ICANN staff.
iii. The findings of the EPSRP shall be reported to ICANN staff and will be publicly announced on the ICANN website. This report shall include and document the findings of the EPSRP, including the rationale for the final decision, and in case of the risk of confusion a reference to the strings that are considered confusingly similar and examples where the panel observed this similarity.
If according to the Extended Process Similarity Review, the EPSRP does not consider the string to be confusingly similar the selected IDN ccTLD is valid.

3. 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.

4. 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, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs. ICANN shall notify the requester accordingly.

5. 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.

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.

Comments PRT section 2.1.3
TABLE 3: SECTION 2.1.3 Procedure and Documentation

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.3 - 2	IDN Table The IDN Table may already exist i.e. has been prepared for another IDN ccTLD or gTLD using the same script and already included in the IANA IDN Practices Repository. In this case the existing and recorded IDN Table may be used by reference.	Using the IDN Table prepared for another IDN cc or gTLD could be an option under specific conditions. When recommendation was developed Variant Management was not taken into consideration. Going forward it is clearly a topic that will need to be addressed and should be taken into consideration	Variant Management and RZ-Label Generation rules and related work on IDN Tables should be reviewed and included in the update of the ccNSO Policy. Work to be undertaken as (part of) ccNSO PDP. Rationale: In current proposal
2.1.3 - 2	Documentation of required endorsement / support for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties	In the Fast Track Process and underlying methodology the reference is to Local Internet Community, which was in use up- and until the Framework of Interpretation was adopted and implemented. Going forward the terminology should be used consistently across different ccTLD related policies. Ensure required documentation and terminology is used consistently across the ccTLD related policy documentation (RFC 1591& related Framework of Interpretation, ccPDP 3 and	Review and update the current proposed policy to ensure consistent documentation and terminology.

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
		overall policy for selection of IDN ccTLD strings.	
2.1.3 - 2	Classification of input For procedural purposes the following cases should be distinguished […]. 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.	To be consistent with previously stated procedures, any issue must be sorted within the territory.	Review the clarifications provided in the text of ccPDP 2. Ensure consistency and clear basis for interpretation.
2.1.3.2	Stage 2 Validation of IDN ccTLD string To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent " Similarity Review Panel" to review the selected IDN ccTLD string for confusing similarity.	What will happen if the selected string has variances? Are all of the variances accepted or is only one accepted?	See next steps re: variance management
2.1.3	Stage 1 Documentation	Should the documentation submitted to ICANN be	The criteria need to be reviewed in depth in PDP.

Section in Document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	Designated Language	written in English or could be written with the requested IDN string?	Rationale: Proposed criteria have been adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.
2.1.3	stage2 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.

Board report section 2.1.4 Miscellaneous Policy Proposals

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 re-delegation 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.

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[32].

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.

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

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.

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.

Comments PRT Section 2.1.4
TABLE 4: SECTION 2.1.4 Miscellaneous Policy Proposals

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.1.4 C	Creation of list over time Experience has shown that entries on the ISO 3166-1 table change over time. Such a change can directly impact the eligibility for an IDN ccTLD. In order to record these changes, it is recommended that	The update frequency caused issues in the past. It might be advisable to review it. It is questionable whether this mechanism still makes sense in the current context. Who is responsible for creating the table and what is the frequency for updating it? What is purpose?	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. Rationale: This element of the policy needs to be reviewed but was included at the suggestion of some GAC members at the time and adopted by the ccNSO members in 2013. Needs to be ensured that both GAC (members) and ccNSO

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
	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.		Membership are able to express their views formerly.
2.1.4 E	Review of policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings It is recommended that the policy will be reviewed within five years after implementation or at such an earlier time warranted by extraordinary circumstances […].	It would be advisable to review the policy whenever deemed appropriate. Considering the dynamic internet landscape, should any significant scenario change and/or arise, it would be quite challenging to wait 5 years to review the policy. Is review warranted every 5 years? What 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.	Review and update/amend this section of the proposed policy as part of a ccNSO PDP. Rationale: Adopted by the ccNSO Members in 2013.

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
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. […].	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. 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	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.

Board report section 2.2 Proposals on the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO

A. Membership Definition: It is recommended that the definition in Article IX section 4.1 should be updated to maintain the one-to- one correspondence between the IANA Root Zone Database and membership in the ccNSO.

Relevant section in the Bylaws
Article IX section 4.1. *"The ccNSO shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD managers. Any ccTLD manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in paragraph 2 of this Section shall be entitled to be members of the ccNSO. For purposes of this Article, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain and referred to in the IANA database under the current heading of "Sponsoring Organization", or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain."*

Proposed change of Article IX section 4.1
Section 4.1 should read: *The ccNSO shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD managers. Any ccTLD manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in paragraph 2 of this Section shall be*

entitled to be members of the ccNSO. For purposes of this Article (Article IX ICANN Bylaws), a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing a country-code top-level domain according to and under the current heading "Delegation Record" in the Root Zone Database, or any later variant and referred to in the IANA Root Zone Database under the current heading of "Sponsoring Organization", or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain."

B. Eligibility and selection of ccNSO Councillors: No changes proposed

C. Initiation of a ccPDP: In order to maintain the envisioned balance and taking into account the leading principles, the WG recommends that:

- All members of the ccNSO should be entitled to call for the creation of an Issue Report;
- These members need to be from different Territories;
- The current minimum of 10 members to request the creation of an Issue Report should be maintained.

Relevant section in the Bylaws
Annex B section 1.
Request for an Issue Report.
" An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:
….
e. Members of the ccNSO. The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO present at any meeting or voting by e-mail. ……"

The proposed change to Annex B section 1 of the ICANN Bylaws:

Request for an Issue Report.
" An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:
…..
e. " Members of the ccNSO. The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO representing at least ten different Territories present at any meeting or voting by e-mail. ……"

D. Voting: For purposes of formal voting, the ccNSO member(s) from a Territory appoint an emissary. If either only one entity from a Territory is ccNSO member or one entity manages all of the (ASCII or IDN) ccTLDs associated with a specific Territory, by definition the representative of that entity is the emissary.

If there are two or more ccTLD managers in a Territory who have become members of the ccNSO, for purposes of voting in the ccNSO an emissary for that Territory has to be appointed by all members from that Territory.

During the period the emissary has not been appointed by all ccNSO members, the longest standing incumbent member of the ccNSO from that Territory is deemed to vote for that Territory, until such time the ccNSO Council is informed by all members from that Territory of the appointment of an emissary for the Territory.

The ccNSO Council shall maintain a register of emissaries. The rules and procedures to maintain such a register shall be developed in accordance with Article IX Section 3.11.

Relevant sections in Article IX the Bylaws
Designation of Representative (Article IX Section 4.5) "*Each ccTLD manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD manager. In the absence of such a designation, the ccTLD manager shall be represented by the person, organization, or entity listed as the administrative contact in the IANA database".*

Selection of Councilors (Article IX section 4.9). *"….an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their designated representatives. …"*

Vote on Recommendations ccPDP (Annex B section 13). *"Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP Time Line, the ccNSO members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP Time Line .."*

Proposed changes to Article IX and Annex B of the Bylaws
Article IX Section 4.5 *Each ccTLD manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD manager in matters relating to the ccNSO (the Representative). In the absence of such a designation, the person, organization, or entity listed as the administrative contact in the IANA database shall be deemed to be the designate of the ccTLD manager by whom the ccTLD member shall be represented.*

Include new Article IX Section 4.6, Designation of Emissary: *In the event two or more ccTLD Managers from one and the same Territory, are members of the ccNSO, those ccTLD managers are to appoint an emissary to vote in the specific cases enumerated in this Article on behalf of the members from that country, territory or area of particular geopolitical interest, for purposes of voting in the ccNSO. For the purposes of this Article, and Annexes B and C, Territory is defined to mean the country, dependency or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed on the 'International Standard ISO 3166-1, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes', or, in some exceptional cases listed on the reserved ISO 3166-1 code elements.*

During any period in which an emissary is not appointed, the ccTLD manager that has been the member of the ccNSO for the longest period of time is deemed to be the emissary for that Territory

For any Territory for which there is a single ccTLD manager, the Representative selected by that manager in accordance with Section 4.5 shall be the Emissary for the purpose of voting.

Include new Article IX Section 4.6.1, *Register of Representatives and Emissaries: The ccNSO Council shall develop and maintain a register of Representatives and Emissaries, in accordance with Article IX Section 3.11*.

Article IX Sections 4.6 through 4.11 and internal references need to renumbered to 4.7 through 4.12.

Adjust Article IX Section 4.9 (new 4.10), Selection of Councilors: *"….an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their Emissaries."*

Adjust Annex B Section 13, Vote on Recommendations ccPDP: *Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP Time Line, the ccNSO members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and through their designated Emissaries. The members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP Time Line.*

E. Quorum: Assuming that one vote per Territory is the preferred principle, the current quorum rule is proposed to be maintained, albeit the relevant sections in the Bylaws need to be adjusted to reflect this principle.

Relevant, current sections in the Bylaws
Article IX Section 4.9 (Election of Councilors by members)
"……In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum,…."

Annex B section 13. *"In the event that at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO members, will be employed irrespective of whether 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favour of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board….."*

Article IX Section 4.9 (Election of Councillors by members)
"……In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum,…."

Proposed changes to Article IX and Annex B of the Bylaws
Amend Article IX Section 4.9 (new 4.10) (Election of Councilors by members)
"……In such an election, a majority of the Emissaries entitled to vote in the Geographic Region shall constitute a quorum,…."

Annex B section 13. *"In the event that at least 50% of the Emissaries entitled to vote lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% Emissaries lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO members, will be employed irrespective of whether 50% of the Emissaries lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favour of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board….."*

F. Scope of ccPDP (Annex C of the Bylaws): No changes needed to the Annex C of the Bylaws.

G. Review of the proposed policy for the inclusion of IDN ccTLD's in the ccNSO: The proposed policy should be reviewed within five years after its implementation or sooner if warranted by extraordinary circumstances.

H. Verification of Implementation. It is anticipated that some parts of the recommendations relating to the inclusion of IND ccTLD's in the ccNSO 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 PRT Section 2.2
TABLE 5: Section 2.2 Proposals on the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
2.2 D	Voting	It is necessary to distinguish the case when IDN ccTLD and ccTLD managed by the same Registry (manager). Is it necessary in this case to include this IDN ccTLD as an individual member of ccNSO? Voting by emissary is limited to formal votes enumerated in Article 10 (was Article IX) of the ccNSO: see page 27 Board report)	No need to update or review the proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws. Only numbering of sections needs to be adopted. In general: section 2.2 of the recommended policy could be separated and submitted to the Board as proposed changes to section 10 of the current ICANN Bylaws.
2.2 A	Membership definition	It is recommended that the definition in Article IX section 4.1 (new Article 10) is updated to maintain the one-to- one correspondence between the IANA Root Zone Database and membership in the ccNSO. The term "later variants" in the Bylaw definition refers to the heading "ccTLD Manager", which used to be "sponsoring organization" For example: Delegation Record for .AC (Country-code top-level domain) ccTLD Manager: Network Information Center (AC Domain Registry) Administrative Contact: Internet Manager Network Information Center (AC Domain Registry) Technical Contact: Administrator ICB Plc.	Proposed Membership definition does not need to be updates for purposes of inclusion of IDNccTLDs in the ccNSO. However should be updated to address concerns identified through ccNSO PDP 3, resulting from the latest Bylaw update of the definition in 2016.
2.2.C	Initiation of PDP	The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO representing at least ten	No need for additional review

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
		different Territories present at any meeting or voting by e-mail. ……" Although questioned the rationale is one vote per territory.	

TABLE 6: Other, additional topics

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
NA	Variant management	The element of "variant management" has become quite relevant in the overall IDN environment. Therefore, it is recommendable that any IDN string selection process takes it into account.	It needs to be included in proposed policy. It is suggested to launch a ccNSO PDP. The 2013 IDN ccTLD proposals includes a placeholder with the understanding at the time that further work needed to be done. Further, at the request of the ICANN Board of Directors the ccNSO will need to coordinate with the GNSO work in this area. Mechanism to coordinate is through a coordination committee/working party. This model is light weight, without the baggage of a Cross-community working group. The results will feed into each of the PDPs Membership is from the ccNSO PDP and GNSO PDP WG membership with membership open to interested groups. Before becoming part of the ccNSO PDP WG proposals the results need to be accepted by the membership of the ccNSO PDP WG

Section in document	Topic	Comment/Rationale for review/ inclusion in list	Proposed next step
			Once included in the total package it shall be treated in same manner as other proposals (subject to Council and Membership adoption).
NA	Retirement of IDN ccTLD	The retirement of ASCII ccTLD is triggered by the removal of the country code form the ISO 3166-1 list. This may be caused by a significant change of name of the country or territory, which results in a need to change the two-letter code and removal of the former. Looking at the selection criteria, the question is which, if any, of the listed criteria, may/should cause the retirement of an IDN ccTLD, and cause the retirement policy to become applicable.	The ccNSO PDP on IDN ccTLD should be amended to include what will cause the retirement of an IDN ccTLD. Rationale: The retirement process will be defined through ccNSO PDP 3 will be applicable to both IDNccTLD and ASCII ccTLDs. The event leading up to the retirement of ASCII ccTLD is derived from RFC 1591 (removal of the country code form the ISO 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.

ANNEX B: Draft Charter ccPDP4 WG

0. Contextual background information

In September 2013 the ccNSO submitted the IDN country code policy development process (ccPDP2) Board Report to the ICANN Board of Directors. The recommended policy ccPDP2 contains two parts:

- Proposals (at a high level) for the criteria and requirements for the IDN ccTLD string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures.
- Proposals to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

By mutual understanding, the ccNSO Council and the ICANN Board allowed the Fast Track Process to evolve, to test and gain experience with the policy aspects pertaining to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process. The aim was to further inform the overall policy, specifically with results of the different reviews of the Fast Track process[33]. The latest step in the evolution of the Fast Track Process was the introduction of the community developed Guideline with regard to the Risk Mitigation Panel and related process.

In March 2019 the ccNSO Council tasked a team (Preliminary Review Team or PRT) to review ccPDP2 in light of and to review the impact of the following on the recommended policies:

- The evolved Fast Track Process,
- The request of the ICANN Board of Directors with respect to IDN Variants and
- Other relevant developments such as retirement of the (IDN) ccTLDs
- The inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

The PRT was requested to advise the Council on whether or not to launch an additional Policy Development Process to address open issues, if any, or take other steps.

Based on its high-level analyses, the PRT identified various issues with the recommended policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and advised Council to launch a ccNSO Policy Development Process (ccPDP4) to address the various issues it had identified, including the de-selection of IDN ccTLD strings. With respect to the recommendations in ccPDP2 pertaining to the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs, the PRT did not identify any issues and therefore advised the ccNSO Council to request a change of Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws and Annex B. The Final Report of the PRT is included as part of ANNEX A of this Issue Report.

At its meeting on 22 August 2019, the ccNSO Council adopted the recommendations of the PRT. To implement these recommendations the ccNSO Council requested the ICANN Board of Directors to agree to take no additional steps with respect to ccPDP2 and to stop the evolution of the Fast Track Process[34]. In October 2019, the ICANN Board confirmed and agreed with this approach[35].

Since March 2019, and following the initial discussions of the ccNSO Council, input and feedback was sought from the community at the Kobe (ICANN64), Marrakesh (ICANN65) & Montreal (ICANN66) meetings. The community present at these meetings concurred with the view that (IDN) ccPDP4, should be launched and focus should be limited to the Items identified by the ccNSO Preliminary Review Team, namely on the (de-)selection of IDN ccTLD strings and management of variants of

[33] See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-cctld-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf, general introduction page 4.

[34] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-04sep19-en.pdf.

[35] https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-sataki-31oct19-en.pdf

selected IDN ccTLD strings. The community also concurred and re-confirmed the ccPDP2 recommendations to amend Article 10 and Annex 10 to allow the inclusion of IDN ccTLD Managers in the ccNSO on equal footing.

1. Goal, Scope and issues to be addressed

1.1 Goal

The goal of the working group (WG) is to report on and recommend a policy for the (de-) selection of Internationalised Domain Name country code Top Level Domain strings (IDN ccTLDS) associated with the country codes assigned to countries, territories or other areas of geopolitical interest listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard and within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development Process.

1.2 Scope

To achieve its goal, the WG shall initially focus on and be guided by the topics and issues listed below in section 1.3. If other topics and issues become apparent that are not listed and that in the view of the WG need to be addressed to achieve its goal, the WG should take these into consideration and inform the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager accordingly.

As this WG will undertake its activities within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development Process, the limitations with respect to the scope of a ccPDP, specifically by Article 10 and Annexes B and C to the ICANN Bylaws shall also limit the scope of the WG's work.

If topics issues become apparent that are considered out of scope of the WG, the Chair of the WG shall inform the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager accordingly. If the ccNSO Council is also of the opinion it is outside the scope of the WG, it is expected to deal with it appropriately.

1.3 High Level overview of topics and Issues to be resolved

The main topics to be addressed are suggested by the PRT in its Final Report as adopted by the ccNSO Council. The detailed results of the PRT are mapped against section 2 the Board Report IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process[36], which contains the recommended policies on the IDN ccTLD String Selection Criteria, requirements and Processes (section 2.1) and Policy Proposals on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO (section 2.2). This overview is included as Annex A of the Issue Report and provides the list of topics and issues that will need to be addressed. Note that for reference and to provide context, section 1 of the Board Report is included. Further note that - per advice of the PRT and as resolved by the ccNSO Council - section 2.2 of the Board Report are outside of scope of the work of this WG. Finally note that policy need to be developed to:
1. Include "variant management" as was also requested by the ICANN Board of Directors, and
2. Define the events which would cause the retirement policy as developed under the ccNSO Policy Development Process pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs ccPDP3 part 1 to become effective.

[36] https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_41859/idn-ccpdp-board-26sep13-en.pdf

2. The WG

2.1 Members and other participants of the WG

The WG is open to members who are representatives of ccTLDs, participants from other stakeholder groups, observers and experts.

Members, participants, and experts commit to participate actively and regularly in the work of the WG and are expected to have at least a basic understanding of the reference material (section 7).

Once appointed, all participants in the WG will be subscribed to a mailing list. The mailing list will be archived after closure of the WG.

The names and affiliation of the WG members and other participants will be published on a dedicated WG page on the ccNSO website.

At any time WG members, participants, observers and experts may resign from the WG, by informing the Chair of the WG, who will then inform the ccNSO Council. After receiving a notification the ccNSO Council may seek a replacement.

2.1.1 Members

The working group should have at least 10 members, at least from two (2) of the five (5) ICANN Geographic Regions. Members are representatives from ccTLD managers or their nominees. With respect to members of the WG there is no requirement for a ccTLD to be a ccNSO Member. Members are appointed by the ccNSO Council in accordance with the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups[37].

2.1.3 Participants, experts and observers to the WG

Participants

In addition, the WG is open to participants, who shall not be considered members of the WG. Participants are entitled to participate on equal footing with members, unless the charter states otherwise. The ccNSO Council will request the following stakeholders to appoint at least one participant:

- Each of the Regional Organisations as defined in Section 10.5 of the ICANN Bylaws;
- ALAC
- GAC
- GNSO
- SSAC

Experts to the WG

The ccNSO Council may also invite and appoint experts as advisors to the WG. Experts shall not be considered members of the WG, but are entitled to participate on an equal footing in their area of expertise. The Council will at least invite the following persons:

- PTI staff
- Expert on the ISO 3166-1 list
- Relevant ICANN Staff

Observers

[37] https://ccnso.icann.org/about/guidelines-working-groups-30mar16-en.pdf

The WG will have the following observers:

- The Issue Manager for the ccPDP
- Any person appointed as observer by the Chair of the WG

2.1.4 **Sub-group Membership**. Members, participants, experts and observers to the working group may - in addition to participating in the working group itself - participate in one or both of the two sub-groups identified below. In addition, Representatives from ccTLD managers or their nominees, participants, experts and/or observers may select to participate in one or both sub-groups only. The rules for membership apply for such limited membership to the extent reasonable.

2.1.5 Staff Support

ICANN will be requested to provide adequate staff support to the WG

2.2 Chair and Vice-Chair

At the nomination of the members of the WG, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the WG will be appointed by the ccNSO Council. The Chair and Vice-Chair should be members of the Working Group.

The Chair together with the Vice-Chair, will manage the ongoing activities of the WG and ensure an appropriate working environment by:

- Promptly sharing relevant information with the entire WG.
- Planning the work of the WG to meet the WG goals and leading the WG through its discussions.
- Regularly assessing and reporting on the progress of the WG to the Council and broader community.
- Keeping track of WG participation. Where a WG member does not regularly participate, the Chair will reach out to the member to engage that person in the WG. If, after a conversation that member does not regularly participates, the Chair will advise the Council, so that further steps can be taken to resolve the situation.

The Chair is the representative of the WG. If the Chair of a WG is not a member of the ccNSO Council, the ccNSO Council will appoint a ccNSO Council liaison, to act as an intermediary between the WG and the ccNSO Council or invite the chair to Council meetings to regularly inform the Council on progress made, take questions and participate in any deliberations related to the WG.

The Chair and Vice-chair will regularly inform the broader community on progress of the WG and seek (informal) feed-back from the community.

3. Operations of the WG

3.1 Working Methods

The first work item of the WG is to develop and agree on its working methods (Rules of Engagement) that will guide how the WG intends to conduct its business. These working methods will be made publicly available and be guided by the following principles:

- The meetings will rotate from a timing perspective to share the burden as the membership is distributed over different time zones.
- No firm decisions are taken during any single meeting without the substance of those decisions having been discussed and open for review / consideration by those that may not have been present during the meeting.

- Efforts should be made to ensure that non-native English speakers can participate on an equal basis in the discussions
- The WG will consider public comments and other input as appropriate, and at its reasonable discretion.
- The Secretariat will set up conference calls, maintaining mailing lists, etc. at the direction of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the WG. At the request of the Chair the Secretariat or other ICANN staff will also provide other forms of assistance, for example providing advice or an expert opinion.

3.2 Sub-groups

The WG is expected to create at least two sub-groups:

- sub-group 1 focusing on developing recommendations pertaining to the confusing similarity review process(es), procedures, criteria and method(s) and
- sub-group 2 on variant management of IDN ccTLD strings.

The Chair and vice-Chair of the WG are ex-officio members of these two groups and are tasked with inviting participants from the GNSO to the sub-groups to coordinate the policy efforts undertaken by both the ccNSO and GNSO in the areas of confusing similarity and variant management. In coordinating the efforts the sub-group are strongly advised to take into account the requests from the Board in the area of Variant Management, and potential efficiencies and effectiveness in coordinating the policy efforts in the area of confusing similarity of TLD strings Each sub-group shall nominate their chair, who will be appointed by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the WG.

Sub-groups shall submit their recommendations with respect to IDN ccTLDs, including but not limited to the results of the coordinating efforts, to the working group to seek the support for the proposal (at a minimum at the level of consensus) from the WG membership. Only if supported by the WG membership, the sub-group proposals become part of the WG proposals and will be included in the Initial Report and Final Report.

3.3 Internal Decision making

In developing its output – guideline for operations, working method, work plan and any reports or papers - the WG shall seek to act by consensus. The Chair of the WG may make a call for consensus. In making such a call, the Chair should always make reasonable efforts to involve at a minimum all members of the WG. The Chair shall be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- Full Consensus - a position where no minority disagrees; identified by an absence of objection
- Consensus – a position where a small minority disagrees, but most agree
- No Consensus

In the absence of Full Consensus, the Chair should allow for the submission of minority viewpoint(s) and these, along with the consensus view, shall be included in the report, paper or other relevant deliverable.

In rare cases, the Chair may decide to use of a poll to assess the level of support for a recommendation. However, care should be taken in using polls: they should not become votes, as there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results. Such a poll shall be open for the WG members only, unless the Chair decides otherwise.

Any person on the WG who disagrees with the consensus-level designated by the Chair, or believes that her/his contributions have systematically been ignored or discounted, should first discuss the circumstances with the Chair. If the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the person should discuss the situation with the Chair of the ccNSO or a person designated by the Chair of the ccNSO.

If No Consensus can be reached by the WG, on policy recommendations, the Chair of the WG will submit a Chair's Report to the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager. In this report the Chair shall document the issues that are considered contentious, the process that was followed to try to reach a consensus position and suggestions to mitigate those issues, if any. If, after implementation of the mitigating measures, consensus still cannot be reached, the Chair shall prepare a Final Chair's Report documenting the processes that was followed to reach consensus and this Final Chair's Report will be deemed to replace the Final Paper. In this case, the ccNSO Council, advised by the Issue Manager, may decide to close the WG, or take mitigating measures, for example changing the charter and reconstitute a WG based on the new charter.

3.3 Standards of Behaviour

The persons on the WG are expected to behave in a mature and professional way when conducting their business on the WG. This includes, but is not limited to, communicating with the fellow membership professionally and ensuring that the WG remains inclusive and productive. To resolve incidents of non-professional communication the following steps should be followed:

- Any concerns regarding the behavior of one of the members, participants, observers or experts should first be raised with that person.
- If the issue is not satisfactorily resolved, a formal complaint may be raised with the Chair of the WG, who will attempt to mediate.
- If that is not possible, or if the complaint is sufficiently serious in nature, the Chair of the WG is empowered to restrict the participation of the person if in the chairs view the continued participation would not be appropriate and/or would seriously disrupt the working group from conducting its business.
- Generally, a person should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such the restriction is put into effect; only in extreme circumstances to be determined by the chair and vice-chair together, this restriction may be put in effect immediately.

If a person on the WG disagrees with an imposed restriction, or the complainant disagrees with a restriction (or the lack of one), or there are other matters regarding the complaint that cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the participant, complainant, or the Chair of the WG may raise the issue with the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the ccNSO Council or their designate(s). They will review the matter and then decide. The ccNSO Council, WG Chair, WG person and complainant shall be informed accordingly.

4. Deliverables

4. 1. Working Method & Work Plan

The WG is expected to develop its working methods and a work plan first. The working methods should provide guidance on how the WG intends to conduct its business (see section 3.1). The work plan should include at a minimum, where feasible, timelines and expected outputs of the WG, based on the deliverables outlined in this Charter. Purpose of the work plan is to inform the community and ccNSO on the expected progress and anticipated schedule of public consultations.

Once the work plan is completed, the Time Line as set forth in section 6 shall be updated and published. If in the course of conducting its business the WG or the chair of the WG is of the view that the Time Line is untenable, the chair will inform the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager. The chair will then also suggest an adjusted Time Line to be adopted by the WG. Once adopted, the chair will inform the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager and the adjusted Time Line will be published.

4.2 WG Initial Report

The WG shall develop and publish for public consultation an Initial Report, which shall, at a minimum, include proposals to address the topics and issues identified in the Issue Report, and any documentation necessary to make the proposals effective. The Initial Report shall also contain a review and analysis of comments made on the Issue Report, if any, with respect to the issues raised in the Issue Report. The Initial Report shall be published for public consultation on the ICANN website following the guidelines for public consultations. The consultation should be scheduled in such a manner that it allows a public discussion with the relevant stakeholders at a designated ICANN meeting. The Chair of the WG will send the Initial Report to the Issue Manager of the ccPDP.

4.3 WG (draft) Final Report

After conclusion of the public consultation on the Initial Report, the WG shall prepare a (draft) Final Report reflecting the Initial Report, and the comments received on the Initial Report during the public consultation period.

If the WG is of the view that an additional public consultation is appropriate, it will prepare a draft Final Report to be published for public consultation on the ICANN website and following the guidelines for public consultations. The consultation should be scheduled in such a manner that it also allows for a public discussion with the relevant stakeholders at a designated ICANN meeting. After conclusion of the public consultation on the draft Final Report, the WG shall prepare its Final Report that reflects the draft Final Report, the comments received and how they have been taken into consideration by the WG, if at all.

The Final Report will include the proposed policy recommendations. This Final Report shall be published within fourteen (14) days after adoption of the Report by the WG and conveyed to the Chair of the ccNSO and the Issue Manager of the ccPDP. The Chair of the ccNSO shall request the Chair of the GAC, opinion or advise from the GAC.

5 Miscellaneous

5.1 Omission in or unreasonable impact of Charter

If this charter does not provide sufficient guidance and/or the impact of the charter is found to be unreasonable for conducting the business of the WG, the Chair has the authority to determine a proper course of action to mitigate the issue. Such action may, for example, consist of a modification to the Charter to address the omission or its unreasonable impact, in which case the Chair(s) may propose such modification to the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager. A modification shall only be effective after adoption of the amended by the ccNSO and after publication of the amended Charter. The chair of the WG shall exercise reasonable discretion with respect to question as to whether this charter does not provide guidance and/or the impact of the charter is unworkable with respect to the conduct of business of the WG.

5.2 Closure of the Working Group

If the WG determines that it has completed its work, or if the WG cannot achieve its goal(s), The Chair of the WG will submit a Final Chair Report to the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager. This report should include a recommendation on the time to close the WG.
A WG is closed by a resolution of the ccNSO Council.

6. WG Time Line

Step	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
1	**Draft Issue Report**		Issue Manager	February 2020	To be presented to the prior to the Cancun meeting
2	**Formal Initiation of ccPDP 4**		ccNSO Council	February 2020	Following public comment ccNSO Council vote
3		**Public notification of Initiation of IDN ccPDP**	Issue Manager	February 2020	Notification of initiation of the ccPDP4 to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Open comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line) and at a minimum 40 days.
4		**Notification of and appointment by Regional Organisations of a representative**	Issue Manager	April 2020	Each representative of a Regional Organisation shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager as part of and within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

Step	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
5		**Formal request to Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice**	ccNSO Council	April 2020	
6		**Formation of Working Group under ccPDP**	ccNSO Council	April 2020	As part of the ccPDP4,create a Working Group will be established
8		**Interim Papers**	ccPDP4 WG	November 2020	Various papers (sub) WG to be concluded at ICANN 69 (Hamburg) to be initially presented at ccNSO meeting
10	**Initial Report**		ccPDP4 WG	December 2020	Combined version of Interim papers. Public comment period of at least 40 days
11	**Draft Final Report**		ccPD4 WG & Issue Manager	February 2021	Publication Final Report of containing the recommendations to resolve issues as identified in Issues report, public comment of 40 days
17	**Adoption Process**				Adoption process ccNSO, including ccNSO membership vote.
		Adoption Final Report by WG	Issue Manager	May 2021	Ensure the Final Report reflects consensus of the WG on recommended policy
18		**Submission of Final Report to the ccNSO Council**	Issue Manager	May 2021	Preferably in time for ICANN's community forum FY 21
19		**Invite the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice**	ccNSO Council	May2021	Preferably in time for ICANN's community forum FY 21
20		**ccNSO Council Adoption of Final Report**	ccNSO Council	June 2021	After GAC has had opportunity to Advise or share its opinion.
21		**First round ccNSO members vote**	ccNSO Members	To be completed post Policy Forum June 2021	Note: the members vote is subject to quorum rule (at least 50 %) of the members

Step	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
					need to have cast a vote.
		Council decision to adopt Board Report	ccNSO Council	October 2021	Board report needs to include the results of members vote.
22	**Submission Board report**	**Board Report**	ccNSO Council	November 2021	

7. References

- RFC 1591 (https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt)
- ISO 3166 standard (http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes)
- The ccNSO Framework of Interpretation working group Final Report, (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf)
- The Fast Track Implementation Plan and related documents, latest version (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/fast-track-2012-02-25-en)
- The draft policy for the selection IDN ccTLD strings (September 2013) (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-26sep13-en.htm)
- The Final Report of the IDN policy preliminary review team (June 2019) (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/final-report-idn-prt-29jul19-en.pdf)
- The Board resolution on IDN (cc)TLD Variants (14 March 2019) (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-03-14-en#2.a) requesting the ccNSO to work on Variant Management and related relevant material (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en)
- Relevant resolutions of the ICANN Board of Directors as documented in the report
- Relevant correspondence between the ccNSO and ICANN Board of Directors.
- Issue report ccPDP4