Issues Report
IDN ccPDP
02 April 2009

Bart Boswinkel
Issue Manager

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1   Background

In the DNS, a ccTLD string (like .jp, .uk) represents the name of a country, territory or area of geographical interest, and its subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as 'territory' or 'territories') that is listed in ISO 3166-1. Traditionally it is represented by two US-ASCII characters. This method of identification was adopted for use in the Internet through RFC 920, dated October 1984, and reaffirmed through RFC 1591, dated March 1994. With a few exceptions, ccTLDs in use today are taken directly from the ISO 3166-1 list or, under special circumstances, from the list of exceptionally reserved code elements defined by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency.

The implementation of Internationalised Domain Names (IDN) for Top Level Domains (TLDs) will introduce the use of characters outside the US-ASCII character set (for example characters in Cyrillic, Chinese, Arabic, and other scripts) for domain name strings.

To help clarify the issues related to the use of IDNs in the ccTLD space, the
ICANN Board at its meeting on 8 December 2006 asked the ccNSO and the GAC to produce an issues paper relating to the introduction and selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes. (http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-08dec06.htm#_Toc27198296)

At its meeting on 27 June 2007 the ccNSO Council adopted the IDN Issues Paper (http://www.ccnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-09jul07.htm) as a ccNSO Issues Paper, and resolved to submit it to the ICANN Board in close cooperation with the GAC. The paper was submitted as a joint GAC ccNSO Issues Paper on Selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes.

At its meeting on 29 June 2007 the ICANN Board of Directors asked the ICANN community including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC to respond to the published list of issues and questions that must be addressed to move forward with IDN TLDs associated with the territories referenced on the ISO3166-1 list (IDN ccTLDs) in a manner that ensures the continued security and stability of the Internet. (www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-29jun07.htm#l)

At the same meeting the ICANN Board asked the ICANN community, including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC, to continue to work collaboratively, taking into consideration the technical limitations and requirements, to explore both an interim and an overall approach to IDN ccTLDs and recommend a course of action to the Board in a timely manner (www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-29jun07.htm#l)

Following a ccNSO Council recommendation and broad support of the ICANN community, including the GAC, GNSO and ALAC, the ICANN Board requested at its meeting in Los Angeles, November 2007, that the chairs of the ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO to establish the IDNC Working Group and appoint members to this group.   The Board further asked that, when established, the IDNC Working Group commence work, in accordance with its Charter (See: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idncwg.htm).

At the ICANN meeting in Paris (June 2008) the working group submitted its Final Report to the Board, including statements of the GAC and ccNSO on the proposed methodology. The Board also directed staff to commence work on implementation issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders; and submit implementation reports (version to date: http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-18feb09-en.htm)

At its meeting on 2 October 2007, the ccNSO Council resolved to initiate the country code Policy Development Process (ccPDP) to develop policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs and asked ICANN to create an Issue Report, in accordance with Annex B section 1 of the ICANN

Bylaws:

1. To determine whether Article IX of the ICANN by laws applies to IDN ccTLDs, and if not, whether Article IX should apply.
2. To recommend whether the ccNSO should launch a PDP to develop the policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs.

In preparing the Issue Report, the Issue Manager is required to identify any other policy matters or by-law changes to be considered in connection with the development of IDN ccTLD policy.

In preparing the Issue Report and in proposing a time line for the ccPDP, the Issue Manager is required to consider the joint ccNSO GAC Issues Paper, the technical limitations and requirements, and any other relevant matters identified by the Issues Manager.

1.2 Process

The IDN ccPDP will proceed as follows:

A. Preparation of this draft Issues Report.

B. Publication of this draft Issues Report for comment.

C. Review of the comments, and preparation and submission of a final Issues Report to the Council.

D. Council vote with respect to initiation of ccPDP as defined in the Issues Report, as required under ICANN By-laws Appendix B, section 3.

E. If the Council initiates the IDN ccPDP, preparation of a draft Initial Report.

F. Publication of the draft Initial Report for comment.

G. Review of the comments and preparation of the Initial Report.

H. Publication of the revised Initial Report for comment.

I. Review of the comments, and the preparation and submission of a Final Report to the Council

J. ccNSO Council development of Recommendations based on the Final Report.

K. ccNSO member vote on Recommendations.

L. Submission of approved Recommendations to the ICANN Board.

The Timeline for the IDN ccPDP set out in section 5, based on the framework outlined above and the methodology proposed in section 4 below.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Introduction
The Bylaws (Annex B) require the Issue Manager to recommend to the ccNSO Council whether or not to initiate a ccPDP. To recommend proceeding, the Issue Manager must first determine that the PDP Issue(s) to be addressed meet threshold criteria defined in the Annex B. (See section 2.3 below).

The Bylaws (Annex B) also require that any such recommendation include an opinion of ICANNs General Counsel as to whether or not the identified PDP Issues are within the scope of ICANN's mission statement and the scope of the ccNSO; implicate or affect an existing ICANN policy; and likely to have lasting value or applicability. (See section 2.4. below).

In the final section 2.5 the recommendation of the Issue Manager is included as to whether the Council should move to initiate the PDP for the issues raised by the joint GAC-ccNSO Working Group. In this particular Issue Report the requests of the ccNSO Council will be addressed to establish if Article IX of the ICANN by laws applies to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes, and if it does not then to establish if Article IX should apply as part of the Issues Managers recommendation

2.2 Summary of the issues raised in the ccNSO GAC Issues Paper
This section contains a summary of the main topics to be addressed in a policy recommendation through the IDN ccPDP. The first sets of issues (A to D) are the topic areas as identified by the joint GAC-ccNSO working Group. For reference the paper is included in Annex A.

A. General issues regarding IDN ccTLDs

Definition of IDN ccTLD

String selection methodology

Need for/possibility of creating an authoritative list of IDN ccTLD strings

Criteria for IDN ccTLD string selection methodology

Should an IDN ccTLD string be "meaningful"?

How many IDN ccTLDs per 'territory'?

How many scripts per 'territory'?

Number of characters in the string?

Are there any 'rights' attached to a given script?

B. Introduction of IDN ccTLDs

Should a list of IDN ccTLD strings be mandated?

What precedence should be given to ccTLDs in the IDN implementation process?

Who selects the IDN ccTLD string in the absence of a mandated list?

What coordination should exist between the different actors?

C. Delegation of IDN ccTLDs

D. Operation of IDN ccTLDs

E. Additional issues relating to Article IX of the ICANN bylaws

2.3 PDP Initiation Threshold Criteria

The proposed issues raised for consideration;
The issues raised for consideration are set out in the Issues Paper of the joint GAC-ccNSO working group, as submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors at the ICANN Puerto Rico meeting, June 2007 (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/jointwg.htm).

Further consideration of matters raised in the Issues Paper will likely raise a number of additional topics to be considered in the IDN ccPDP, including, for example, relevant Bylaw provisions and ccNSO membership structure changes.

The identity of the party submitting the issue;
A joint working group of the ccNSO and the GAC prepared the Issues Paper.

How that party is affected by the issue;
ccTLD managers and their respective 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.

2. 4 Opinion ICANN's General Counsel

ICANN Bylaws Annex B, Section 2.3 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.

> (Note: while the general subject of the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs is within scope of the ccNSO, it should be noted that a few of the particular questions raised by the GAC-ccNSO WG might not be within the scope of a ccNSO PDP on the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs, or within the scope of the ccNSO as defined in Annex C. For example, the WG asked "... can a gTLD registry get the Kanji script accepted under the IDNA protocol? Should that use be vetted/approved by Japan?")

In reaching the determination on the question of scope, the ICANN Bylaws specify that the following considerations should be examined; whether:
      1) The issue is within the scope of ICANN's mission statement;

2) Analysis of the relevant factors according to Article IX, Section 6(2) and Annex C affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope of the ccNSO;
3) Implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy;
4) 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 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. Policy development on IDN ccTLDs as outlined within this issues paper does fall within the scope of the ccNSO as elaborated in Annex C to the ICANN Bylaws <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.

2.5 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 for the issues identified in this report.

The ccNSO Council asked the Issue Manager:

1. To establish if Article IX of the ICANN by laws applies to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes, and if it does not then to establish if Article IX should apply.
2. To establish whether the ccNSO should launch a PDP to develop the policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes.

Applicability of Article IX to IDN ccTLDs
Under the Bylaws (Article IX Section 4.1) and for the purposes of Article IX, 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.

All of the work undertaken to date by the ccNSO, the GAC and the IDNC Working Group and all references to IDN ccTLDs by the ICANN Board have referred specifically to IDN ccTLDs being IDN TLDs associated with the ISO 3166 list of territories (referenced in this Issues Report as IDN ccTLDs).

Provided that, as a result of the IDN ccPDP, IDN ccTLDs are delegated to entities or organisations that are referred to in the IANA database under the heading of "Sponsoring Organization," Article IX will apply.

To address Issues identified in the IDN ccPDP, however, modifications to Article IX are likely to be required, particularly with respect to the structure of the ccNSO and its membership. In addition, the IDN ccPDP may produce a recommendation to more clearly define the term ccTLD manager. Amendments may also be required to remove any doubt as to the applicability of Article IX to IDN ccTLDs. Consideration of necessary changes to Article IX is a topic that is within the scope of the ccNSO PDP.

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 Joint ccNSO GAC Issues Paper, considering that the Threshold Criteria are met, and taking into account General Counsel's opinion, the Issues Manager recommends that the ccNSO Council initiates an IDN ccPDP to develop policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs and identify any changes to Article IX and annexes needed in connection with such policy.

3. Uncertainty of approval of outcome by the ICANN Board

The Bylaws (Annex B section 2.g) require the Issue Manager to advise as to whether the IDN ccPDP is likely to result in a policy that will be approved by the ICANN Board. To date, no substantive discussion on these issues has taken place. Such discussions are to commence in the next phase of the ccPDP. Therefore 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 outcome of the ccPDP.

4. Methodology

Taskforce

The Bylaws permit the ccNSO Council to appoint a Task Force to gather information documenting the positions of the various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, 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 t, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.

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 the IDNC Working Group 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 two working groups each with its own charter, working method and schedule.

The purpose of the first working group is to study and report on a feasible 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 (see: Annex A) and comments received on that document (see reference list), the Final Report of the IDNC Working Group and the associated Implementation Plan. The Council should invite the ALAC, GAC and GNSO to participate in and appoint each two members to this Working Group. The SSAC and technical community should be invited to appoint

one member to the working group. The Issue Manager further recommends the inclusion of an expert on standardisation. A draft charter for the Working Group is included as Annex B.

The purpose of the second working group is to report on changes to Article IX of the ICANN bylaws necessitated by the policy recommended by the first working group. The Issue Manager recommends that the Council invite members of the ccNSO and IDN ccTLD managers delegated under the Fast Track, if any, to participate in this Working Group, and include experts to assess the impact of the proposed policy on Article IX and associated annexes and evaluate the impact of the proposed amendments of Article IX and annexes. A draft charter for the Working Group is included as Annex C. The ccNSO Council should review the charter of the second working group after the first working group has produced its initial Paper (see section 5 Proposed Time line).

5. Proposed PDP Time line

Under the Bylaws (Annex B) a PDP must proceed on in predefined stages, some of which may involve a minimal period of time.

The issuance of this draft Issue Report concludes the first stage.

The Issue manager recommends that in the next stage, the Council seek comment and input from stakeholders on the issues raised and possible alternative solutions, if any, to resolve the issues.

Final comments and input should be requested on concrete proposals, leading to recommendations to be presented to the ccNSO Council and members for a vote, leading to Recommendations to be presented to the ICANN Board of Directors.

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

Accordingly, the tentative time line to conduct the PDP is the following:

	Event		Entity	Tentative Date completion	Comment
1	**Draft Issue Report**		Issue Manager	February 2009	To be presented to the Council for the Mexico meeting
2	**Formal Launch of the IDN ccPDP**		ccNSO Council	April 2009	ccNSO Council vote
3		Public notification of Initiation of IDN ccPDP	Issue Manager	April 2009	Notification of initiation of the IDN ccPDP to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Open comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and

					ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be commenced for the issue.
4		Notification of and appointment by Regional Organisations of a representative	Issue Manager	April 2009	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	April 2009	
6		**Formation of Working Group I under ccPDP**	ccNSO Council	April 2009	As part of the IDN ccPDP, a cross constituency Working Group will be established to propose a definition of, and a policy for delegation and introduction of IDN ccTLDs .
7		**Topic Paper of IDN ccPDP WG I**	IDN ccPDP WG I	June 2009	To be published in time for full discussion at the Sydney ICANN meeting
8		**Interim Paper**	IDN ccPDP WG I	October 2009	To be published in time to be discussed at ICANN meeting and public comment
9		**Formation WG II**	ccNSO Council	October 2009	To accommodate IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO, the structure of the ccNSO will likely need to be modified. The recommendations of the IDN ccPDP will include such changes.
10		**Final Paper WG I**	IDN ccPDP WG I	February 2010	
		Closure of	ccNSO	February 2010	

		WG I	Council		
11		**Topic Paper WG II**	IDN ccPDP WG II	February 2010	Issues paper on topics related to necessary changes of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws and associated Annexes. To be published in time for discussion at ICANN meeting and public comment
12		**Interim Paper IDN WG II**	IDN ccPDP WG II	June 2010	
13		**Final Paper WG II**		October 2010	
14		**Closure of Working Group II**	ccNSO Council	ICANN 39 meeting	
15	**Initial Report IDN ccPDP**		Issue Manager	October 2010	Interim Report will incorporate recommendations IDN ccPDP WG I and WG II. To be published in time for full discussion at ICANN meeting and public comment
16	**Final Report**		Issue Manager	February 2011	Final Report of containing the recommendations to resolve issues as identified in Issues Paper as adopted by the ccNSO Council (#
17	**Adoption Process**				Adoption process ccNSO, including ccNSO membership vote.
18		**Submission of Final Report to the ccNSO Council**	Issue Manager	February 2011	
19		**Invite the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice**	ccNSO Council	February 2011	
20		**ccNSO Council Adoption of Final Report**	ccNSO Council	March 2011	

21		**ccNSO members vote**	ccNSO Members	To be completed by June 2011	
22	**Submission Board report**	**Board Report**	ccNSO Council	June 2011	

Annex A: Issues Report joint GAC-ccNSO Working Group

ISSUES PAPER
Selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with
the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes

Background: In the DNS, a ccTLD string (like .jp, .uk) has been defined to represent the name of a country, territory or area of geographical interest, and its subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as 'territory' or 'territories') as identified in ISO 3166[1], and is represented by 2 US-ASCII characters. This method of identification was adopted for use in the Internet through RFC 920, dated October 1984, and reaffirmed through RFC 1591, dated March 1994. All ccTLDs in use today are taken directly from the ISO 3166-1 list[2] or from the list of exceptionally reserved code elements defined by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. There are two sources used by ISO to develop the 3166 lists; the United Nations Terminology Bulletin *Country Names* or the *Country and Region Codes for Statistical Use* Of the UN Statistics Division.

The implementation of Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) ccTLDs introduces the (apparent) use of symbols outside the US-ASCII character set (for example characters in Cyrillic, Chinese, Arabic, and other scripts) for domain name strings. It has been generally accepted that the implementation of such proposed IDN ccTLDs must be in compliance with the IDNA protocol standards, RFC 3454, 3490, 3491, and 3492[3]. For more information on these standards see http://www.icann.org/general/idnguidelines-22feb06.htm and the references therein to RFCs 3454, 3490, 3491, and 3492.

To help clarify the issues related to the use of IDNs in the ccTLD space, the ICANN Board has asked the ccNSO and the GAC to produce an issues paper relating to the introduction and selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes[4].

In response the ccNSO and the GAC have formed a joint working group and have considered a non-exhaustive list of questions detailed below. Note that a number of the issues below are interrelated and the answer to one may potentially be dependant on the outcome of another.

To facilitate understanding and further discussion, the different questions are grouped in four clusters: 1) General, 2) Introduction, 3) Delegation and 4) Operation.

---

[1] http://www.iso.org/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/04background-on-iso-3166/what-is-iso3166.html
[2] http://www.iso.org/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/02iso-3166-code-lists/list-en1.html
[3] The IDNA protocol is currently undergoing revision, as such the mentioned RFC's may be updated accordingly
[4] ICANN Board resolution of 8 December 2006 at http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-08dec06.htm#_Toc27198296

General issues regarding IDN ccTLDs
Which 'territories' are eligible for an IDN ccTLD?

The existence of IDNs as ccTLDs assumes a direct relationship between an IDN TLD string and a 'territory' as in ASCII ccTLDs.

a) Should this relationship be maintained?

b) If so, should the 'territories' which are potentially eligible for IDN ccTLDs be exactly the same as the 'territories' that are listed in the ISO-3166-1 list?

c) If not, should another list be used or should another mechanism be developed?

d)   Should anything be done about ccTLDs already being used as gTLDs?

Should an IDN ccTLD string be "meaningful"?

An ASCII ccTLD string 'represents' the name of a 'territory' based on its entry into the ISO 3166-1 list.

a) Is there an obligation to make the IDN ccTLD string 'meaningful' in its representation of the name of a 'territory'? For example, whereas .uk is 'meaningful' because it is a commonly used abbreviation for United Kingdom, .au is not 'meaningful' because the commonly used abbreviations for Australia are Oz or Aus.

b) If so, how is "meaningful" determined and by whom?

How many IDN ccTLDs per script per 'territory'?

Apart from some exceptions, there is one single ASCII ccTLD per listed 'territory'.

a) Should there similarly be only a single IDN ccTLD for a given script for each 'territory' or can there be multiple IDN ccTLD strings? For example, should there be only one equivalent of .cn in Chinese script for China or .ru in Cyrillic for Russia?

b) Could there be several IDN strings for a 'territory' in a script? If so, who would determine the number and what are the criteria?

c) If an IDN ccTLD string is not applied for, for whatever reason, should an IDN ccTLD string that could be associated with a particular 'territory' be reserved or protected in some way?

How many scripts per 'territory'?

a) Can a 'territory' apply for more than one IDN ccTLD string in different scripts if more than one

script is used to represent languages spoken in that location? For example in Japan more than one script is used to represent the Japanese language. In other words, should there be a limit on the number of scripts each territory can apply for?

b) In what circumstances would it be appropriate to seek to introduce a limit on the number of scripts a 'territory' may choose to introduce for a ccTLD or any TLD with a national connection?

c) Can a 'territory' apply for an IDN ccTLD string even if the script is not used in a language with any 'official status' in that 'territory'? For example, if the Kanji script is accepted under the IDNA protocol, can Australia apply for a representation of Australia in that script even though neither the script nor any language deriving from it has any 'official' status in Australia?

d) If 'official status' is required who will define it and who will determine it in each case?

Number of characters in the string?

Currently, ccTLD strings are limited to 2 US-ASCII characters and gTLDs to 3 or more. It is understood that abbreviations can be problematic for internationalized TLDs as abbreviations used in US-ASCII are not used on a global basis in all scripts. The underlying nature of IDN makes the actual string inserted in the DNS always longer than two characters when expressed in Unicode (due to the IDNA requirement to prefix internationalized labels with 'xn—'). However, it is how the string appears in its non US-ASCII character set that is important. In this context:

a) Should all IDN ccTLD strings be of a fixed length, for example by retaining the two-character limitation that applies to ASCII ccTLD labels, or can they be of variable length? If a variable string length is introduced for IDN ccTLDs, should it also be introduced for ASCII ccTLDs?

b) Does moving outside the current 2-symbol limitation create any security, stability or integrity issues?

c) Who determines the appropriate label used to represent a new IDN ccTLD string, and how are the set of characters used to represent this label selected?

Are there any 'rights' attached to a given script?

In purely technical terms, a script is a collection of symbols. However, each of those collections of symbols when put together in particular ways produce the 'languages' of groups of people sometimes defined by borders, although very often not. These groups are often referred to as language communities.

a) Should such groups (or their governments) have special rights regarding those scripts? For example, should the Korean language community be entitled to restrict the use of the Hangul script? If special rights exist what is the procedure to exert these rights and resolve conflicts?

b) Can anyone get acceptance of a script under the IDNA protocol or are there restrictions? For example, can a gTLD registry get the Kanji script accepted under the IDNA protocol? Should that use be vetted/approved by Japan? If yes, would the same requirement apply if a script were used in more then one 'territory'?

c) Should it be possible to adopt two or more 'versions' of a script with only minor differences for use under the IDNA protocol and are there issues or concerns should this occur?

2. Introduction of IDN ccTLDs

Should a list of IDN ccTLD strings be mandated?

In the US-ASCII case, ccTLD strings are currently primarily based on the ISO 3166-1 Alpha 2 list. If a similar mechanism were adopted for IDN ccTLDs, this could mean that every ISO 3166 entry would have an equivalent IDN ccTLD string(s) to represent it.

a) Is such a list necessary?

b) Who would develop such a list?

c) Should such a list be mandated?

d) If yes, by whom?

e) Who would develop the criteria and relevant policies for identifying IDN ccTLDs?

f) Under what policy or authority would the list be created?

g) If additional criteria and or policies are required, who is responsible for formulating that policy?

What precedence should be given to ccTLDs in the IDN implementation process?

Who selects the IDN ccTLD string in the absence of a mandated list?

If IDN ccTLD strings are not going to come from a mandated list then, how does an IDN ccTLD string become designated as the string for a particular 'territory'?

a) What are the criteria and policies to determine who can submit a request for the designation of an IDN ccTLD?

b) Who will develop the criteria and policies for determining the designation of an IDN ccTLD?

c) How will such issues as competing requests (both domestic and international) be dealt with?

d) What will happen if 2 'territories' are eligible for the same or confusingly similar strings for IDN ccTLD?

What coordination should exist between the different actors?

The deployment of IDN ccTLDs will require coordination among various actors, within territories and ICANN constituencies. Irrespective of the methodology employed, some coordination questions must be addressed, such as:

a) Who are the appropriate actors?

b) What are their roles?

c) Do the GAC ccTLD principles need to be revised in the light of the introduction of IDN ccTLDs?

4. Operation of IDN ccTLDs

Is the operation and management of an IDN ccTLD different to that of an existing US-ASCII ccTLD such that there are specific global technical requirements, in addition to the general IDN standards, needed for the operation of an IDN ccTLD? If so, how are those requirements developed and who would develop them?

Annex B: Charter Working Group I

1. Purpose

The purpose of the working group (WG) is to report on and identify a feasible policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 (IDN ccTLDs) within the framework of the IDN ccPDP.

2. Scope

In meeting its purpose, the WG shall focus on, without limitation, examination of the topics raised in joint GAC-ccNSO Issues paper and comments received on that document. It shall also take into account the proposals and recommendations of the IDNC Working Group and the Implementation Plan based on the work of the IDNC WG.

As this WG will undertake its activities within the framework of the IDN ccPDP, the limitations on the scope of a ccPDP, in particular by Article IX of and Annex C to the Bylaws, shall limit the scope of the WG's work in a similar manner.

If issues outside this scope become apparent to the WG, the Chair of the WG should inform the ccNSO Council of the issue so that it can be taken into account and dealt with more appropriately.

3. WG Members, Observers and Experts

Members of the WG
The working group will have the following members

- Ten (10) ccTLD managers or their nominees (being 2 from each of the 5 ICANN Geographic Regions) and the chair of the ccNSO.

- Two (2) members nominated by the ALAC;

- Two (2) members nominated by the GAC;

- Two (2) members nominated by the GNSO;

- One (1) member nominated by the SSAC;

- One (1) representative from the technical community

In the event there are fewer than 2 ccTLD nominations from a Geographic Region the vacancy may be filled by a nominee from another Geographic Region, to be selected by the ccNSO Council. In the event there are 3 or more ccTLD nominations from the same Geographic Region the ccNSO Council will decide which nominees shall be appointed to the WG.

The WG members shall select a chair and alternate chair from the members of the Working Group.

Observers to the WG
The WG will additionally have observers. Observers shall not be considered members of the WG, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing with members.

The WG will have the following observers:
- The Issue Manager for the IDN ccPDP

- One (1) observer from each of the Regional Organisations as defined in Section 5 of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws.
- Any person appointed as observer by the chair of the WG

Experts to the WG

The chair of the working group may also appoint experts as advisors to the WG. Experts shall not be considered members of the WG, but otherwise are entitled to participate on an equal footing.

Staff Support

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

4. Processes and Working Methodology

a. WG Topic Paper

The WG shall publish for public consultation a Topic Paper on the topics and issues, which in the view of the WG need to be taken into consideration to propose a feasible policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs (the Issues) on the schedule set forth in the WG Time Line (set forth in Section 5. below). The consultation should include a public discussion with the relevant stakeholders at a designated ICANN meeting.

b. WG Interim Paper

At the conclusion of the public consultation period, the WG shall prepare an Interim Paper, which, building on the Topic Report, shall include, a proposal for policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs (Draft Recommended Policy), and any documentation necessitated by the Draft Recommended Policy. . The Interim Paper shall also contain a review and analysis of comments made on the Topic Paper. The Interim Paper shall be published for public consultation on the schedule set forth in the WG Time Line (set forth in Section 5. below). The chair of the WG will send the Interim Paper to the Issue Manager of the IDN ccPDP.

c. WG Final Paper

At the end of the public consultation on the Interim Paper, the WG shall prepare a Final Paper reflecting the Interim Paper, the comments received on that Paper from the public consultation period, and the Draft Recommended Policy. The recommendations of the WG shall be included in the Interim Report of the IDN ccPDP.

d. WG Methodology

In developing its Papers, the WG shall seek to reach consensus among its members. If there is a minority view of the members on a particular issue, that minority position shall be articulated in the relevant WG Paper.

The WG will consider public comments and other input as appropriate, in its reasonable discretion. The WG is not obliged to include such comments or other input, including comments submitted by or input from any one individual or organisation.

The Final Paper shall be published within fourteen (14) days after adoption of the Report by the WG and conveyed to the chairs of the ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO and SSAC and to the Issue Manager of the IDN ccPDP for inclusion in the Interim Report in the IDN ccPDP.

e. Adjustment of Timeline

In the event the chair of the WG is of the view the Time Line as set forth in section 5, is untenable, the chair will inform the chair of the ccNSO Council with a request to adjust the

timeline.

f. Closure of the Working Group
Upon submission of the Final Paper to the Issue Manager, the WG will be closed **by the ccNSO Council at its first meeting following the submission of the Final Report.**

g. Omission in or unreasonable impact of Charter
The chair of the WG shall exercise reasonable discretion with respect to question as to which 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. WG Time Line

Activity	Date*	Closure*	Minimal Duration
Establishment of Working Group	April 2009		
Publish Topic Paper	12 June 2009	NA	NA
Public Comment on Initial Report	12 June 2009	1 July 2009	28 days
Publish Interim Report	9 October 2009		NA
Public Comment on Interim Report	9 October 2009	13 November 2009	35 days
Publish Final Report	2 weeks prior ICANN 37 meeting (February 2010)		NA
Closure of the WG	ccNSO Council meeting at ICANN 37		

* Latest date possible to meet minimal duration for public consultation period.
** It is assumed in this schedule / time line the Final Paper is presented at an ICANN meeting.

6. References

Issues Report joint GAC-ccNSO Working group
http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/jointwg.htm

IDNC WG Final Report < http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idncwg.htm>
Public Comments on IDNC Final Report http://forum.icann.org/lists/idn-cctld-fast-track/

Implementation Plan IDN ccTLD Fast Track
http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-18feb09-en.htm

Public comments on Implementation Plan

Issue Report IDN ccPDP < to be included >

Annex C: Charter Working Group II

1. Purpose

The purpose of the working group (WG) is to report on changes to Article IX and relevant Annexes in the Bylaws to include IDN ccTLD's as full members and on equal in the ccNSO on equal footing as the current members (ASCII ccTLDs) as necessitated by the policy recommended by the first working group.

2. Scope

In meeting its purpose, the WG shall focus on, without limitation, examination of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws to include IDN ccTLD's, taking into account the proposed overall policy for the introduction of IDN ccTLD's, the Final Report of the IDNC WG, and the Implementation Plan the based on the work of the IDNC WG.

As this WG will undertake its activities within the framework of the IDN ccPDP, the limitations on the scope of a ccPDP, in particular by Article IX of and Annexes B and C to the Bylaws, shall limit the scope of this Working Group's work in a similar manner.

If issues outside this scope become apparent to the WG, the Chair of the WG should inform the ccNSO Council of the issue so that it can be taken into account and dealt with more appropriately.

3. WG Members, Observers and Experts

Members of the WG
The working group will have the following members

- Ten (10) (IDN) ccTLD managers or their nominees (being 2 from each of the 5 ICANN Geographic Regions) and the chair of the ccNSO.

In the event there are fewer than 2 ccTLD nominations from a Geographic Region the vacancy may be filled by a nominee from another Geographic Region, to be selected by the ccNSO Council. In the event there are 3 or more ccTLD nominations from the same Geographic Region the ccNSO Council will decide which nominees shall be appointed to the WG.

The WG members shall select a chair and alternate chair from the members of the Working Group.

Observers to the WG
The WG will additionally have observers. Observers shall not be considered members of the WG, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing with members.

The WG will have the following observers:
- The Issue Manager for the IDN ccPDP
- One (1) observer from each of the Regional Organisations as defined in Section 5 of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws.
- Any person appointed as observer by the chair of the WG

Experts to the WG

The chair of the working group may also appoint experts as advisors to the WG. Experts shall not be considered members of the WG, but otherwise are entitled to participate on an equal footing.

Staff supports

ICANN will provide adequate staff support to the WG

4. Processes and Working Methodology

a. WG Topic Paper

The WG shall publish for public consultation a Topic Paper on the topics and issues, which in the view of the WG need to be taken into consideration for changes of Article IX of the ICANN bylaws (the Issues) on the schedule set forth in the WG Time Line (set forth in Section 5. below). The consultation should include a public discussion with the relevant stakeholders at a designated ICANN meeting.

b. WG Interim Paper

At the conclusion of the public consultation period, the WG shall prepare a Interim Paper which, building on the Topic Report, shall include a proposal for changes to Article IX of the ICANN bylaws policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs (Draft Recommendations), an impact analysis of the proposed changes and any documentation necessitated by the Draft Recommended Policy. The Interim Paper shall also contain a review and analysis of comments made on the Topic Paper. The Interim Paper shall be published for public consultation on the schedule set forth in the WG Time Line (set forth in Section 5. below). The chair of the WG will send the Interim Paper to the Issue Manager of the IDN ccPDP.

c. WG Final Paper

At the end of the public consultation on the Interim Paper, the WG shall prepare a Final Paper reflecting the Interim Paper, the comments received on that Paper from the public consultation period, and the Draft Recommended Policy. The recommendations of the WG shall be included in the Interim Report of the IDN ccPDP.

d. WG Methodology

In developing its Papers, the WG shall seek to reach consensus among its members. If there is a minority view of the members on a particular issue, that minority position shall be articulated in the relevant WG Paper.

The WG will consider public comments and other input as appropriate, in its reasonable discretion. The WG is not obliged to include such comments or other input, including comments submitted by or input from any one individual or organisation.

The Final Paper shall be published within fourteen (14) days after adoption of the Paper by the WG and conveyed to the chairs of the ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO and SSAC and to the Issue Manager of the IDN ccPDP for inclusion in the Interim Report in the IDN ccPDP.

h. Adjustment of Timeline

In the event the chair of the WG is of the view the Time Line as set forth in section 5, is untenable, the chair will inform the chair of the ccNSO Council with a request to adjust the timeline.

i. Closure of the Working Group

Upon submission of the Final Paper to the Issue Manager, the WG will be closed by the ccNSO Council at its meeting following the submission of the Final Report.

j. Omission in or unreasonable impact of Charter

The chair of the WG shall exercise reasonable discretion with respect to question as to which 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. WG Time Line

Activity	Date*	Closure*	Minimal Duration
Establish Working Group 2	October 2009		Submission date Final Paper
Publish Topic Paper	February 2010	NA	NA
Public Comment on Initial Report	February 2010	March 2010	28 days
Publish Interim Report	June 2010		NA
Public Comment on Interim Report	June 2010	July 2010	35 days
Publish Final Report	2 weeks prior ICANN 39 meeting (October 2010)		NA

* Latest date possible to meet minimal duration for public consultation period.
** It is assumed in this schedule / time line the Final Paper is presented at an ICANN meeting.

6. References

Issues   Report   joint   GAC-ccNSO   Working   group
http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/jointwg.htm

IDNC WG Final Report < http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idncwg.htm>
Public Comments on IDNC Final Report http://forum.icann.org/lists/idn-cctld-fast-track/

Implementation   Plan   IDN   ccTLD   Fast   Track
http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-18feb09-en.htm

Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws
http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#IX