TABLE OF CONTENTS – Reference Materials

Consent Agenda

06 September 2013

To: ICANN Board
From: The SSAC Chair
Via: The SSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board

The purpose of this letter is to bring you up-to-date on proposed changes to the membership of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) and to provide an explanation for the attached requests for Board action. These changes are the result of ongoing new member evaluations conducted by the SSAC Membership Committee and approved by the SSAC. In addition, one SSAC member has elected to resign from the Committee.

The SSAC Membership Committee considers new member candidates and makes its recommendations to the SSAC. The SSAC has agreed with the Membership Committee's recommendation to nominate Xiaodong Lee and Carlos Martinez as new members of the SSAC.

Mr. Lee was appointed to the SSAC on 25 July 2010 but he resigned on 31 January 2012 to join ICANN as Vice President of the Asia Pacific Region. Earlier this year, Mr. Lee left ICANN to become CEO of CNNIC. He also holds a position as Research Professor at the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CNIC). Mr. Lee brings extensive experience and understanding about the Asia Pacific Region, especially China, in addition to broad technical competence in areas of interest to SSAC.

Mr. Martinez currently is the Security and Stability Manager at LACNIC. He is also Assistant Professor at the School of Engineering of the Universidad de la República in Montevideo, Uruguay. Mr. Martinez brings experience and technical expertise from the Latin American region, as well as experience in Regional Internet Registries (RIRs).

Thus, the SSAC respectfully requests that the ICANN Board should appoint Mr. Lee and Mr. Martinez to the SSAC for three-year terms. Their biographical information is attached for your reference.

The Board appointed Vanda Scartezini to the SSAC on 25 June 2010 for a term ending on 31 December 2013. On 25 July 2013 Ms. Scartezini indicated that she is resigning from the SSAC at the end of her term. Ms. Scartezini has been a valued SSAC member who has made many excellent contributions to the Committee's work. The SSAC requests that the Board should join the Committee in extending its thanks to Ms. Scartezini for her service to the SSAC and the Community.

The SSAC welcomes comments from the Board concerning these requests.

Patrik Fältström, SSAC Chair

1

2006	"*Some Considerations on the Design of Multiservice Backbone Networks*" In Spanish, Telcom2006, Montevideo, Uruguay
2006	"*An Introduction to Flow-Aware Networking*" In Spanish, Telcom2006, Montevideo, Uruguay
2006	"*CERT.uy – Hacia un CSIRT Nacional*" In Spanish, Telcom2006, Montevideo, Uruguay
2003	"*A Real World Example of a Distributed E-mail System*" CITA2003, Montevideo, Uruguay
1998	"*Nonlinear Joint Transform Correlator Using One-dimensional Fourier Transformation*" Optical Engineering 37 (10) (1998) 2742

Past Research	
2005 **ANTEL** **U. de la República** **Uruguay**	Creation of *Computer Security Incident Response Teams* (CSIRTs) (5) (6) including methodology, procedural and management aspects.
2004 **INRIA** **France**	"*Modeling of a TCP/IP Network Stack in the Synchronous Language SIGNAL*" Internship in IRISA / INRIA, ESPRESSO Team[1] Director: Jean-Pierre Talpin Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, France

2001-2004
 U. de la República
 Uruguay
	Research topics during this period included:
	 · Network management
	     o Implementation of components of the TMN management architecture for IP networks.
	     o Offline path computation architectures (7; 8)
	 · Alternative quality of service approaches
	     o Flow-Aware Networking (4)
	 · Design of large-scale IP backbone networks

---

[1] ESPRESSO Team: http://www.irisa.fr/activity/research/espresso

23 October 2013

Heather Dryden
Chair of Governmental Advisory Committee

Re: ccNSO Policy Recommendations on IDN ccNSO Issues

Dear Heather,

Pursuant to Article XI, Section 2.1.j of the ICANN Bylaws, this letter is to formally notify the GAC that the ccNSO Council has approved policy recommendations on the IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process. The Board Report provided to the Board on these recommendations is provided with this letter. The Board formally received this report on [DATE], and intends to consider the policy recommendations contained within the Board Report at its first regularly scheduled meeting after ICANN's meetings in Buenos Aires. In the event that the GAC believes that there are public policy issues raised by these recommendations and provides advice accordingly on those issues, ICANN will take the GAC's advice into account on this matter as set forth in the Bylaws.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Crocker

Los Angeles Offices: 12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300   Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536   USA   T +1 310 301 5800   F +1 310 823 8649
Brussels   •   Silicon Valley   •   Sydney   •   Washington

Page 13/49
http://icann.org

Board Report
IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process

September 2013
ccNSO PDP Issue Manager
Bart Boswinkel

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The purpose of this IDN country code policy development process (IDN ccPDP) Board Report is to convey to the ICANN Board of Directors 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.

The ccNSO Recommendation results from the adoption by the ccNSO members of the ccNSO Council Recommendation by electronic vote concluded on 13 August 2013. The Council Recommendation contains all policy proposals as suggested in the Final Report, as submitted to the Council on 1 April 2013, which are the result of work by two working groups, extensive consultations, and takes into account the experience from 3 years IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process and two reviews. The ccNSO Council adopted the recommendations contained in the Final Report at its meeting on 10 April 2013.

The proposed policy is a two-stage process:
> Stage 1: String selection in Territory
> Stage 2: Evaluation of proposed string

The policy proposals describe (at a high level) the criteria and requirements for the string selection and activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the string selection and string evaluation processes and procedures. These proposed processes and procedures are an integral part of the policy recommendations. At the same time it is anticipated that further detail may need to be added as a matter of implementation. It is recommended that the ccNSO reviews and approves the final planning document, prior to implementation.

In addition overarching principles are presented. Their purpose is to set the parameters around and provide a framework for interpretation of the policy proposals.

It is recommended that the delegation of IDN ccTLDs shall be in accordance with the delegation process of (ASCII) ccTLDs. Thus the proposals contained in this report build on and are complementary to the delegation, re-delegation and retirement processes applicable to all ccTLDs. This implies that - once the evaluation process has been successfully completed - the policy, procedures and practices for the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs apply.

To facilitate the inclusion of IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, two main principles were identified that should be maintained:
1. The underlying principle for the creation of ccTLDs (ASCII and IDN's) is listing on the ISO 3166 -1 standard (including territories that are listed on the exceptionally reserved list of ISO 3166-1). This principle should also be reflected in the ccNSO.

2. All (IDN and ASCII) ccTLD managers should be treated equally. In this context this implies parity between managers within a Territory and parity across Territories.

In order to enable the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO, changes to the ccNSO Membership definition are proposed. Further to accommodate the anticipated changes to the structure of the ccNSO, it is recommended to change sections in Article IX and Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws relating to:
   - The Initiation of a country code Policy Development Process
   - Voting rules pertaining to selection of ccNSO Councilors and the ccPDP, in particular the members vote
   - The Quorum rules pertaining to membership votes.

It is further recommended that the proposed changes to the ccNSO should be reviewed within five years, after implementation.

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[1]. 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[2] 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[3] .

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[4]:
- 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

---

[1] http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/ccnso-gac-issues-report-on-idn-09jul07.pdf
[2] http://ccnso.icann.org/about/minutes/ccnso-council-call-02oct07.pdf
[3] http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-16nov09-en.htm
[4] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-07apr09.pdf

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.[5] The recommendations contained in the Final Paper were integrated in the Interim Report[6]. 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.

The IDN ccPDP WG 2 has published its recommendations in its Final Paper in November 2012.[7] 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 incudes 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.

---

[5] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-recommendations-idn-cctld-selection-21dec12-en.pdf
[6] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/idn-ccpdp-05feb13-en.htm
[7] http://ccnso.icann.org/node/35859

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 is required according to section 10 of the ccNSO PDP rules.

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 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, 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[8].

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.

---

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

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.

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 this 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[9].

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[10].
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.

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

---

[9]   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.
[10]   See ISO 3166-1: 2006 Section 5.1

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   9

Page 22/49

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)[11].

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

---

[11]   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.

- That the selected string meets the meaningfulness criteria.

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[12] (letter [a-z] codes), nor
2. Existing TLDs or Reserved Names as referenced in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook[13]

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[14].

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[15].

---

[12]   International Organization for Standardization, "Information Technology – ISO 7-bit coded character set for information interchange," ISO Standard 646, 1991
[13]   Version 2012-06-04, section 2.2.1.2.1 Reserved Names.
[14]   Based on Unicode Technical Report #36, Section 2: Visual Security Issues
[15]   https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-dns-zone-codepoint-pples/

Notes and Comments

The rule on confusing similarity originates from the IDNC 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[16].

J. Variants PLACEHOLDER
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.

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

---

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

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[17]. 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.

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

---

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

<u>Definition of Significantly Interested Parties</u>. 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."

<u>Classification of input</u>
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[18].

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.
- 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

---

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

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[19]" 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[20] and confusing similarity[21] validity of the selected IDN ccTLD strings and details of the reporting as foreseen for the validation processes.

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.

---

[19]   Or any other name ICANN would prefer.
[20]   See section 2.1.2 H above
[21]   See 2.1.2 I above

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.

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[22].

D. Transitional arrangement regarding IDN ccTLD strings under the Fast Track IDN ccTLD Process
1. Closure of Fast Track Process. Upon implementation of the policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs by ICANN, the policy for selection of IDN ccTLDs only applies to new requests, unless a requester indicates otherwise.
2. If an IDN ccTLD string request submitted under the Fast Track Process is still in process or has been terminated due to non-validation of the string, the requester may within three months after implementation of the policy request a second, final validation review by the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel .

E. Review of policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings
It is recommended that the policy will be reviewed within five years after implementation or at such an earlier time warranted by extraordinary circumstances. It is also recommended that the ICANN Board of Directors should initiate such a review including consulting the ALAC, ccNSO and GAC on the Terms of Reference for the review.

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

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

---

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

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   23

overall policy does not provide sufficient guidance and/or the impact of the policy is considered to be unreasonable or unfair for a particular class of cases.

The IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel members should consist of one member from ALAC, two members from the ccNSO, two members of the GAC, one member of SSAC. The ICANN Board should appoint the members of the Panel nominated by the related Supporting Organisation and Advisory Committees.

Section 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*".

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   25

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.

3. Process to date

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[23]. It was clear that the development of the required policy for IDN ccTLDs to resolve the identified issues was likely to take a minimum of 2 years. Also it was clear that such a time frame was a major concern for countries and territories, which 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[24] 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's.

At its meeting on 2 November 2007, the ICANN Board of Directors invited the Chairs of the ccNSO, GNSO, GAC, ALAC, and SSAC to set-up the IDNC Working Group and appoint members to this group and, when established, requests the IDNC Working Group to commence its work, in accordance with the Charter adopted by the ccNSO Council[25].

The recommendations of the IDNC WG were presented to the ccNSO and GAC and submitted to the ICANN Board of directors in June 2008 at the Paris ICANN meeting[26]. The Board directed staff to commence work on implementation issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders[27]. After extensive consultations and the Final Implementation for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process was adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors at its meeting in Seoul in October 2009[28] and the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process was launched on 16 November 2009[29]

On 2 April 2009, the Issue Manager published the Final Issue Report[30], which includes the recommendation to initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process, and the opinion of ICANN's General Counsel[31] that the general subject of the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLD is within the scope of a ccNSO PDP.

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[32]:

---

[23] http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/ccnso-gac-issues-report-on-idn-09jul07.pdf
[24] http://ccnso.icann.org/about/minutes/ccnso-council-call-02oct07.pdf
[25] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-02nov07-en.htm#_Toc55609363
[26] http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-26jun08-en.htm
[27] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-26jun08-en.htm#_Toc76113172
[28] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30oct09-en.htm#2
[29] http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-16nov09-en.htm
[30] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-issues-report-idn-ccpdp-02apr09.pdf
[31] The opinion of ICANN's General Counsel is required per section 2, Annex B ICANN Bylaws.
[32] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-07apr09.pdf

- 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 necessitated by the policy recommended by the first working group.

On 31 August 2009 the IDN ccPDP WG 1 started its activities. This resulted in publication of a draft Topic Paper on 4 November 2009[33]. The purpose of the Topic Paper was to identify and define the topics and issues that, 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 WG therefore sought input and comments from the community on whether the topics and issues that had been identified by the WG are the relevant one's that needed to be addressed by a global policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs. The public comment period closed at 4 December 2009. Based on the comments received and their analysis[34] the Topic Paper was updated and posted[35].

To move forward the chair of the WG had a chair's Interim Paper published for pubic comment[36]. The purpose of this paper was to report to the community on structure and potential directions of the recommendations for the overall policy. Building on the Topic Paper, an initial draft for the proposed policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs (Draft Recommended Policy), and any documentation necessitated by the Draft Recommended Policy was presented for discussion. The proposed policy followed the Methodology of the Fast Track Process as proposed by the IDNC Working Group and implemented under the Fast Track Process. The public comment period closed on 2 April 2010 and the summary and analysis of the comments received was posted on 26 April 2010[37].

In November 2010, the WG published its Progress report[38] prior to the ICANN meeting in Cartagena, Columbia (5-10 December 2010). The goal of this report was to inform the community about the progress made to date by the WG and to solicit input and feedback on its work. The working group has been discussing the criteria and requirements for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. Following the consultations, the chair of the WG reported to the ccNSO Council that issues had been identified which are out of scope of the IDN ccPDP, in particular issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names as Top Level Domains. The ccNSO Council established a ccNSO Study Group[39], which conducts its activities and reports to the community

---

[33] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/idns-policy-04nov09-en.htm
[34] http://forum.icann.org/lists/idn-ccpdp/msg00010.html
[35] http://ccnso.icann.org/node/10977
[36] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/idn-cctlds-02mar10-en.htm
[37] http://forum.icann.org/lists/idn-ccpdp/pdfeFO5KBtHX5.pdf
[38] http://ccnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-29nov10-en.htm
,[39] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/notes-ccnso-council-25jan11-en.pdf

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   30

under its own mandate and charter[40].

In March 2011, the ccNSO Council passed a resolution to request the IDN PDP Working Group 1 to investigate issues pertaining to confusable similarity of IDN ccTLD strings. This followed from a discussion at the ccNSO meetings session during the ICANN San Francisco meeting, in particular from the discussion of the results of the Fast Track review.[41] The IDN ccPDP WG 1 was also requested to develop, as soon as possible, guidelines (within the framework of the existing rules for the Fast Track) to improve the predictability of the evaluation relating to string confusion as defined in the IDNC Final Report and the Final Implementation report adopted by the ICANN Board in November 2009. As a result the ccNSO Council requested the ICANN Board to amend the Fast Track Process[42]. The Fast Track Implementation Plan was adjusted accordingly.[43] The discussions on the confusing similarity of requested IDN ccTLD strings have continued in the WG, also taking into account the statements of the GAC on this particular subject.[44]

The WG published its draft Final Paper[45] in August 2012. The goal was to report on the draft policy recommendations for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings associated with the territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 (IDN ccTLDs) within the framework of the IDN country code Policy Development Process and to seek public comments on its draft recommendations. The public comment period closed on 9 November. Based on the analysis of the comments received[46] and consultations throughout the Toronto ICANN meeting, there was no need to update the draft, and the WG agreed on the final text of its recommendations. The Final Paper was then published in December 2012.[47]

The IDN ccPDP WG 2 commenced its activities on 5 August 2010.[48] It has awaited the first results of IDN ccPDP WG 1. As stated in its charter, this WG had to take into account the proposals and recommendations of the IDN ccPDP WG 1. Building on the Issue Report of the Issue Manager, the WG identified potential issues that need to be resolved to include IDN ccTLD's in the ccNSO. The WG reported on their findings in its Interim Paper.[49] The purpose of the Interim report was to report to and seek input and feed-back from the community, in particular whether the list of topic and topics was complete and potential solutions.

Following further discussions and seeking further input and feed-back from the

---

[40] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/use-of-names-statement-of-purpose-31jan10-en.pdf
[41] http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-8-21feb11-en.htm
[42] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-26oct11-en.pdf
[43] http://www.icann.org/en/resources/idn/fast-track/idn-cctld-implementation-plan-15dec11-en.pdf
[44]
https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/10125361/FINAL_GAC_Communique_20120628.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1341949563000 and
[45] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/draft-recommendations-idn-cctld-selection-29aug12-en.htm
[46] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/report-comments-draft-recommendations-idn-cctld-selection-05dec12-en.pdf
[47] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-recommendations-idn-cctld-selection-21dec12-en.pdf
[48] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/notes-ipwg2-05aug10-en.pdf
[49] http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-pdp-wg2-final-interim-report-22nov10-en.pdf

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   31

community at the ccNSO meeting session[50], the WG published its draft Final Paper on 22 October 2011. The purpose of the paper was to report to the community on the draft recommendations and seek their comments and input. Some of the recommendations included were supported unanimously, others by just a majority. The Public comment period closed on 15 December 2011 and no comments were received.

At the ICANN Prague meeting (June 2012) WG 2 presented their findings again at the ccNSO members meeting.[51] As a result of the discussions at the Prague meeting, the WG finalised its recommendations, which are supported unanimously by the members of the WG and reflected in the Final Paper of the WG[52], which was published on 20 November 2012.

The Final Papers of both IDN WG 1 and WG 2 have been submitted to the IDN ccPDP Issue Manager, and both sets of recommendations were included in the Interim Report. This report was published for public comment from 5 February 2013 until 21 March 2013 in accordance with Annex B of the ICANN Bylaws[53]. Also in accordance with the rules of the IDN ccPDP, the Issue Manager has at the end of the comment period reviewed the comments received. The summary and analysis of the comments has been published[54].

In accordance with the Bylaws the Issue Manager has, at his reasonable discretion, amended the Interim Report, and prepared the Final Report. The Final Report was submitted to the chair of the ccNSO Council on 1 April 2013, who has distributed the report among the Council members. On 3 April 2013 the chair of the ccNSO formally informed the chair of the GAC of receipt of the Final Report and included an invitation to the GAC to offer opinion or advise. The formal notification and invitation is included (Annex E)

At its meeting on 10 April 2013, the ccNSO Council unanimously adopted all proposals contained in the Final Report on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO[55]. The ccNSO Council Recommendation was conveyed to the members of the ccNSO in the Members Report.

Following the submission of the Members Report, the membership of the ccNSO was given the opportunity to vote upon the Council Recommendation. The first round of voting (22 May 2013-11 June 2013) was not employed, as less than 50 % of the members casted their vote. The second and final round of voting was conducted from 24 July 2013, 00.00 UTC until 13 August, 23.59 UTC 2013. Out of the 71 votes cast (which is 51% of the 138 eligible votes), 65 were in favour (91 %), and 2 votes

---

[50] For example at the Dakar ccNSO meeting see:
http://dakar42.icann.org/meetings/dakar2011/presentation-idn-pdp-wg2-voting-mechanism-hotta-25oct11-en.pdf
[51] http://prague44.icann.org/meetings/prague2012/presentation-idn-pdp-wg1-wg2-boswinkel-26jun12-en.pdf
[52] http://ccnso.icann.org/node/35859
[53] http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/idn-ccpdp-05feb13-en.htm
[54] http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-idn-ccpdp-05feb13/msg00003.html
[55] http://ccnso.icann.org/node/38787

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   32

against. Of the votes received, 4 were abstention votes. As a result, and in accordance with section 13 of Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws, the ccNSO Council Recommendation has been adopted by the ccNSO membership, and following the approval by the Council on 23 August 2013 is conveyed to the ICANN Board of Directors as the ccNSO Recommendation.

Annex A IDN PDP Working Group 1 Members & Participants

ccTLD Representatives

African Region
Mohamed El Bashir, .sd
Yan Kwok, .mu

Asia-Pacific Region
Gihan Dias, .lk
Hiro Hotta, .jp (observer)
Ai-Chun Lu, .tw (observer)
Minjung Park, .kr
Siavash Shahshahani, .ir (observer)
Tan Yaling, .cn (observer)
Chris Disspain, .au (Chair of the WG)

European Region
Irina Danelia, .ru (Observer)
Andrei Koleshnikov, .ru
Annebeth Lange, .no (observer)
Maria Mokina, .ru (observer)
Vaggelis Segredakis, .gr

Latin American Region
Sandro Marcone, .pe
Rodrigo Saucedo, .bo

North American Region
Becky Burr, NomCom appointee

ALAC Members
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC Members
Manal Ismail

GNSO Members
Olga Cavalli
Edmon Chung
Avri Doria (observer)
Chuck Gomes (observer)

Technical Community
Lyman Chapin

Patrik Fältström

SSAC Liaison
Ram Mohan

Expert on Standardisation
Jaap Akkerhuis

ICANN Staff
Bart Boswinkel (Issue Manager IDN ccPDP)
Mandy Carver
Baher Esmat
Kim Davies
Olof Nordling
Kristina Nordstrom
Kurt Pritz
Naela Sarras
Gabriella Schittek

Annex B. IDN ccPDP Working Group 2 Members & Participants
Working Group Members

African Region
- Paulos Nyirenda, .mw (observer)
- Mary Uduma,.ng

Asia - Pacific Region
- Chris Disspain (observer)
- Hiro Hotta, .jp (chair)
- Siavash Shahshahani, .ir
- Zmarialai Wafa, .af
- Jian Zhang, APTLD

European Region
- Dejan Djukic, .rs
- Daniel Kalchev, .bg
- Andrey Romanov, .ru
- Giovanni Seppia, .eu

Latin American and Caribbean Region
- Demi Getschko, .br (vice –chair)

Support Staff
- Bart Boswinkel
- Samantha Eisner
- Kristina Nordström

Board Report IDN ccPDP, August 2013   35

- Gabriella Schittek

Annex C: Final Report

The Final Report as submitted to the ccNSO Council on 2 April 2013 can be found at:
http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-ccpdp-final-29mar13-en.pdf

Annex D: Members Report

The Members Report as conveyed to the ccNSO members can be found at:
http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-ccpdp-members-18apr13-en.pdf

Annex E: Notification to the chair of the GAC and invite to provide advice or opinion

Subject: Invitation to the GAC to offer advise or opinion on recommendations IDN Country code Policy Development Process
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2013 1:24:13 PM Central European Summer Time
From: Bart Boswinkel
To: Heather.Dryden@---
CC: Lesley Cowley, Jeannie Ellers

Dear Heather,
The Issue Manager of the IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process has submitted the Final Report to the chair of the ccNSO Council for Council deliberations. This Final Report is included, and will be posted shortly on the ccNSO Website (http://ccnso.icann.org).

In accordance with ICANN Bylaws Annex B section 10 a., and on behalf of the chair of the ccNSO, the GAC is formally invited to offer opinion or advice on the Final Report.

The ccNSO Council will discuss the recommendations contained in the Final Report at its meeting in Beijing, 10 April 2013. If adopted, the ccNSO membership will vote on the recommendations of the Council, before the Durban meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me, if you have any questions or need any additional information.

On behalf of the Chair of the ccNSO,
Kind regards,
Bart Boswinkel