Basic Policy proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Process

Update Sections 1-9: Deselection
Version 04, 25 February 2022
The basic policy recommendations document has been updated to include suggestions pertaining to the De-Selection of IDNccTLD strings

Table of Contents

Section 0. Overall Principles

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

I.   **Association of the (IDN) country code Top Level Domain with a territory.** For purposes of this policy "Territory" or "Territories" are defined as a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed in Section 3 of the 'International Standard ISO 3166, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes' [ISO 3166-1:2020] or, in some exceptional cases, e.g. grandfathered-in delegations, a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed for an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element.

Under the current policy for the delegation of (ASCII) ccTLDs[1], the country codes associated with **Territories** are eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Only IDN ccTLD strings associated with a **Territory** are eligible to be delegated as a ccTLD.

WG Comments and discussion

Comment: Link was defined long back. Under 1 territory several IDNs possible. One single language might be spoken in various territories. Several languages in 1 territory is a common example. We have to discuss this carefully. Comment: Territories? No reference to countries? Refernece to verb "select" Comment: criteria section clarification on role of languages.
Action: Define what is meant by "territory". Include definition in terminology doc
Revisit in future the verb. Friendly amendment Jaap is included

Additional Text Principle I
The DES sub group proposes:
If a the name of a **Territory** is removed from the ISO3166 because it is divided into two or more new ones or two or more countries have merged, the removal is considered a "trigger event" and causes the initiation of the process for the retirement of **all the selected IDNccTLD(s) (and their variants),** which are a meaningful representation of the name of the **Territory**.

---

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

II. (ASCII) ccTLD and IDN ccTLDs are all country code Top Level Domains.

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

III. Preserve security, stability and interoperability of the DNS.

To the extent different and/or additional rules are implemented for IDN ccTLDs, these rules should:
a. Preserve and ensure the security and stability of the DNS;
b. Ensure adherence with the RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892, RFC 5893

c. Take into account and be guided by the Principles for Unicode Code Point Inclusion in Labels in the DNS Root (RFC 6912).

WG Comments and Discussions

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

As reminder from introduction to section 2.1.1:
The purpose of the overarching principles is to set the parameters within which the policy recommendations have been developed, should be interpreted and implemented. They take into account the experiences of the IDN Fast Track Process and subsequent discussions. They have been developed to structure, guide and set conditions for the recommended policy, its implementation and future interpretation.

Reframing the question: Do the references as included set the parameters as intended?
This section may need to be revisited after completion of section on criteria. WG may or may not suggest to include a refrence to the IDN Guidelines and RZ-LGR.
The doc ref'd in line 5 is RFC 6912.
Should we look into including RFC5894 and RFC5895?
2 additional informational RFC's. Additional work on RZ-LGR was done in the meanwhile. Variants of TLDs. it also identifies if a TLD is technically valid, based on the criteria used to develop the technical doc or the LGR for the RZ IDN Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en [icann.org]
Current applicable version is 3.0 Root Zone Label Generation
Rules: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en [icann.org]

The IDNA protocol is defined in RFCs 5890-93; in addition there are informational RFCs 5894-95 (implementation guidelines of sorts
Refer in section 2.1.1 to basic documents that inform policy and provide basis for interpretation of policy Using implementation work in the principle document does not make sense

Refernce to IDN Guidelines to be dicussed further

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

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

The string must meet the criteria of the current or any subsequent versions of the *ICANN Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names*. This includes:

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

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

The IDN ccTLD requesters are encouraged to:
1. Use and refer to already existing IDN Tables
2. Cooperate in development of the IDN Table(s).

Section 5.1.1 (Preparation Stage), page 19

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

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

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

WG Comments
Added the words "CAN BE"

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

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

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

Section 1. Criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings

1.1 Minimal Number of non-ASCII characters

An IDN country code Top Level Domain must contain at least one (1) non-ASCII character (i.e a character that is not included in ISO/IEC 646 Basic Character Set). To illustrate this criterion: For example, *españa* would qualify under this specific requirement and *italia* would not. Note that *españa* contains at least one (1) non-ASCII character (i.e a character that is not included in ISO/IEC 646 Basic Character Set[2] .

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

> **WG discussion**
> WG prelimenary agreed that reference to *españa* is an example aand that should be clear from the text.
> During first reading is was agreed to strike the reference to [a-z, 0-9]. During first reading it was suggested to strike the reference to U-Label and A-label. Need to be checked when discussing the Technical criteria, if (updated) reference needs to be included in this section. The original text was: "A different way of expressing this is that the selected IDN ccTLD must be a valid U-Label that can also be expressed as an A-label. It cannot be a NR-LDH Label."

~~1.2 IDN ccTLD only for Territories.~~

> ~~A TLD string associated with a **Territory** can only be requested and shall be delegated as IDN country code Top Level Domains if and only if all criteria of this policy for the selction of IDN ccTLD strings and other relevant policies for the delegation of ccTLDs are met.~~

> **WG discussion**
> The orginal section has become superfluous as the definition of Territory and Territories is now included in the principles. The statement as proposed should be in the principles.

1.2. Meaningfulness Criteria and related process and procedures

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

---

[2] https://www.iso.org/standard/4777.html

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

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

1.2.2 A Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territory MUST be in a Designated Language of the Territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string should be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of the territory in a **Designated Language** of that **Territory**. For this purpose, a **Designated Language**[3] is defined as: a language that has a legal status in the **Territory** or that serves as a language of administration[4].

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

a)   The language is listed for the relevant **Territory** as an ISO 639 language in Part Three of the "Technical Reference Manual for the standardization of Geographical Names", United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (the UNGEGN Manual)

---

[3] The limitation to Designated Language is recommended as criteria for reasons of stability of the DNS. According to some statistics currently 6909 living languages are identified. See for example: http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno_docs/distribution.asp?by=area. If one IDN ccTLD would be allowed per territory for every language this would potentially amount to 252*6909 or approximately 1.7 million IDN ccTLDs

[4] The definition of **Designated Language** is based on: "Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names", United Nations Group of Experts on Geographic Names, United Nations, New York, 2002 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/pubs/documents/Glossary_of_terms_rev.pdf . Note that in the Glossary the term "Official Language" is used. Experience has shown that, depending on the specific Teritory, "Official Language" has a specific connotation, which sometimes creates confusion with the term "Official Lanaguage" as defined in the Glossary.

(https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf).

b) The language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** as defined in section 3.7 of ISO 3166-1 standard [2020].

c) The relevant public authority in the **Territory** confirms that the language is used in official communications of the relevant public authority and serves as a language of administration.

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

WG Comments and discussion

This section needs to be revisited once the Variant Sub-WG completed its work. The full WG needs to be aware of impact of variants on criteria. Should requirement of designation also apply to the script i.e an IDNccTLD string has to be in a Designated Language and Designated Script?

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

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

Unicode also lists scripts it encode
here: https://www.unicode.org/Public/13.0.0/ucd/Scripts.txt [unicode.org]

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

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

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

Notes and Comments

It should be noted that other requirements relating to non-confusability are applicable and should be considered, including the specific procedural rules and conditions for cases when the same manager will operate two or more (IDN) ccTLD's which are considered to be confusingly similar.

WG comments and Discussion

Notes and comments are not intended to be part of the policy itself. They are intended as a clarification and assist in (future interpretation of the policy itself.
Text on similarity needs to be revisit to avoid misunderstandings. Tone of words used in version 05 line 16 -17 above, 19 and 20 and notes and comments not consistent.

Discussion around if a language is expressed in more then one script in a Territory,m then persmissible to have one string per script, although the multiple strings are in the same language.

Example 1. For the chinese example. In fast track simplified and traditional chinese strings are separate, as different scripts, but not as variants. If considered variants, then special mechanism needs to be introduced to grandfather the existing IDNccTLDs.

Latin generation panel lead. 200 languages, using lating script. No decision according to languages. Tried to process all languages using specific scripts. Wrote in proposal that the use of language is not important when creating TLDs. possibility to use a label which means something in a language, but not important to use languages in label definition

 Language used in multiple scripts. Use of language may not be "official" in some cases. Any of the scripts in which the language is written? Only in certain scripts? Would there be a limitation on not just the language, but also on scripts?

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

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

Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographic Names, Part Three column 3 or 4 version 2007[5], or a later version of that list, it is considered to be a **Meaningful Representation**.

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

1. The selected IDNccTLD string is not the long or short form name of the **Territory** as included in the UNGEGN Manual in the **Designated Language,**

    or

2. The selected IDNccTLD string is an acronym of the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated Language**

    or

3. The selected IDNccTLD string is the name of a **Territory** that does not appear in the UNGEGN Manual,

    or

4. The selected IDNccTLD string is in a **Designated Language** that is not included in the UNGEGN Manual.

If such documentation is required, the documentation needs to clearly establish that:

- The meaning of the selected string in the **Designated Language** and English and
- That the selected string meets the meaningfulness criteria.

Specific requirements regarding documentation to demonstrate the **Meaningful Representation** are included in the procedures and documentation recommendations (see section 2.5 and 2.7 below).

1.2.5 Documentation of the meaningfulness of the selected IDN ccTLD string

---

[5] https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/pubs/documents/UNGEGN%20tech%20ref%20manual_m87_combined.pdf . Note that the UNGEGN Techanical Reference Manual only contains the names of 192 Countries, which is a sub-set of all the Territories listed under the ISO 3166 standard.

The selected IDN ccTLD string(s) must be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of the corresponding **Territory**. A string is deemed to be meaningful if it is in the **Designated Language** of the **Territory** and if it is:

1. The name of the **Territory**; or
2. A part of the name of the **Territory** denoting the **Territory**; or
3. A short-form designation for the name of the **Territory** that is recognizable and denotes the **Territory** in the selected language.

The meaningfulness requirement is verified as follows:

1. If the selected string is listed in the UNGEGN Manual, then the string fulfills the meaningfulness requirement.
2. If the selected string is not listed in the UNGEGN Manual, the requester must then substantiate the meaningfulness by providing documentation from an internationally recognized expert or organization.

ICANN should recognize and accept documentation from one of the following experts or organizations as internationally recognized:

- National Naming Authority – A government recognized National Geographic Naming Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented. The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) maintains such a list of organizations at: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/publications.html [unstats.un.org]
- National Linguistic Authority – A government recognized National Linguistic Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented.

In the exceptional circumstance where there is no access to a National Naming Authority nor to a National Linguistic Authority for the **Territory,** assistance may be requested from ICANN to identify and seek reference to an expert or organization to provide the required documentation. This documentation will be considered acceptable and sufficient to determine whether a string is a **Meaningful Representation** of a **Territory** name.

WG Comments and Discussion
Are all authorities required to provide documentation? Originally they are intended as alternatives.

What is the logic behind a, b, c? Should be allowed that a cctld operator appoints an expert in the region or territory. Depend on the opinion of the expert to provide answers. For exemple the ccTLD Operator could appoint a linguistic expert. That case is missing.

Additional comment on point c: there is a qualifier that implies that c can only happen if a and b fail. A ccTLD operator may want to appoint an expert in addition to a naming authority. There are cases where an internationally recognized expert is brought in, in addition. Skill sets are equally relevant. The language proposed I sresult form discussions from 2007 to 2009. Not ethe requirement is limited to the IDNccTLD string itself. It was also agreed that the request process should NOT be limited to existing ccTLD managers. In addition the process should involve the SIP of aTerritory (see section 4.2 below). For that reason, the lsit of experts was limited. Second reason: This is about the name of the territory. In principle, support of relevant government needed for what is considered a designated language for the name of a

Territory. Same kind of mechanism. What is and what is not a **Designated Language** is first of all a matter of the relevant government, and not by a ccTLD appointed expert.

Qualifier for the icann agreed expert. Only can be appointed if a and b fail. Seems to preclude the ability to do a or b AND c. This was to ensure that in principle the decision was made in **Territory**, and with the support of a government.

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

Option c only applies if a and b fails. Avoid situation that in case a or b lack for a Territory, the Territory is not eligible for an IDN ccTLD.

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

From the 6 April meeting.
Question: Who determines who is the authority? Response: Is determined in-territory. The national naming authorities or national linguistic authorities.   Follows basic principle that IANA is the business to determine what is or what is not a country.

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

Its clear, of course, that the pertinent Territory itself determines as per its processes, who the pertinent "Naming Authority" is, but my question is, is there something in ccNSO, some sort of accreditation step like what happens in GAC, where a Nation establishes its credentials to be able to join GAC, and then GAC makes a decision of whether or not to allow membership? For example, is it that the pertinent Territories' ccTLD manager informs ccNSO who that Naming Authority is and that fact remains stable until officially changed again after a similar process?

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

1.2.6 Notes and Comments. ICANN should include an example of the documentation that demonstrates the selected IDN ccTLD string(s) is a Meaningful Representation of the corresponding **Territory** in the implementation plan.

ICANN should include a procedure in the implementation plan, including a timeframe, to identify expertise referred to or agreed as set out in the final paragraph of section 1.2.5 above.

1.2.7 Documentation Designated Language. The requirements for allowable languages and scripts to be used for the selected IDN ccTLD string is that the language must be a **Designated Language** in the **Territory** as defined in section (see above`). The language requirement is considered verified if one of the following conditions is met:

1. If the language is listed for the relevant **Territory** as an ISO 639 language in Part Three of the *Technical Reference Manual for the standardization of Geographical Names, United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names* ("UNGEGN Manual") (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm);

   or

2. If the language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** in ISO 3166-1;

   or

3. If the relevant public authority of the **Territory** confirms that the language is used or serves as follows, (either by letter or link to the relevant government constitution or other online documentation from an official government website):

   a. Used in official communications by the relevant public authority;

      or

   b. Serves as a language of administration.

Further, the documentation MUST include a reference to the script or scripts in which the **Designated Language** is expressed and which MUST be listed in the script charts of the latest version of UNICODE.

WG Discussion and Comments

Use another standard to limit the scope ? in a future new version of unicode, adds a new word. But what if this applies as a TLD and is not allowed in the IDN standard? To revisit later. Take into account the other script-related requirements. This is not the only requirement.

Note IDNA is not about unicode. IETF is tracking the first versions of unicode. Currently processing v11 of Unicode. see: https://www.iana.org/assignments/idna-tables-11.0.0/idna-tables-11.0.0.xml

Does proposed format work (v07 of document) ? Need for a reference to a script. Is this a way to reference to a script?

As far as script names are concerned. ISO15924 standard used for script names. Unicode also lists scripts. The challenge in referring to unicode: it does not get automatically adopted in IDNA standard. If the reference to unicode version is not correct. Would a reference to the IDNA tables themselves work? Are scripts listed there? As a set of characters. Would also resolve other concern probably. Refer to the IDNA2008 standard as based on the latest version of unicode.

Latest unicode version processed for IDNA2008.

From discussion of 20 April 2021.
Line 6-8: does this now capture what has been discussed at the previous meeting?
Strike "have been applied"?
Refer to code table of IDNA2008. This is updated per unicode table. If unicode is updated, that is updated too.
Comment: That unicode tables are updates does not mean anything for IDNA2008. Not slavely following what is in unicode. Should first be interpreted by the people that do the standard. Sometimes unicode is changing attributes to characters that makes them either valid or not valid to be used in IDNA2008. Current IETF version is lagging behind the unicode version. If you follow what is in unicode blindly, you make existing labels no longer valid, or the other way around. Have a critical eye.
Question: Does IDNA2008 include a list of scripts that can be used?
Respense: No. big difference with 2003. Algorithm to look at attributes of the unicode characters. No single table. Changes all the time.
Suggestion: Wait for the VM sub group. The overarching question: What is the sole source to validate TLD tables? Candidate is the RZ-LGR. Derived from IDNA2008 but further. Universe of codepoints that could be used for TLD lables. If this PDP accepts RZ-LGR as sole source, we need to revise this small section later
Response this coud be put in parking lot. But the issue we wanted to address is whether we should use a designated script.
Group agreed this was not the most appropriate way to go. But some languages are expressed in 1 or multiple scripts or writing systems. Set of characters. Would your suggestion address this concern?
Response: ok. Delete "which is processed for IDNA2008"

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

Note: Unicode is a necessary but not sufficient condition. Scripts processed by IETF. if RZ-LGR is adopted as the condition to move forward, then either the Maximal Starting Point or RZ-LGR would be the relevant reference points.
Remark: a script is only eligible if it appears in the latest version of unicode that has been processed.
Note: this is not about characters. This is to address "if an application comes in with a designated language to refer to a script".

Note: The sole purpose of this section of the proposals is to identify and include a relevant point of reference to scripts which are used to express a Designated Language. The requirement with respect to IDNA 2008 etc. are dealt with in another section of the document (section5) relevancy of RZ-LGR in this context is dealt with by the Sub-Group VM.

1.2.8 Notes and Comments

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

WG Discussion and Comments on inclusion additional criteria Designated Script
Question: should "IDNccTLD String must be in Designeated Script" be introduced as additional criteria?
Conclusion: Update section 3 to include reference to a script, as being required in the documentation provided by the national naming authority or the national linguistic authority. Further discussion on 6 April.

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

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

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

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

As discussed previously. If you do not put a limit to the number of languages, you can easily end up in a situation which is not manageable. According to 639-3 standard: 7000+ languages listed. Potentially 1.5 million TLDs.
Designated = official language, external definition. UNEGN.
Further what is and what is not an official/designated language ais a matter for in-territory. ICANN nor the the ICANN community should not be put in the position to tell "you have the wrong name". Matter for government and other significantly interested parties to determine the right string.

Connect the 2 terms (script/language). Should solve the issue, and question raised about recognised by ICANN. Documentation should include language and script and reference. Potentially include "if there is more than 1 script, reference to the script. ISO15something, or other existing standard where the script is mentioned."
If you include the link regarding change of script, is it a condition for the de-selection of the string. Around 150 scripts in unicode. When a territory applies a string for a particular language, does the application need to be limited to the scripts in that territory? Or any of the scripts in the unicode? Not every language is written in every script. See example Wolof (senegal). Not implied script, to have Wolof for instance in Chinese Current language does not imply that restriction. Do we want to make script relevant to the language? Or arbitrary choice. There are implications. If icann receives a string for a particular country, supported by the government, it should be processed. Fast track demonstrated that this approach works. We take the same approach here, with some small refinements

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

1.3 Deselection of IDNccTLD

1.3.1 Proposal Sub-group Deselection: Impact change of name of the Territory

The selected IDNccTLD string is no longer a (visual) association with the name of the Territory. The general policy requirement is that an IDN ccTLD string must be a **Meaningful Representation** of the name of a T**erritory**. The principle underlying the representation of **Territories** in two letter (ASCII) **code elements** is the visual association between the names of **Territories** (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their corresponding **code elements**.

The principle of association between the IDN country code string and the name of a **Territory** is maintained: a selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be a meaningful representation of the name of the **Territory**.

The IDN ccTLD will be considered de-selected and should be retired when it is evidenced that a selected and /or delegated IDNccTLD string is no longer (de-selected) a **Meaningful Representation** of:
   a) The name of the **Territory** in the **Designated language of the Territory,**

b) Part of the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated language** of the **Territory** that denotes the **Territory,** or

c) The short-form designation for the name of the Territory in the **Designated language** of the **Territory** (for example the two-letter or three-letter **country code** transliterated in to the **Designated Language**).

The de-selection of an IDNccTLD string is evidenced as follows:

1. If the meaningfulness requirement at the time of the delegation of the string was verified by listing of (part of the name) in the **Designated Language** of the **Territory** in the UNGEGN Manual, the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated Language** is no longer included.

2. If the meaningfulness was substantiated by providing documentation from an internationally recognized expert or organization[6], by documentation or a statement of a similar, internationally recognized expert or organization that the selected string no longer denotes the name nor is a short-form designation for the name of the **Territory** in the **Designated language** of the **Territory (**hereafter**: Statement of (dis-)association** or if such a statement cannot be provided within a reasonable time (3 months) upon request of ICANN.

Confirmation of association or dis-association.
ICANN is not expected to actively seek confirmation of association or dis-association of an IDNccTLD string with the name of the Territory.

---

[6] Note already included): ICANN should recognize and accept documentation from one of the following experts or organizations as internationally recognized:

- National Naming Authority – A government recognized National Geographic Naming Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented. The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) maintains such a list of organizations at: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/publications.html [unstats.un.org]
- National Linguistic Authority – A government recognized National Linguistic Authority, or other organization performing the same function, for the **Territory** for which the selected string request is presented. In the exceptional circumstance where there is no access to a National Naming Authority nor to a National Linguistic Authority for the **Territory,** assistance may be requested from ICANN to identify and seek reference to an expert or organization to provide the required documentation. This documentation will be considered acceptable and sufficient to determine whether a string is a **Meaningful Representation** of a **Territory** name.
See section 1.2.5.

However, if ICANN receives a valid request[7] for an IDNccTLD string for a **Territory** which is in the same Designated Language and related script as an IDNccTLD string associated with the same **Territory** that is either in the verification process or has been delegated, ICANN shall require a **Statement of (dis-)association** from the requester or IDNccTLD Manager of the first IDNccTLD string for the name of the Territory.

If such a **Statement of (dis-)association** cannot be provided within a reasonable time frame (3 months upon notification by ICANN), the first IDNccTLD string is deemed to be de-selected and shall be retired. As of the time a **Statement of (dis-)association** is requested until such a time the **Statement** is provided or after the reasonable time frame has passed (whatever is the earliest), the processing of the requested IDNccTLD strings for that **Territory** shall be put on hold.

If according to the **Statement of (dis-)association** the first requested IDNccTLD string or delegated IDNccTLD string is still associated with the name of the **Territory** as required, the latter requested IDNccTLD string shall be considered invalid and the requester and the related government will be informed accordingly.

ICANN should include in the implementation plan an example of the documentation required i.e. an example of the **Statement of (dis-) association**.

Comment Full WG 15 February 2022

Bart: criteria. And then looking at the required documentation. That is the procedural aspect. The subgroup proposes an additional section on the de-selection of IDN ccTLDs. Meaningful representation of the name of the territory, expressed in a non-latin script. The DS-group dealt with 3 situations:
Change name territory itself. (full name, short name, short form designation)
Recap of all criteria. Basic mechanism and proposal by DS-subgroup
The subgroup identified: name of territory is included in iso 3166. Whether or not there is a significant name change in ENG or French, has no impact on the deselecton. Consequence of the proposed mechanism in 1.3.1.
Editorial changes (e.g. it stil says 3 - 4 months, should be 3 months to be consistent with full text)

No red marks

Subgroup DES Comments and discussion
A change of the country name, in English or French, should that result in a change of the retirement of the IDN ccTLD?
Comment 1 : look into the matter. Depends on the type of change.

---

[7] Note this includes documentation of support by the SIP!!

Comment 2: "meaningful" is the key here, there have been numerous changes to the English representation that would not essentially change the name, really; maybe we should dig out some of those examples.
Updates to 3166-1 (e.g. articles or proposition changes in English). Checking whether it is still a meaningful representation.

Observation: Normally, the idn cctld string is motivated by the name in the local language. Not necessarily in EN or FR.
Comment: This is one of the cases indeed dealt with. (scrolling up). Captured in the doc
Comment: trigger looking into the issue, but not necessarily changing it.

Observation: local name can be quite long (Kingdom of…). When a name changes in a country or territory, it could change in a part that is not relevant to the idn ccTLD string. A country name could change in a different place.

Question: not sure I understand: the IDN ccTLD has to represent the full country name, not only that of a subset of that country? i.e., you cannot have "cats and dogs island" being represented by "cats" in Klingon, say
Response : Various cases where the IDN ccTLD is deemed to represent the name of the country. Cats and dogs island. Is it United States? Or is America a meaningful representation?
If the full name of the country is represented in the idn string, and even part of it would change, that would affect the meaningful representation. Example United Arab Emirates. Serbia is number c.
Some ccTLDs refer to 2 or 3-letter code, and this is considered a meaningful representation
Examples: For Serbia only .srb in Cyrillic script, Fullname of country: Kingdom of Thailand —> 'Thai' for IDN ccTLD

For information. This is place to look up a full name of a country in official language https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/geonames/ [unstats.un.org]

Note: if an idn cctld string refers to the geo-names document, it is clear that no additional documentation is needed see section 1.2.7 of full document..

If part of name that changes is not a trigger event, but is an alert, and a need for clarification and additional information. Suggestion is to discuss on the next call whether this results in the retirement.

Question need to introduce a notification?
Response: good point. At the start there is one doc. Language is a designated language, direction needed from this sub-group on how you foresee notification, alert and/or confirmation happens.

Designated language is called "official language" under the fast track. It created confusion, because in some countries "official languages" have a different meaning. What is or what is not a designated language is an internal process.

From 7 December 2021 call
No longer a meaningful representation in the name of the territory
Various sub-criteria: Name of territory changes, or part of the name of the territory.

Note : some countries might prefer to keep the original ccTLD. They are familiar with it. Problem if icann enforces the removal, against the will.
Comment: removal of previous one, once the new proposal is there

Comment: this is a decision by the SIP whether or not the change is meaningful or not. Republic of, or Federated state. Follows domestic declaration of the state. Significant change, but perhaps the old name is not banned. Some triggers need to be further investigated.

Note : if there is a significant change in the name, because of a change in the designated language, and there is an application for a new IDN ccTLD. As soon as there is an application, what happens to the existing IDN ccTLD in the designated language? Is it still the designated language?

Comment: if all interested parties that took part in the first delegation are also involved. They need to agree that the old IDN ccTLD should be retired and the new one should be installed. That moves the decision from icann or iana to the SIP.

Comment: request a new idn cctld

1.3.2 Proposal Sub-group Deselection: Impact change of Designated Language

The general policy requirement is that to be considered an IDNccTLD string it must be a Meaningful Representation of the name of the Territory in a Designated Language of the 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[8].

The IDN ccTLD will be considered de-selected and should be retired if it is evidenced that a selected IDNccTLD string that is either in the validation stage or is delegated as an IDNccTLD is no longer a Meaningful Representation in a **Designated Language** of the **Territory**.

A language is evidenced to be no longer Designated:
- If at the time of the request of the IDNccTLD string the **Designated Language** requirement was demonstrated and verified by a reference to the listing of (part of the) name of the **Territory** in the **Designated Language** in the UNGEGN Manual, the name of the **Territory** is no longer included in the **Designated Language** (see 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

---

[8] The definition of **Designated Language** is based on: "Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names", United Nations Group of Experts on Geographic Names, United Nations, New York, 2002 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/ungegn/pubs/documents/Glossary_of_terms_rev.pdf . Note that in the Glossary the term "Official Language" is used. Experience has shown that, depending on the specific Teritory, "Official Language" has a specific connotation, which sometimes creates confusion with the term "Official Lanaguage" as defined in the Glossary.

Geographical Names (the UNGEGN Manual)
(https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf).

- If at the time of the request of the IDNccTLD string the **Designated Language** requirement was demonstrated and verified by referencing it as an administrative language for the relevant **Territory** as defined in section 3.7 of ISO 3166-1 standard [2020], the language is no longer referenced as such.

- If the relevant public authority in the **Territory** confirms that the language is no longer used in official communications of the relevant public authority or serves as a language of administration (**Statement of Designation of Language)**

If it is evidenced that a language is no longer a **Designated Language** in the **Territory** the related IDNccTLD string for the name of that **Territory** is considered de-selected and if delegated, the IDNccTLD must be retired.

Confirmation of association or dis-association.
ICANN is not expected to actively seek confirmation of change of status of a language in **Territory**.

However, if ICANN receives a valid request[9] for an IDNccTLD string for a **Territory** which is in the same **Designated Language** as another IDNccTLD string associated with the same **Territory** and the latter is either in the verification process or has been delegated, ICANN shall require a **Statement of Designation of Language** from the requester or IDNccTLD Manager of the IDNccTLD string being verified or delegated (whatever the case may be). The **Statement of Designation of Language** must be provided by a similar relevant public authority that provided the original documentation.

If such a **Statement of Designated Language** cannot be provided within a reasonable time frame (3 months upon notification by ICANN), the IDNccTLD already in process of being verified string or already delegated, is deemed to be de-selected and shall be retired. As of the time a **Statement**

---

[9] Note this includes documentation of support by the SIP, with a prominent role of the government!!

of Designated Langauge is requested until such a time the **Statement** is provided or after the reasonable time frame has passed (whatever is the earliest), the processing of the requested IDNccTLD string for that **Territory** shall be put on hold.

If according to the **Statement of Designated Language** the language remains to be a **Designated Language**, the (second) requested IDNccTLD string in the same **Designated Language** of the **Territory** shall be considered invalid and the requester and the related government should be informed accordingly.

ICANN should include in the implementation plan an example of the **Statement of Designated Language.**

Comments Full WG 15 February 2022
We will revisit, with editorial changes (e.g. it stil says 3 to 4 months)
Mechanism. Procedural solution to the issue.
Editorial change: repetition "if the time"
Svitlana: if the language is disappearing, the country can request to delete the IDN ccTLD?
Bart: yes, possible
Svitlana: is a trigger event?
Bart: is more forced. By mutual agreement. We could include it. To maintain the coherence of the system
Bart: do you support 1.3.2?
No red marks

1.3.3 Proposal Sub-group Deselection: Impact change of script or writing system.

The general policy requirement is 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**.

Further, where a language is expressed in more than one script in a **Territory**, then it is permissible to have one string per script, although the multiple strings are in the same **Designated Language**. For that matter the documentation to request an IDNccTLD string must include a reference to the script or scripts in which the **Designated Language** is expressed and which MUST be listed in the script charts of the latest version of UNICODE.

If it is evidenced that in the **Territory** a **Designated Language** is no longer expressed in the script or scripts in which the IDNccTLD string associated with the **Territory** was expressed at the time it was requested, then that IDNccTLD string shall be considered de-selected and if delegated, must be retired.

Confirmation of script to express Designated Language.
ICANN is not expected to actively seek confirmation of change of status of the script in which a **Designated Language** in **Territory** is expressed.

However, if ICANN receives a valid request[10] for an IDNccTLD string for a **Territory** which is in the same **Designated Language** as another IDNccTLD string associated with the **Territory** but is expressed in another script, ICANN shall require a **Statement of Referenced Script** from the requester or IDNccTLD Manager of the IDNccTLD string already being verified or delegated (whatever the case may be). The **Statement of Referenced Script** must be provided by a similar relevant public authority that provided the original documentation with respect to the referenced script.

If such a **Statement of Referenced Script** cannot be provided within a reasonable time frame (3 months upon notification by ICANN), the IDNccTLD already in process of being verified string or already delegated, is deemed to be de-selected and shall be retired. As of the time a **Statement of Referenced Script** is requested until such a time the **Statement** is provided or after the reasonable time frame has passed (whatever is the earliest), the processing of the requested IDNccTLD string for that **Territory** shall be put on hold.

If according to the **Statement of Referenced Script** the Designated Language remains to be expressed in the script originally referenced, the (second) requested IDNccTLD string in the same **Designated Language** of the **Territory** shall be considered invalid and the requester and the related government should be informed accordingly.

ICANN should include in the implementation plan an example of the **Statement of Referenced Script.**

---

[10] Note this includes documentation of support by the SIP, with a prominent role of the government!!

Procedural solution to the issue.

Question: if the language is disappearing, the country can request to delete the IDN ccTLD?
Response: yes, should be possible
Question: is a trigger event?
By mutual agreement. We could include it. To maintain the coherence of the system. However if **Statement of Referenced script** is submitted voluntarily, this could trigger the retirement.

Comment: Kazakhstan was going to change its alphabet from cyrillic to latin.
Same with the Moldovian language.

Observation: if they would have an IDN, it should be deselected. However, it is proposed not to actively police this. Intention is not enough. It really needs to happen.

Comment: if it would be a change from Cyrillic to Latin, they would probably have special characters
Observation: it is still a change of script. If that is the case, in principle it should be de-selected.
There are also other criteria for IDNs

Comment: ISO MA received a letter from Kazachstan that they wanted to change the country code. 1 or 2 years ago. Changing the K into a Q. that is not happening. After that, there has not been any further communication regarding this. The designated language is still Russian and Kazach. If they want to abolish the current script, ICANN will hear from relevant government or ccTLD manager.

Note that it is quite an undertaking to change scripts
Elements in bold to be included in the glossary
First reading Text 1.3.3 supported, no abstentions nor objections

Section 2 Required SUPPORT for IDNccTLD string
2.1 The selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be non-contentious within the Territory. The selected IDN ccTLD string must be non-contentious within the **Territory**. The non-contentiousness is evidenced by a statement of support/endorsement/non-objection by the **Significantly Interested Parties[11]** in the **Territory**.

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

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

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

---

[11] The concept Significantly Intersted Parties is derived from RFC 1591 and used as detailed in the Framework of Interpreation by the FOIWG (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_46435/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf) . Accordingly: The FOIWG interprets "Significantly Interested Parties" (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to include, but not be limited to: a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. To be considered a Significantly Interested Party, any party other than the manager or the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD must demonstrate that it is has a direct, material and legitimate interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s). The FOIWG interprets the requirement for approval from Significantly Interested Parties (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for delegations and transfers

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

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

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

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

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

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

Response: "territories" in this policy has a very specific, defiend meaning, which is directly related to the iso3166 standard. The examples are given are not included and related to the list. What is meant with "disputed"? If a country would vanish or change its name, it could impact in the sense of de-selection of the IDN ccTLD string. If a Territory is not included in the standard, therefore not eligible.

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

Observation: possible contention at the horizon. Going back to FOI. when the SIP were adopted as the concept, how their collective wisdom was captured as consensus or non objection. Include reference to FOI.
From discussion 20 April 4.1.
Non-objection included. Some governments will have an issue with explicitly expressing support or endorsing a string, but they do not mind non-objection.
Line 5-11 has been amended to reflect the timing of the concurrent request. Reference to significantly interested parties (SIP) in the footnote from the framework of interpretation (FoI)
Michael" shouldn't "... for selecting and IDN ccTLD string …" be ".. for selecting an IDN ccTLD string …"
typo: receveid => received

Resolve must / should. Mixture of language.

Question: if there is a request that is being processed and a second request comes in, both are on hold. Each of the parties asked to solve this internally. Is it ok to inform the others about the other request?
Response: within the territory …. SIP includes the government. You do not want a fight between 2 governmental agencies. All parties should be informed of concurrent requests.
Note that once the conflict is resolved, 1 will withdraw and the other application moves forward.
Question: what happens if variants will be enabled in future. Is it clear enough?
Resonse: all should be revisited once the recommendations by the sub-groups are ready.

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

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

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

To be considered a **Significantly Interested Party**, any party other than the government or territorial authority for the **Territory** associated with the selected IDN ccTLD must demonstrate that it 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."

2.2.2 Classification of input

For procedural purposes the following cases should be distinguished:

- Request for the full or short name of **Territory** (as defined in Section 3, reference needs to be updated in final version).
- Other cases, where additional documentation is required.

In both cases the relevant Government / Public Authority needs to be involved and at a minimum its non-objection should be documented.

2.2.4 Notes and Comments. In cases where additional documentation is required:

- Unanimity should NOT be required.
- The process should allow minorities to express a concern i.e. should not be used against legitimate concerns of minorities
- The process should not allow a small group to unduly delay the selection process.

ICANN should include an example of the documentation required to demonstrate the support or nonobjection for the selected string(s) in the implementation plan.

WG Comments and Discussions
No comments

2.3 Proposal Deselection Subgroup: Impact IDNccTLD string becomes contentious within the Territory

The general policy requirement is that the selected IDN ccTLD string MUST be non-contentious within the **Territory.** The non-contentiousness is evidenced by a statement of support/endorsement/non-objection by the **Significantly Interested Parties (SIP**) in the **Territory**.

If it is evidenced that the selected IDN ccTLD string has become contentious within the Territory, it shall be retired. The contentiousness of the IDNccTLD string is evidenced by a statement of the **Significantly Interested Parties** in the **Territory** the IDNccTLD string is contentious (Hereafter: **Statement of De-Selection**)

For purposes of the procedure, The Definition of Significantly Interested Parties (section 2.2.1) and Classification of input (section 2.2.2) apply.

Further, in all cases the relevant Government / Public Authority needs to be involved and must express their support for the Statement of De-Selection i.e express their objection to the originally selected IDNccTLD string, which must be included in the Statement of De-Selection.

To be effective the **Statement of De-Selection** MUST be published on the ICANN Website. Prior to publication of the **Statement**, the IDNccTLD Manager shall be informed by ICANN of receipt of such a **Statement of De-Selection**.

If a concurrent **SIP** statement in support of the IDN ccTLD string(s) is received by ICANN before the **Notification of Retirement** is provided to the Manager of the de-selected IDNccTLD string, this SIP Statement and the **Statement of De-Selection** shall be deemed to be conflicting within the **Territory**. Before any further steps are taken in the retirement process, this issue needs to be resolved in **Territory**.

If a request for an IDNccTLD string in the same **Designated Language** for the same **Territory** is received at the same time or after the **Statement of De-Selection** is received, but before the date the **Notification of Retirement** is sent, then the issue of contradicting statements with respect to the de-selection of the IDNccTLD string needs to be resolved in **Territory**, before any further steps are taken in the de-selection process of the delegated IDNccTLD string and/or validation process for the newly requested IDNccTLD string.

ICANN should include in the implementation plan an example of the documentation required to demonstrate the support for the De-Selection of the selected string(s).

Comments discussion Full WG 15 February 2022
What happens if the SIP no longer supports the originally selected string?
We discussed one or 2 cases extensively. If, at one point, the SIP - including the gvt - no longer support the string, it should be retired. That has consequences. Same mechanism: it should come from the SIP and the timing for doing so, is when a request with such a statement is submitted. It always includes the gvt with respect to support
Question: who sends the request for delegation?
Bart: this is not about delegation. Goes back to the original request of the IDN ccTLD, in all cases the gvt is involved.
Comment: now understands difference between deselection and the deleting
Editorial: page 30 (was page 28) was long paragraph is now split in 2 paragraphs

First reading Text 2.3 supported, no abstentions nor objections

Subgroup Comment and Discussion
Staff Note 1: understand process for selection of IDNccTLD string
Staff Note 2: According to the proposed Retirement policy the process to retire an (IDN)ccTLD takes at least 5 years.
Staff Note 3: Once a country code has been assigned by the ISO3166 MA, the country code will remain to be assigned to the name of the Country, sub-division or other area of geopolitical interest, unless the name of the country changes significantly or the entry is deleted.

According to section 1.2.1 of the full text 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**.

Losing support from the SIP implies that the selected IDN "country code" is no longer a meaningful representation of the name of the Territory

Observation: Community, manager, government. All of them are SIP. What if they have clear consensus that the string should not continue? What if there is disagreement?

Comment: the SIP needs to express support the selected idn cctld string. Meaningful representation of the name of the country

Question: Could there should be a way to "hand back" an IDN ccTLDs based on the consensus of the SIPs (Example the UM TLD); However, this should not be a shortcut for redelegation, just because one member of the SIP does no longer likes the registry.
Question
(lack of) support for a string, by the SIP. Please explain the process through which you went in Serbia to seek support for the IDN ccTLD string. What needs to be done, if one of the supporting parties does not support it anymore? Or if all no longer support?
Mirjana: one of 1st ccTLDs that applied, approx. 10 years ago. Application process was new to all. Decided first to promote an action, asking the community for proposals. They received approx. 15 suggestions. A commission selected the name, which best describes the country. 5 reasonable proposals in the end. A voting took place, and 2 proposals remained. About 10.000 responses. That was an usually high number. 2 proposals were presented to the government, to seek their support. Prior to that, there was contact with ICANN, to see whether there were potential conflicts, and suggestions on the steps to follow. Once all documentation was in place, the request was submitted to ICANN. Process took 2 or 4 months.

Question: if you look at the process, what needs to happen, in your view, if the governments no longer support the choice.
Response : not sure. Depends. Consult with internet community (users, registrars, internet providers, maybe others….) in some countries the communities are organised. Very complicated matter. No clear answer.
What is on the net, stays forever. But if a ccTLD ceases to exist, changes to interested parties might happen.

Observation: concerns about multi stakeholder representation in country or territory. I would like to present the case of .ykp (.укр in Cyrillic)

: what if SIP no longer support the IDN ccTLD.
What is on the net, stays forever. But if a ccTLD ceases to exist, changes to interested parties might happen.

Depends on country / internet community ← sometimes organized

Best way if all interested parties, changes in interested if all them IDN can be removed

Case .ukr
String for .ukr misusing name

2010 -> Ukraine received string: questions , what is concerned UKP, UKR

Discussed IGF UA, rejected receiving -> community the most active participants decided not to revoke string , best approach, 2015 every gove
Definition of SIP: Different per country
GAC representative , authorized agency , language expert
Eventually IDNccTLD , operator

Question: Do you support that full SIP should be in position to revoke their support for the IDN country code?
Temp of the room, yes.
Should this trigger the retirement process?
Again temperature was green -> support

Other parties: need to be clarified

Meeting 9 December 2021

Government is part of the SIP. in some case the only one.
Question: Would it be enough, if only the government would require a change? Or all SIP as defined?
If there is no longer a support, should it be all of the SIP that no longer support the selected string?
Response: all SIP, which include the government.
Comment is supported

Question: is there list of SIP per country?

Response: At a minimum (see line 11-12) the relevant government / public authority that needs to express its non-objection.

Question: should in case in case of a change of IDnccTLD string (i.e. no longer supported) the government express its support? This is a higher threshold, as implication is retirement.

Secondly, there is documentation in policy on who is expected to be involved in SIP. This however depends on the country
In addition, in basic document of full wg stated that support does not need to unanimous, a vast majority suffices, and this majority may change over time.

Comment: governments must be involved.

Poll: do you agree Unanimity is not required
Do you agree? yes

Section 3 Variants PLACEHOLDER

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

Section 4 TECHNICAL & OTHER STRING REQUIREMENTS AND THEIR VALIDATION

4.1.1 Technical Criteria

The selected IDN ccTLD string must abide by all Technical Criteria for an IDN TLD string. In addition to the proposed general requirements for all labels (strings), the selected IDN ccTLD string MUST abide to the normative parts of RFC 5890, RFC 5891, RFC 5892 and RFC 5893.

All applicable technical criteria (general and IDN specific) for IDN ccTLD strings should be documented as part of the implementation plan. For reasons of transparency and accountability they should be made public prior to implementation of the overall policy and endorsed by the ccNSO.

Validation that a string meets the technical criteria is a process step and shall be conducted by an external, independent panel. The recommended procedure is described in Section 2.1.3, Processes and Documentation.

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

WG Comments and discussion
Comment: after RZ-LGR is considered and agreed, it needs to be added to the technical criteria. DNS Stability Panel (DSP). To be revisited next week.
Actual technical criteria to be documented as part of the implementation plan. Who will define them? The current group, another group?
Response: Current practice is that the implementation plan is up to icann org, and then consultation with the community.
To be revisited. The more you add to the policy, the less timeless it will become. Things might evolve.
To be taken into account. Question: what does independent review mean?
Response: recommendation is having a technical panel or a similarity review panel. One and the same panel at the moment. It is up to We leave it up to icann for cost-saving following the regular procedure.
page 25. Line 1. Change to "any".
It has to meet "all" criteria. That is the idea? I agree. "all" should be "any" in line 2
Suggestion: fails to meet any
Q: Will applicant informed about non compliance?

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

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

4.2 TECHNICAL and CONFUSING SIMILARITY Validation Processes and Procedures

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

4.2.1 General description of Technical and string confusion review

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

- To validate the technical requirements ICANN should appoint a "Technical Panel[12]" to conduct a technical review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.
- {PLACEHOLDER: To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent Panel(s)}

4.2.2 Process for Technical Validation

1. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request (see below section} , ICANN staff will submit the selected IDN ccTLD string to the "Technical Panel" for the technical review.
2. The Technical Panel conducts a technical string evaluation of the string submitted for evaluation. If needed, the Panel may ask questions for clarifications through ICANN staff.
3. The findings of the evaluation will be reported to ICANN staff. In its report the Panel shall include the names of the Panelists and document its findings, and the rationale for the decision.

Usually the Panel will complete its review and send its report to ICANN staff within 30 days after receiving the IDN ccTLD string to be evaluated. In the event the Panel expects to need more time, ICANN staff should be

---

[12] Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

informed accordingly. ICANN staff shall then inform the requester accordingly.

If according to the technical review the string meets all the technical criteria the string is technically validated. If the selected string fails to the the technical criteria, the requested string is not-valid under the policy. ICANN staff shall inform and notify the requester accordingly and section **Change, withdrawal or termination of the request** (see section below) applies.

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

Section 5. Two-Step Process

Under the overall policy a two-stage process is recommended for the selection of an IDN ccTLD string:
Step 1: String selection stage in Territory
Step 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.

5.1 Stage 1: String Selection in Territory
5.1.1 General Description

The string selection stage is a local matter in Territory and should ideally involve all relevant local actors in Territory. The actors in Territory must:

1. Identify the script and language for the IDN Table and prepare this Table if necessary,
2. Select the IDN ccTLD string. The selected string must meet the meaningfulness and technical requirements and should not be confusingly similar.
3. Document endorsement /support of the relevant stakeholders in Territory for the selected string, and
4. Select the intended IDN ccTLD string requester before submitting an IDN ccTLD string for validation. In cases where the string requester is not yet selected, the relevant public authority of the Territory may act as nominee for the to be selected string requester.

Notes and Comments

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

- The IDN ccTLD string requester. This actor initiates the next step of the process, provides the necessary information and documentation, and acts as the interface with ICANN. Typically this actor is the expected IDN ccTLD manager.
- Significantly Interested Parties.
    - 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.

As part of the in territory step the following documentation should be prepared:
i. Documentation of required endorsement / support for selected string by Significantly Interested Parties

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

<u>Classification of input</u>

Notes and Comments

ii. Documentation of the meaningfulness of the selected IDN ccTLD string

Notes and Comments

iii. Documentation Designated Language

Notes and Comments

Further, and at the request of the actors in **Territory**, ICANN may assist them with the in-Territory Process.

WG Comments and Findings
The WG has already discussed the requirements of the documentation: see section 2
Text agreed upon attendees 6 July 2021 meeting
One of the requirements was for the IDN ccTLD string to be in a designated language. Reference to the script in which it is expressed
Would that suffice at this stage? This needs to happen in the territory
Remark: would come later, at the validation. The RZ-LGR will provide you with the script.

Proposal is to change the text accordingly. Need to identify the designated language for the IDN ccTLD string

Comment on what was said. Makes sense to keep the relation. "Prepare this table as necessary". But the is not the responsibility of thse who select the string. If a table has not been prepared yet, they could initiate the process?

Response: assume so. Needs to be a mechanism by which the SIP where there is no table, should be able to apply and/or initiate the process. Is that a correct understanding?
Question/comment Should it also refer to the string itself, in addition to the IDN table?
Should the wording identify the script and language of the IDN ccTLD string AND the IDN table, rather than just the table
Response: combining 1 and 2

Who are the parties to be served? How do we identify them?
SIP have been defined in the previous section (section 2.1.1 of the consolidation versions November 2020 - May 2021). Drift of the argument to stay the same, but include a reference to the text previously used, for consistency. Local internet community: replaced by "significantly interested parties" (SIP). used in cc policies.

Question: When and by whom will be verification be defined? Response: this is part of stage 2, required verification of the documentation, technical checks, confusing similarity. Not clear from the text yet however.

5.1.2 Detailed aspects String Selection Stage

1. 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[13]. 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~~

WG Comments and Findings
Section 5.1.2 will be revisited once the variant management group has concluded its work. They have been explicitly asked to provide draft text for this section.

Staff note:
Please note the following background material, which may be relevant in this context:
1. **Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names | Version 3.0** (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-guidelines-2011-09-02-en)
This document supersedes version 2.2 of these Guidelines to reflect the IDNABIS revision ("IDNA2008") of the initial IDNA protocol ("IDNA2003"). It was prepared by members of the IDN Guidelines Revision Working Group (of gTLD and ccTLD registries with IDN experience)

---

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

2. **Procedures for the IDN Repository** (https://www.iana.org/help/idn-repository-procedure) The Repository of IDN Practices was created to support the development of the internationalized domain names (IDNs) by promoting the sharing of registry IDN policies. The policies are referred to as "Label Generation Rulesets" (LGRs), and historically as "IDN tables" or "variant tables."

The WG discussed some aspects of the IDN Table section. However, it was agreed to await the results of the Variant Management Sub-Group and then revisit this section.

Detailed aspects:
When we list the IDN table, do we need to clarify the context? Is it related to the review of the string? The string being applied for? Second level registrations? If it is for the string being applied for, further discussion needed. Relation with RZ-LGR. Also linked to review of the string.
Comment: IDN table is mainly for RZ-LGR. Not for second level domains. Chinese LGR. Japan, Korea, China all use hang characters. Second level table is based on chinese comment. Different environment, different language. You cannot apply idn table for RZ-LGR to 2nd level registrations. Good experience for using the table. 20 years. Do not use another table

Question: is the IDN table that has been developed in China for the chinese language included in the IANA IDN repository?
Response: We also have our IDN table in the iana repository. CDNC chinese variant table
Is that also the Table used for second level labels?
Response: yes.
Question: were there any issues/concerns with submitting this in the repository?
Response: already submitted. No concerns. Put in practice for many years. Has proven to be successful
Question: any advice?
Response: depends on language. Japanese characters also use Hang characters. Same for Korea. Top level domains have formed the same group. Discussed this together.
See for reference: https://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables
Staff observation: potential overlap. VM-group to come up with a recommendation, to ensure consistency. Language and script. Suggestion for VM-group
Reference to IDN Table to be deleted in next version

5.2. Stage 2: Validation of IDN ccTLD string
5.2.1 General description
The String Validation stage is a set of procedures to ensure all criteria and requirements regarding the selected IDN ccTLD string 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. [TO BE REVISITED FOLLOWING SUGGESTION VM SUB-GROUP]
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.

5.2.2 Detailed aspects String Validation Stage
A. 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[14].

WG Comment and Findings
To be revisited as soon as VM sub-group has completed its work

B. **Submission procedure for selected string and related documentation** This part of the process is considered a matter of implementation.

C. **Validation of selected string**

---

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

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 **Territor**y
- 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.

WG Comment and Finding

Need to include validation of variants of selected string. To be suggested by VM and discussed by Full WG.

Should the documentation submitted to ICANN be written in English or could be written with the requested IDN string?
During meeting views in support of both approaches:
To promote multilingualism, including IDNs request and relevant documentation should be allowed to be submitted in Designated language.
At eh other end strong opposition: may create ambiguity in application. One cannot expect ICANN and external panelist to master all Designated Languages possible, nor should be the burden for a validated translation be on ICANN. Need to accept that English is the lingua franca of the Internet

Proposed way forward: request and documentatation may be submitted in Designated Language together with authenticated/certified translation in English. Requester needs to ensure the translation from Deesignated Language into English is provided and certified. In validation and processing English documentation will prevail for purpose of IDNccTLD selection process. What is considered a auntehnticated/certified translation for this purpose is considered a matter of implementation

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 and in accordance with section 8 below.

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

If ICANN staff anticipates issues pertaining to the Technical and String Confusion Review during its initial review of the application, ICANN staff is advised to inform the requester of its concerns. The requester will have the opportunity to either:

1. Change the selected string,
   or
2. Tentatively request two or more strings as part of the application including a ranking of the preference to accommodate the case where the preferred string is not validated,
   or
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
I General description of Technical and string confusion review
WG Comments and Findings
Staff Comment: Note some of the topics in this section from Section 2.1.3 , 2013 Report to the Board have already been reviewed. The sections on cofusing similarity wil be reviewed and updated by the confusing similarity sub-group .

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

- To validate the technical requirements ICANN should appoint a "Technical Panel[15]" to conduct a technical review of the selected IDN ccTLD string.
- {PLACEHOLDER: To validate a selected string is not confusingly similar, ICANN should appoint an external and independent Panel(s)}

---

[15] Or any other name ICANN would prefer.

4. After completion of the ICANN staff validation of the request (see section 7.2.2 3.a above), ICANN staff will submit the selected IDN ccTLD string to the "Technical Panel" for the technical review.

5. 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.

6. The findings of the evaluation will be reported to ICANN staff. In its report the Panel shall include the names of the Panelists and document its findings, and the rationale for the decision.

Usually the Panel will complete its review and send its report to ICANN staff within 30 days after receiving the IDN ccTLD string to be evaluated. In the event the Panel expects to need more time, ICANN staff should be informed accordingly. ICANN staff shall then inform the requester accordingly.

If according to the technical review the string meets all the technical criteria the string is technically validated. If the selected string fails to the the technical criteria, the requested string is not-valid under the policy. ICANN staff shall inform and notify the requester accordingly and section **Change, withdrawal or termination of the request** (see section below) applies.

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

WG Discussion and Comments
Step 1 Selection IDN ccTLD string needs to happen in the country/territory.
Step 2 is Validation. Section 5.2.1. Is High-level process and milestone description of the validation process.
Section 5.2.2. Goes into the details of the validation process.
What will be role of staff with respect to validation of variants VM? Looking at the original string in context of RZ-LGR and what the variant strings are. Share that those are potentially 2 different steps in the process

Response: Up to the VM group what they will have to propose. Not preempt the outcome of the VM subgroup

Section 6. 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.

WG Comments and Discussion

Under Fast Track Process the selected string is posted (called: "primary string(s) represent the string that the requester now may seek for IDN ccTLD delegation"). For current publication see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/string-evaluation-completion-2014-02-19-en

Comment on terminology used on website: Note that the string passed all validation steps. Seeking delegation is next phase. Also note that "variants identified by the requester (applicant)" has a very spefic meaning: Accoring to tht text "they will be allocated to the requester in order to be reserved to the entitled manager for potential future delegation in the DNS root zone"

Question from meeting 6 July: should under the policy both the selected string and variants be posted. If variants to be posted: all allocatable or other sub-set? To be proposed by VM subgroup. Note that set of allocatable strings could be huge.

Question: Is there a need for a complaint process? Once the TLD string is published,and before putting the string into the zone? Note: IDN string selection happens in country and support needs to be documented including by the relevant governmental authority. This is therefore first and foremost an internal matter. Also note that validation ois looking at the string itself i.e whether the requirements and criteria for an IDNccTLD string have been met. Unclear who should complain if published. Non-SIP? Other governments, parties from outside the Territory. By introducing a complaint step the internal nature of the string selection and role of SIP, including the government or relevant public authorities will become subject to a complaint.

If complaint: what are possibly complaint period, Who may complain? Is when published final?

WG agreed to revisit later as a case for a stress test.

Section 7. 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, transfer and retirement of ccTLDs. ICANN shall notify the requester accordingly.

WG Comments and Discussion

Section 8. 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.

WG Comments and Discussion
No comments raised meeting 6 July 2021

Section 9. Miscellanous

From Section 2.1.4 , 2013 Report to the Board

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 delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs apply to IDN ccTLDs.

WG Comments and Findings

No comments. Text accepted

B. Confidentiality of information during due diligence stage (read: validation 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.

WG Comments and Findings

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

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

The approach is very similar to current practices with around delegation and transfers etc. of (IDN)ccTLD, which were re-confirmed in the FoI. Publication is relevant from an accountability perspective.

WG agreed with proposal on 2 August meeting

~~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.~~

C.1 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[16].

WG Comments and Findings

At its 17 August meeting the members of the WG present agreed to strike section 9 C**.**

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

Are there existing lists? Yes, 5 lists. Will record IDN ccTLD names or their variants. For instance: IANA Root Zone Database. This is policy in action. ccTLDs, gTLDs. What is the added value of an additional list? None …. Seen the fact that there are existing lists, the historical reasons for having such a list no longer exist, and the maintenance of such a new list is a true challenge. Example discussed was "reserved names". What should happen with them? High cost, implications of reserving names, especially when open-ended. Needs to be litigation-proof.

Line 21 on page 2. Staff also included the arguments from the discussion at the previous meeting.

Questions or comments?

Taking all the arguments into account, and seeing the divergence in this group at the previous meeting, staff prepared an overview of the existing lists.

Question on line 15. How can it have an impact on non-ccTLD policies?

Response: Currently, non-ccNSO policy means GNSO policies. If we build a list, it may directly impact what is allowed under the new gTLD process. If you carve out certain aspects, it may impact what has been developed under SubPro. Grey area around IDN strings with 3 characters. Allowed currently under subPro. There is no clean delineation between the 2. The world was easy with only 2-char codes. Clearly ccTLDs. With the arrival of IDN ccTLDs, this distinction became blurred.

---

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

Question: distinction between IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD?

Response: if the name of the country or territory is listed in iso 3166. Keep in mind, that at the time when this was created, there was no such exclusion. This was pre-AGB, pre-SubPro WT5.

Question to the group: Are you in favour of removing item c? Line 6-11. 2 in favour, some not in favour.

Comment: .id has submitted 2 years ago an IDN application. But was rejected. Language is still not an official language. Important that we refer to ISO3166.

Observation: But this list has nothing to do with the iso list. Independent. Completely different.

Comment: more of a question. What harm is done by keeping the list, other than the possibility of ambiguity with the ISO list. This list has also the variants, which are not going to be listed elsewhere.

Response: will need to be maintained. Independent of the creation of a new list. But why maintain a list, if there are so many lists? Effort needed.

Question: is there another place where an authoritative list continues to exist? Variant, territory, ccTLD

Response 1: root zone.

Response 2: ICANN does maintain a list of IDN ccTLDs. Variants for IDN TLDs (gTLDs and ccTLDs): need to develop a mechanism. Talking to IANA too. How to maintain the list? ccTLDs maintained. Variants maintained once policy is approved and implemented. Independent of this list.

Comment: Need to be conservative. Is there is something currently that is authoritative, do not remove it unless the new authoritative list is in place. Expecting policies to be created in the future, seems risky. Worried about utility going away, before a replacement is found

Response 1: this list does not exist yet. This was an idea in 2011, but was never implemented.

Response 2: my point too. There is currently no such a list.

Question: the iana list includes idn ccTLDs and variants? Only idn ccTLDs, and the process for including variants is not yet defined?

We could instead of creating a list, maintain a record of the validated idn ccTLDs and variants. Refer to iana list, and say we expect them to included the variants too?

Response: there are no variants yet. Not yet delegated.

Even before delegation, ICANN maintains a list of validated IDN ccTLDs. There will be a mechanism, for dealing with VM, once the policy has been adopted.

Staff in chat:

- list of IDN ccTLDs successfully delegated. https://data.iana.org/TLD/tlds-alpha-by-domain.txt

- List of successfully validated TLDs: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/string-evaluation-completion-2014-02-19-en

There could be validated TLDs, which are not yet delegated.

Comment: reading number c as "what is possible", already maintained by iso3166 list. Comment. Section 6 which we discussed previously is about the publication of the validated IDN ccTLD string. The VM-group will come up with a recommendation to include variants. Will be addressed in the future

All members present agreed with striking lines 6-11 after discussion.

Staff Note: Creation of list over time
1. Historical reason to create list over time has disappeared. When proposal was developed in 2011 timeframe there was an intense discussion in ICANN community around the use of country and territory names as gTLDs. For an in depth overview the WG is referred to the sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Final report of the CCWG on use of Country and Territory Names (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/ccwg-ctn-final-paper-15jun17-en.pdf) and results of the SubPro WT5 discussions concluded in October 2019 and included in the GNSO SubPro Final Report Annex J. (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/final-report-newgtld-subsequent-procedures-pdp-18jan21-en.pdf)

2. Existing lists. Currently various, authoritative lists are already available and in use in the context of IDNccTLDs. Each of the lists records aspects, but is not complete as they rely on the data provided by external (local) sources. The lists are:
- ISO 3166 standard part 1: list of countries, sub-divisions and other areas of geopolitical interest.
- ISO 3166 standard part 3: defines codes for country, sub-divisions and other areas of geopolitical interest which have been deleted from ISO3166 since its first publication in 1974.
- UNGEGN List of Country Names: List of Country names which includes the name of countries, with national official names and in the 6 official UN languages (https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/docs/11th-uncsgn-docs/E_Conf.105_13_CRP.13_15_UNGEGN%20WG%20Country%20Names%20Document.pdf)
- ISO639-3 and related the Ethnologue, listing the living languages of the world: https://www.ethnologue.com/browse/names
- IANA Root Zone Database (https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db)

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

4. **Maintenance of list over time.** As noted the operational issues of maintenance may be prohibiting: the more information included the more resources are needed to maintain and the more detailed the rules have to be to avoid ambivalence. Related, the size of the list may be prohibitive: as

said if the proposal is to include the names of Territories in all languages and their variants (per script), the number of entries will be in order of the millions. As a second order issue of such a large repository is correctness at a certain point tin time of the entries. This is specifically an issue if the requestors or ccTLD Manager of the selected IDNccTLD string will be required to provide updates to the entries, particularly if there is hardly any incentive for them to do so.

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

Nowadays (2021) First question to ask if it still makes sense to create a new list over time?
Question: who maintains this list? Response: unclear
Maintenance is very important. The discussions in SubPro did not have much to do with country code, but more regarding politics. For example, all kind of claims were made about the ISO-list, which had nothing to do with the ISO 3166, and related it puts maintenance at risk. Therefore to avoid furuter issue the purpose of such a list should be well defined purpose and scope. If it is agreed to create a list   as part of the process You need a supposedly neutral list. Purpose of such a list should be well-defined.
There is an additional issue which is related and that is the potential scale of such a list. One could end up with a list of millions of names. Currentluy roughly 250 country codes in the ISO list and each country code multiplied by all living languages, and then again with variants. Currently around 7000 living languages, and number of variants is unknown. It seems easy to include this as a requirement, but it is an immense task to maintain, and without any clear purpose and for what purpose
Question: Who would create and maintain the list? If the 2-letter code ceases to exist in the iso list? Guess that is easy to track?
ISO 3166 part 3 includes the historical data.

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

Question: does applicant or icann staff include entries? What is the relevance of this table?
Response: This is a proposal in the original 2013 policy. The list itself has never been created. It was a proposal at the very end of the process. This group is reviewing the 2013 proposals.

Note: If any changes are made to the ISO list, which triggers the retirement, that is something to record and keep for future reference. But not a table. To discuss later when we come to the selection of idn strings.
Response: this is good point. De-selection is already covered for ASCII ccTLDs.
Added Staff Note: Again what is purpose of maintaining of list of retired ccTLDs? Currently: in principle once a country code is removed from the ISO3166 list, for example as a result of siginicant rename of the country, then the original country code may be used again as a ccTLD.

Question: If there is a change to the delegated string, someone would complain, if it is an issue. Otherwise no benefit to this list
There is a path for complaints?
Response: not really. If there is a significant name change, which results in a change in the string, the original ASCII cctld will disappear and a new ascii 2-letter code will be assigned by the ISO3166 MA.This would trigger the removal and retire process. The retirement is recorded

in the iana reports, which are publicly available. Regarding variants: to be discussed once it is clear what triggers the de-selection. See retirement process: once you define the retirement trigger event, the idn cctld will be removed, together with its variants (staff observation)

Question: concern regarding not understanding line 25. what characteristics?
Response: not sure. Unclearity already 10 years ago. But senses this does not withstand the time.
Question: Assuming ISO3166 maintains its own change record. Is there a need to duplicate that effort?
Response: Assumption is correct history is recorded in part 3 of the standard. No point in maintaining the history of what is not authoritative.
Additiinal point made: just follow the standard, and create a layer on top of that?
Response: this again raises the question about maintenance etc. and purpose
Additional note: part 3 includes all the retired codes. The officially assigned codes, Reserved codes which are not official. Easy to find.

Question: what if a designated language of a territory changes?
Response: not clear. This is part of the de-selection sub-group to discuss and check what the impact is.

Comment: maintain it, if it is useful for reference. So far we do not have an existing mechanism. Easy.
Response: what would be the difference between that list, and the existing iso3166? That one is maintained.
Additional comment: including reference to idn. Not sure iso3166 has that.

Response: risk of duplication. Possibility of confusion among stakeholders. Records should be clean, in one location, and useful to all.
Comment: proposal to create a list is Ill-defined. Not clear what it will be used for. List of IDNs exist; delegation are in the iana database.

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

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

Action item

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

D. Transitional arrangement regarding IDN ccTLD strings under the Fast Track IDN ccTLD Process

1. Closure of Fast Track Process. As of the moment ccPDP4 has been fully implemented and is available for processing requested selected IDNccTLD strings, the Fast Track Process must be closed for new selected IDNccTLD string requests.

2. If at the time the IDNccTLD request process based on ccPDP4 becomes available, IDN ccTLD string requests which are still in the Fast Track Process must be completed through the Fast Track Process. Completion results either in publication of the selected IDNccTLD string in accordance with section 5.6.4 of the FIP, or results in the withdrawal of the request by the requestor or in termination of the request by ICANN in accordance with section 5.4 of the Final Implementation Plan[17].

3. All IDNccTLD strings that have been validated under the Fast Track Process, will be deemed to be validated under the IDNccTLD policy for the selection of IDNccTLD strings, and are grandfathered. The recommendations under this policy development process with respect to the de-selection of IDNccTLD strings shall be applicable to the grandfathered IDNccTLD strings.

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

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

Any comments or questions Scenarion1? Closure of the FTP (Fast Track Process)
We should rephrase. "this policy shall be the only one available to submit a request." something along those lines.
Comment intention is that once the policy is operational and becomes operational, no new strings can be requested through the FTP.
Agreement with the idea. But the wording should be clearer.

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

---

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

Action: pdate the text ahead of the next meeting.

Note that to date (August 2021) over 60 IDN cctld strings that have been delegated as result of the fast track process. Clear that transitional arrangement is needed. This also needs to be updated with a section on the Variant Management. Just a transitional arrangement to ensure that those idn cctlds that have been delegated as a result of the Fast Track Process, are not affected by this policy. In addition, when this policy comes into effect, requests that are pending under the FTP, should run through that process (in case the procedures differ). Empty the FTP channel, and then close it.

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

Note: this clause as is does not put a time-bound on the applicant. Not clear if the transition can apply for 1 or even 10 years. Applications can take multiple years.
Response: good point. Perhaps we should leave this to implementation? To be included as an element for further discussion.
Comment: section D will not impact already delegated idn cctld strings, nor the currently pending applications. Include both. New application and cctld string which is already delegated. This sentence needs to be rephrased. "Applications" or "under application". Let's limit the scope.
Bart: section to be revisited. With the following scenarios in mind:
- Scenario 1: Transitional arrangement. Regarding idn cctlds still under FTP
- Scenario 2: idn cctld strings that were granted under FTP, and that have been delegated. Not affected by overall policy. Grandfathered
- Scenario 3: what to do with variants?
Comment: variants delegated under the FTP. not mentioned here
Response: No variants have been delegated under FTP rules

2nd Reading 14 September 2021
Item D.1: agreed, no comments

Item D.2. No comments

Item D 3.
Comment: There are some scenarios which have been raised by the Technical Study Group as well. Overlaps with number 4. Idn cctlds that could potentially be variant tlds, but that have been delegated as synchronous tlds. No discussion happened yet. Grandfathered? Or ? once that discussions happens, flag this to be addressed
Response: Variants not part of FTP, even though there is a link, simply separate idn ccTLDS. Perhaps good to make a note and to revisit this with the full WG.
Comment: Agree, wait for more clarity. Add as a note.

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

Response: if synchronous IDNccTLDs are grandfathered as is, then the variant rules, or the recommendation applied on variant TLDs would apply to each of them separately. But if they would be considered variants would be different , if they would be considered variants.
Comment: need a policy that distinguishes what was delegated under Fast Track Process, and what is the variant. Confusing.

Comment: First VM-subgroup to finish its work

Comment: line 13. Selection policy. Process, but not for this selection. Wording should be clearer
Deselection is just defining the trigger events. The retirement policy itself has already been approved
and is applicable to all ccTLDs, including IDNccTLDs. Once the trigger event has been defined, the de-
selection/removal/retirement process applies. This is only the de-selection itself. The
recommendations on the de-selection of the string.
Comment: de-selection is an action, not a policy. If it is a policy with special wording, it should be
capitalised.
Response: external event which triggers the application of the retirement policy

**NOTE & Action: Impact of VM on transitional arrange,ment will be discussed after the VM sub-
group has completed its work.**

Recommended transitional was supported second reading 28 Septmeber 2021, including the note
and Action item.

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 the ccNSO Council initiates
such a review by launching a review group who will be tasked to review the
ascertain whether the policy needs to be updated and advise the ccNSO
Council on the proposed method for such an update. The scope and
working method of such a review must be determined by the ccNSO after
consulting relevant stakeholders, and take into account the experience
with the ccPDP4 process and relevant circumstances and developments
with respect to IDN TLDs

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.

WG Findings and comments
Item 5: review of the policy.
Notion of a review, to be triggered by the ICANN Board, with a review Team which operates with
ToR.
Question: why 5 years?
Response: at the time (2011) it seemed to be logical, but could also be 10 years
Question: If event which triggers the review of the policy. But what if there is no trigger, no
complaints?
Response: valid question for the group

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

Terms to be discussed at the next meeting (5 years, or different proposal)
This is done by a WG, which has Terms of Reference (ToR), to be defined under auspices of the ICANN BoD
Broader review, and then a PDP?
Comment: ccNSO itself can make a review and determine whether adjustments are necessary to the policy.
Response: policy would say that ccNSO would need to organise issue report and review.
Comment: ccNSO itself. Preferred option
Note: ccNSO Council and Board can always start a PDP. Regular review, whenever needed. Through mechanism of a PDP. The review itself is the Issue Report. Policy directed at the ccNSO. In the review, interested SO/ACs need to be consulted - if willing.

2nd Reading 14 September 2021
Amended text was adopted.

F. Verification of Implementation

It is anticipated that some parts of the recommendations and process steps will need to be further refined and interpreted by ICANN staff before they will be implemented. It is further anticipated that this will be done through an implementation plan or similar planning document. It is therefore recommended that the ccNSO monitors and evaluates the planned implementation of recommendations and the ccNSO Council reviews and approves the final planning document, before implementation by staff.

Comments and Findings
Recommendation directed at ccNSO and ICANN. Ensure that implementation is coordinated between ICANN and ccNSO, and members of the ccPDP4 WG could be consulted when needed. Suggestion was supported first reading 14 Septemebr and second reading 28 September 2021.

G. Permanent IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel

~~Due to the complex nature of IDN's and the sensitivities and interest involved in the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, it is recommended that under the overall policy a Permanent IDN ccTLD Advisory Panel is appointed to assist and provide guidance to ICANN staff and the Board on the interpretation of the overall policy in the event the overall policy does not provide sufficient guidance and/or the impact of the policy is considered to be unreasonable or unfair for a particular class of cases.~~

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

Comments and Findings WG

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

Question: why permanent?

Response: to ensure that it always exists. Taken into context from 2011. Advise to strike this. Rely on the ability to review the process by the ccnso council.

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

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

Question: is there something similar?

Response: no such thing for ccTLDs.

Members attending 14 September meeting agreed with proposed text (1st reading).Members attending the 28 Septemebr meeting supported striking this recommendations.

Annex A: Specific terminology used in policy proposal

Term	Definition/Description	Document, section To be updated	Comment
Territory, Territories	"Territory" or "Territories" are defined as a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed in Section 3 of the 'International Standard ISO 3166, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes' [ISO 3166-1:2020] or, in some exceptional cases, e.g. grandfathered-in delegations, a country, a sub-division, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed for an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element	ccPDP4-WG Work Document Section 2.1.1 Version 05 – 06 January 2021 , I	The definition of territory may be included in Article 10 of the ICANN Bylaws for purposes of Article 10.
Meaningful Representation	A country code string is considered to be a **Meaningful Representation** if it is: a. The name of the **Territory**; or b. Part of the name of the **Territory** that denotes the **Territory**; or c. A short-form designation for the name of the **Territory**, recognizably denoting the name.	Policy proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Criteria, Requirements and Processes v05, section 3.2	
Designated Language	A language that has a legal status in the or that serves as a language of administration	Policy proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Criteria, Requirements and Processes v05, section 3.2	

Terminology derived from the ISO 3166 Standard

Included is basic terminology included in the ISO3166 Standard, which was identified by the ccPDP3 Retirement WG in the context of developing the process for the retirement of ccTLDs. Some of these terms are also used in the context of ccPDP4.

Notes with respect to the terminology derived from the ISO 3166 Standard:

- In this overview a distinction is made between terminology defined in the 2013 and 2020 editions of the Standard and the ISO Online Browsing Platform (OBP). The terminology defined in the Standard is included in the table in normal font. The terminology used in the Online Browsing Platform is *emphasized*.

- The definitions contained in the Standard are considered to take precedent. Terminology from the Online Browsing Platform is only included for informational purposes. It is strongly advised not to use or refer to the informational terms in Policy and policy related documents.

- A new version of ISO 3166 was published very recently (2020). The major change is that the table of country codes is no longer part of the printed standard but online as part of the ISO Open browser Platform (iso.org/obp). The text of the standard reflects this change with some additional definitions. Also, there are non-substantial changes to other definitions to abide to the new ISO guidelines for writing and publishing standards.

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in:	ISO 3166: 2020 terminology
Assigned (or allocated) code elements	The result of applying the principle of visual association between the country names (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their corresponding code elements.	ISO Standard Section 5.1	Section 5.2: The principle behind the alphabetic codes in the code corresponding to this document is a visual association between the country names (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their corresponding code elements. In applying this principle, the code elements have generally been assigned on the basis of the short names of the countries, thus avoiding, wherever possible, any reflection of their political status. The distinguishing signs for road vehicles reported by the contracting parties to the Conventions on Road Traffic (1949 and 1968; see Reference [21]) provided the major source for code elements for the code corresponding to this document.
Unassigned	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		Mentioned in 3.10. status of alpha-2 country code element (in the OPB) information whether the code element is assigned, unassigned or reserved transitionally, exceptionally, or for an indeterminate period
Unassigned	*Code Elements that have not been assigned to country names.*	ISO Online Browsing Platform	
Deletions from the list of country names	Deletions from the list of country names shall be made on the basis of information from the United Nations Headquarters, or upon the request of a member of ISO 3166/MA. The ISO 3166/MA shall decide upon deletion, on the basis of the information given. ISO3166-3 provides the list of country names deleted in this part of ISO 3166 since its first edition in 1974.	ISO Standard Section 7.3	Deletions from the list of country names shall be made on the basis of information from the United Nations Headquarters, or upon the request of a member of ISO 3166/MA. The ISO 3166/MA shall decide upon deletion, on the basis of the information given. ISO3166-3 provides the list of country names deleted in this part of ISO 3166 since its first edition in 1974.

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in:	ISO 3166: 2020 terminology
Reservation of Code Elements	Some code elements are reserved. For a limited period when their reservation is the result of the deletion or alteration of a country name. For an indeterminate period when the reservation is the result of the application of international law or of exceptional requests.	ISO Standard Section 7.5 & 7.5.1	Now in Section 7.6 & 7.6.1
Reallocation Period	Some code elements are rese For a limited period when the is the result of the deletion or a country name. For an indeterminate period v reservation is the result of the international law or of exceptional requests.	ISO Standard Section 7.5.2	*Section 7.6.2 New text* Country code elements that the ISO 3166/MA has altered or deleted should not be reassigned during a period of at least fifty years after the change. The exact period is determined in each case on the basis of the extent to which the former code element was used.
Transitionally Reserved	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		mentioned in 3.10. status of alpha-2 country code element (in the OPB)
	Codes that are reserved during a transitional period while new code elements that may replace them are taken into use. This results from changes in the standard.	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform Glossary.	

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in:	ISO 3166: 2020 terminology
Period of Non-Use	Certain code elements existing at the time of the first publication of the ISO 3166 country codes and differing from those in this part (ISO 3166-1) should not be used for an indeterminate period to represent other country names. These code elements should be included in the list of reserved code elements and should not be reallocated during a period of at least fifty years after the date the countries or organizations concerned have discontinued their use.	ISO Standard 7.5.3	Now section 7.6.2 Certain country code elements existing at the time of the first publication of the ISO 3166 country codes and differing from those in this part of ISO 3166 should not be used for an indeterminate period to represent other country names. This provision applies to certain vehicle designations notified under the 1949 and 1968 Conventions on Road Traffic. Code elements to which this provision applies should be included in the list of reserved code elements (see 7.6.5) and should not be reassigned during a period of at least fifty years after the date when the countries or organizations concerned have discontinued their use.
Exceptionally Reserved	Code elements may be reserved, in exceptional cases, for country names which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in this part of ISO3166, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority must be sought.	ISO Standard 7.5.3	Now Section 7.6.4
Exceptionally Reserved	*Codes that have been reserved for a particular use at special request of a national ISO member body, governments or international organizations.*	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform Glossary.	Section 7.6.4 Code elements may be reserved, in exceptional cases, for country names which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in the code corresponding to this document, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority should be sought.

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in:	ISO 3166: 2020 terminology
Reallocation	Before reallocating a former code element or a formerly reserved code element, the ISO3166/MA shall consult, as appropriate, the authority or agency on whose behalf the code element was reserved, and consideration shall be given to difficulties which might arise for the reallocation.	ISO Standard Section 7.5.5	Section 7.6.2. See the period of non-use entry
Indeterminately Reserved	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		mentioned in 3.10. status of alpha-2 country code element (in the OPB)
Indeterminately Reserved		ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform glossary.	
Country Name	Name of country, dependency, or other area of particular interest	ISO Standard Part 1 Section 3.4	Section 3.4 (OBP 3.14-3.18, 3.22)
Country Code	Listing of country names with their representations by code elements	ISO 3166 Part 1 Section 3.3	Section 3.3 (OBP 3.10-3.13)
Code Element	The result of applying a code to an element of a coded set	ISO 3166 Part 1 Section 3.2	Section 3.2 (OBP 3.10-3.13)
Code	Set of data	ISO 3166 Part 1 Section 3.1	Section 3.1, changed definition: set of data transformed or represented in different forms according to a pre-established set of rules
List of Country Names	Part of the Clause 9 list	ISO 3166 Part 1 Section 6, 6.1. In clause 6 of part 1 the content of the list is enumerated in Clause 9.	The whole clause disappeared. The list is replaced with the ISO Open Brower Platform portal. and that is therefore there are definitions 3.xx in the standard

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in:	ISO 3166: 2020 terminology
Formerly Used Codes	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		Defined in Part 3, Section 3.3.3 **alpha-4 formerly used country code element** coded representation of country no longer in use
Formerly Used Codes	*Codes that used to be part of the standard but that are no longer in use. See alpha-4 codes.*	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform	