

**DRAFT Final REPORT
Recommendations for Fast Track**

Published for Comment

PLEASE NOTE: This is a first Draft of the Final Report and is published for comment and input. This document has not been signed off by the IDNC Working Group who will continue to provide their own comments and input. The IDNC WG will conduct a meeting in Paris during the ICANN meeting.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	page 3
2. Introduction	page 4
3. Guiding Principles	page 5
4. Fast Track Methodology	page 6
Stage 1 Preparing for the Fast Track in Territory	page 6
Stage 2 Due Diligence	page 9
Stage 3 Designation of IDN ccTLD	page 11
5. Alternative views	page 12
6. Overview of Recommendations	page 14
7. Background IDNC WG and Process	page 15
Annex A: High level process flow diagram	page 18

Recommendations IDNC Working Group

1. Executive Summary

The IDNC WG was tasked by the ICANN Board to recommend mechanisms to introduce a limited number of non-contentious IDN ccTLDs, associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes, to meet near term demand, while the overall policy is being developed.

The scope of the IDNC WG is limited to developing feasible methods (for the introduction of a limited number of IDN ccTLDs) that do not pre-empt the policy outcomes of the IDN ccPDP.

The IDNC WG has developed and recommends a three-stage methodology for the Fast Track. This methodology is based on and takes into account the overarching requirements as defined in its Charter and a number of guiding principles for the methodology on which the IDNC WG reached consensus.

The Methodology:

Territory prepares to enter the Fast Track

1. Identify script and language
2. Select String
3. Document the endorsement in territory of identified language/script and string.
4. Appoint/ select IDN ccTLD manager and prepare documentation endorsement/support, and other items necessary to submit a delegation request
5. Prepare language table to be used

Due Diligence

1. Submit language table into IANA Repository & submission of selected string and related documentation.
2. Due Diligence by 'Technical Committee' and 'Linguistic Expert Advisory Panel' of selected string.
3. Publish selected string on ICANN website

Delegation Process

1. Request delegation in accordance with current IANA procedures

2. Introduction

The purpose of the Fast Track is to introduce a limited number of non-contentious IDN ccTLDs, associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes in a short time frame to meet near term demand. The scope of the IDNC WG was limited to developing feasible methods (for the introduction of a limited number of IDN ccTLDs) that do not pre-empt the outcomes of the IDN ccPDP.

In developing feasible methods the working group was required to take into account and be guided by the overarching requirements of stability and security; IDNA protocols and IDN guidelines; input of the technical community in respect to implementation of IDNs; and current practices for the delegation of ccTLDs.

In developing its methodology the IDNC WG is aware of the current review and revisions taking place of the current IDNA protocol (RFC 4690, hereafter: IDNA 2003). The IDNC WG is also aware that implementing the Fast Track process as recommended, may be dependent on conclusion of that revision (IDNA*bis*, Work in progress, hereafter: IDNA 2008).

The IDNC WG published for comment a draft Initial Report to canvass the topics that need to be covered.

The IDNC WG published a draft Interim Report to canvass a methodology.

As determined in the Initial and Interim Report, the Fast Track requires two specific mechanisms:

1. A mechanism for the selection of the IDN ccTLD string; and
2. A mechanism to designate an IDN ccTLD manager.

A number of general guiding principles (section 3) have been developed which, in conjunction with the overarching requirements, structure, guide and set conditions for the methodology. These principles are based on and take into account the substantive input received on the Initial and Interim Report.

The methodology itself is presented in section 4. It is a three stage approach, devised to enable the relevant actors in the territory to self-assess and determine whether the delegation of an IDN ccTLD under the Fast Track process is feasible and to enable the relevant stakeholders to select a string for the IDN ccTLD and prepare for a delegation request. The methodology describes (at a high level) the activities, roles, and responsibilities of the actors involved in the processes. It is anticipated that this will need to be further detailed by ICANN staff as a matter of implementation.

The IDNC WG is aware that in order to implement the recommended methodology some of the current procedures and practices, for instance the practices relating to the maintenance of the repository and requirements for an IDN table, may need to

be changed to implement the recommendations. However, identifying these procedures or suggesting changes is considered a matter of implementation.

The IDNC WG recommends that as part of the implementation plan a request for information (RFI) is send out to all territories to gain an understanding of the interest of individual territories to participate in the Fast Track process. Participation in the RFI should however not be mandatory to be eligible for an IDN ccTLD under the Fast Track. It is suggested that through the RFI process relevant information is gathered on at least the following: interest of the territory to participate in the Fast Track, and if so, what language/ script is considered and which string is intended to be selected. Furthermore an indication of the timeframe in which the territory intends to enter the Fast Track could be useful. It is suggested that the information will be collected on a confidential basis by ICANN. However the territory may choose to make the information public. All territories should be contacted.

Alternative views of members of the Working Group are presented in Section 5.

The report concludes with an overview of the specific recommendations (section 6) and background information on the IDNC WG and process (section 7). To assist the reader to relate to the different elements of the proposed methodology and how they interact, the report contains a high level process flow diagram (Annex A).

3. Guiding Principles

Based on the substantive input during the various comment periods the IDNC WG has established the following guiding principles:

A: Ongoing Process

The Fast Track should be an ongoing process to enable a selected IDN ccTLD manager (hereafter referred to as: selected delegate) to enter the Fast Track when ready. The Fast Track should cease to be available when the overall IDN ccTLD policy has been adopted by the ICANN Board.

B: Non pre-emption of overall policy

The Fast Track should not pre-empt final IDN ccTLD policy, so it must be a simple, clear and limited solution.

C: Purpose of Fast Track is to meet pressing demand

The Fast Track should only be available where there is a pressing demand in the territory. The existence of this demand is evidenced by the readiness of the selected delegate and relevant stakeholders in the territory to meet the

requirements to introduce an IDN ccTLD under the Fast Track. The territory needs to be ready to use the IDN ccTLD and to demonstrate that readiness.

D: Fast Track only for non-Latin scripts

The possibility of IDN ccTLDs being delegated in Latin script is a matter that will be considered as part of the ccPDP. Accordingly, in the Fast Track, the script has to be a non-Latin script to avoid pre-empting the outcome of the ccPDP.

E: The proposed string and delegation request should be non-contentious within the territory

Delegation of an IDN ccTLD should only be possible in the Fast Track where the IDN ccTLD string is non-contentious within the territory and the designation of the selected delegate is non-contentious within the territory. This is evidenced by the support/endorsement of the relevant stakeholders in the territory for the selected string as a meaningful representation of the name of the territory and for the selected delegate.

F: The Fast Track is experimental in nature

The introduction of IDN ccTLDs is experimental in nature, and this should be taken into consideration when delegating names under the Fast Track. However, this should not be interpreted to mean that delegation under the Fast Track will be temporary.

G. Criteria determine the number of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track.

The criteria to select the IDN ccTLD string, and to designate the IDN ccTLD manager should determine the number of eligible IDN ccTLDs, not an arbitrarily set number.

4. Fast Track methodology

Stage 1: Preparing for the Fast Track in Territory

To be eligible under the Fast Track a territory should be listed on the International Standard ISO 3166-1, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes (hereafter referred to as: Territory).

This part of the process should be performed by the local actors in Territory. Typically this would involve:

- The selected delegate: typically initiates the process and provides the needed information and documentation
- The relevant public authority associated with the selected IDN ccTLD,
- Parties served by the IDN ccTLD. They are asked to show that they support the request and that it meets the interests and needs of the local Internet community

(See: <http://www.iana.org/domains/root/delegation-guide/>):

1. Identify the language and script for the string and language table.

The criteria to identify the language/script are:

- The language must be an 'official' language
- The script in which the language is represented has to be non-Latin

Official language criteria

For the purpose of the Fast Track, an 'official' language is one that has a legal status in the Territory or that serves as a language of administration (hereafter: Official Language).

This definition 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.

A language is demonstrated to be an Official Language:

- a. 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 (the UNGEGN Manual) (<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/default.htm>); or
- b. If the language is listed as an administrative language for the relevant Territory in ISO 3166-1 standard under column 9 or 10; or
- c. If 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.

In the event that there is more than one Official Language in the Territory, it may be possible for the Territory to use the Fast Track for the delegation of an IDN ccTLD in each of those languages.

Requirements relating to the script

For purposes of the Fast Track a non-Latin script is any script not based on the 26 letters of the Latin alphabet -- a-z -- that are encoded in US-ASCII.

2. Select String

The selected string must meet the meaningfulness and technical requirements

Meaningfulness Requirement

For purposes of the Fast Track the string used must be meaningful in the Official Language. A string is meaningful if it is in the Official Language and:

- a) is the name of the Territory; or
- b) a part of the name of the Territory that denotes the Territory in the language; or

- c) a short-form designation for the name of the Territory, recognizably denoting it in the indicated language

Where the proposed string is listed as the long form or short form name of the relevant Territory in Part Three column 3 or 4 of the UNGEGN Manual then the string should be considered to be meaningful. If the string is not so listed then meaningfulness will need to be documented by the selected delegate of the IDN ccTLD.

Territories using the same script may, if they wish, consult with each other on the selection of a relevant IDN ccTLD string.

Technical Requirements

- The label itself is in accordance with and complies with IDNA2008 protocol
- No characters other than identified in Unicode as Letters or [combining] marks are used
- No characters are used that map out as compatibility equivalents and only strings that are NFC-compliant
- No leading or trailing digits (in any script) are used.
- No joiners or other invisible characters are used
- There is no mixing of scripts
- The proposed string is valid both for IDNA2003 and IDNA2008
- No names that are shorter than three characters in ASCII, nor names shorter than two characters in non-ASCII are used;
- It is demonstrated that the language and script chosen for the Language table for an IDN-ccTLD, is an “official” language in Territory, regardless of the The TLD proposed in combination with the language table being used when operational together with the Language Table does not create rendering problems in URLs, Email addresses etc., when in use.

3. Document endorsement /support by actors in Territory for identified language and script and selected string.

It is proposed that with regard to the selection of a string the involvement of the relevant actors in the Territory should be documented in a similar manner as is required for a delegation request, by the selected delegate.

(See < <http://www.iana.org/domains/root/delegation-guide/> >)

It is also recommended that the selected delegate provides the relevant documentation at the start of the due diligence stage.

4. Prepare language table

For requirements and purpose of preparing the language/script table see Stage 2 Due Diligence, Step 1 and Step 2.

The language/script table to be used by the IDN ccTLD may already exist i.e. has been prepared by another Territory using the same language/script and was already submitted. In this case the selected delegate should indicate its intention to use that language/script table.

Territories using the same script are encouraged to cooperate in developing a language script table, in accordance with IDN guidelines.

5. Select intended IDN ccTLD manager

In accordance with current practices for delegation of a ccTLD (see for further information: <http://www.iana.org/domains/root/delegation-guide/>)

Stage 2: Due Diligence

Step 1. Submission of language table into IANA Repository

Unless the selected delegate indicates it intends to use a language/script table for the official language that is already in the IANA Repository, the language/script table must be submitted to IANA in accordance with the practices relating to the maintenance of the repository and requirements for an IDN table (for current practices see: <http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html>). As indicated in the introduction this practice may need to be updated to implement the recommendations).

Step 2 Due Diligence

A. Basic Premises

The ICANN Board is responsible for the final decision to delegate a TLD. The Fast Track methodology sets a series of criteria that must be met in order for a delegation to be approved by the ICANN Board. However, it is not considered appropriate for the ICANN Board to be required to confirm that a selected string meets either the technical or the meaningful criteria. Therefore an external and independent “Technical Committee ” and “Language Expert Advisory Panel (LEAP)” should be appointed to conduct the due diligence and report to the Board.

In order to avoid unnecessary delay and for reasons of efficiency, the report of the LEAP and Technical Committee should be available early in the process (at the end of Stage 2).

B. Technical Committee

1. Role and responsibility: To provide external and independent advice to the Board that, based on the documentation provided by the selected delegate, the selected string meets the technical criteria. If after a request for clarification the

Technical Committee still finds that the selected string does not meet one or more of the criteria, the request for the IDN ccTLD with that particular selected string is not eligible under the Fast Track.

2. Required documentation

Information required from the selected delegate:

- the selected string in the selected language and script;
- the selected string in the xn--- format; and
- the UNICODE code points.
- a reference to the language and script used;
- the ASCII ccTLD string and name of Territory that the IDN-ccTLD is associated with;
- the language table to be used both for the TLD and for delegations under the TLD (see Due Diligence Step 1).

3. Due Diligence Technical Committee

The selected string is considered to meet the criteria if the Technical Committee establishes the string meets the criteria as defined in Stage 1, section 2, technical requirements above.

If necessary the Technical Committee can seek further clarification from the selected delegate.

4. Structure of Technical Committee

The Technical Committee should be appointed by the ICANN Board, and should be external to and independent of the ICANN structure.

For the purpose of assisting the selected delegate, where the Technical Committee seeks clarification on some aspect of the string, the Technical Committee should be able to provide the selected delegate with access to a pool of recognised independent technical experts for advice.

C. Linguistic Experts Advisory Panel

1. Role and responsibility: To provide external and independent advice to the Board that, based on the documentation provided by the proposed delegate, the proposed string is “meaningful” and in an “official” language in accordance with criteria. The LEAP has not the right to block or veto a proposed string. Their task is limited to a due diligence check based on the documentation provided by the selected delegate.

2. Due Diligence

The selected string is considered to meet the criteria if:

1. The identified language is an “official” language/script of the Territory in accordance with the definition in Stage 1, section 1 above

and

2. The selected string is the long or short form name of the Territory in the selected language in the UNGEGN Manual.

In all other cases the LEAP should consider documentation presented by the selected delegate in conducting its due diligence.

Other cases include:

- (i) the selected string is a part of the long or short form name of the Territory in the UNGEGN Manual in the selected language or
- (ii) an acronym of that name or
- (iii) the Territory or the language do not appear in the UNGEGN Manual.

Where the documentation presented includes a report from a linguistic expert(s) that the selected string meets the criteria, the LEAPs due diligence should be guided by this.

If necessary the LEAP can seek further clarification from the selected delegate.

3. Structure of the LEAP

The LEAP should be external to and independent of the ICANN structure. The LEAP should consist of 5 recognised linguistic experts (one from each of the ICANN Geographic Regions), and one independent chair, with a background in due diligence.

For the purpose of assisting the Territory, where clarification is required, the LEAP should be able to provide the Territory with access to a pool of recognised independent linguistic experts for advice, if so requested by the selected delegate.

Step 3. Publication result of due diligence stage

It is recommended that ICANN publishes the selected string in the identified language and other formats on its website as soon as the advice of the Technical Committee and LEAP are available, and it is evidenced that the selected string is supported/endorsed by the relevant stakeholders in Territory.

Stage 3: Designation of IDN ccTLD

Request for delegation

- In accordance with current IANA practices

In the view of the IDNC WG there are no additional requirements relating to the delegation of an IDN ccTLD. The delegation of an IDN ccTLD should be conducted according to current practices for delegation.

5. Alternative views

In accordance with the charter any minority positions shall be incorporated in the IDNC WG (draft) Final Report. In this section these views are presented, including a reference to the section in section 3 and 4, the name and affiliation of the proposer and members of the WG supporting the minority position. Please note this is a draft Report, produced to inform the community. As discussion will continue, this part of the report may be especially susceptible to change.

Each alternate view is a direct quote from the proposer.

1. Alternative position on Principle E:

“Delegation of an IDN ccTLD should only be possible in the Fast Track where the designation of the selected delegate is non-contentious within the territory. This should be evidenced by the support/endorsement of the relevant stakeholders in the territory for the selected delegate. The IDN ccTLD string proposed should be non-contentious within the territory, and should be non-contentious for the security and stability of the Internet. This should be evidenced by the support/endorsement of the relevant stakeholders within the territory that the selected string is a meaningful representation of the name of the territory and that the security and the stability for the Internet community is maintained”.

Position proposed by Edmon Chung, member IDNC WG on behalf of GNSO,
Affiliation: .ASIA

2. Alternative position on Principle E:

“Maintianing Consistency with Current ccTLD Practices and GAC ccTLD Principles

Another alternative view understands that based on available documentation of ccTLD practices, including the GAC ccTLD principles, while it is accepted that the delegation of a ccTLD should be a matter within the corresponding territory, the current practice for the selection of the ccTLD string is explicitly established through international collaboration. More specifically, the current ccTLD practice is not a mechanism whereby each territory proposes a particular two-letter string to ICANN, but rather it follows the process of the ISO 3166-1 standard. The IDN ccTLD Fast Track, will introduce a new method that cannot be said to be identical with the current ccTLD practices. Therefore, it is important to continue to maintain, as the IDNC WG charter expresses, that the IDN ccTLD introduced in the Fast Track should be non-contentious.”

Position proposed by Edmon Chung, member IDNC WG on behalf of GNSO,
Affiliation: .ASIA

3. Alternative position on Principle E:

Non-Contentious of an IDN ccTLD in the Fast Track within a country/region

“There is an alternative view that the IDN ccTLD string for Fast Track should be non-contentious not only within the territory. Because not all ccTLDs (i.e. the list of entries of in the ISO 3166-1 standard), are sovereign countries, it may be useful to consider non-contentiousness within a corresponding country, region or collective of territories.”

Position proposed by Zhiang Jian, member IDNC WG on behalf of ccNSO,
Affiliation: CNNIC

Position supported by Jonathan Shea, member IDNC WG on behalf of ccNSO,
Affiliation: HKNIC

4. “Mechanism for Handling Comments

There is an alternative view that a mechanism to handle comments early in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process would be beneficial. The mechanism should allow potential issues that affect the security and stability of the technical and social fabric of the Internet to be raised and subsequently addressed to improve the efficiency and transparency of the overall process”.

Position proposed by Edmon Chung, member IDNC WG on behalf of GNSO,
Affiliation: .ASIA

Position supported by Jonathan Shea, member IDNC WG on behalf of ccNSO,
Affiliation: HKNIC

5. “Enforcement of Compliance to IDN Standards and ICANN IDN Guidelines

While the group believes that the issue of whether any legal arrangement should be established between ICANN and the Fast Track IDN ccTLD is outside of the scope of the IDNC WG charter, an alternative view holds that in consideration of the overarching technical requirements for the deployment of IDN, this report should encourage ICANN to have in place an expressed understanding with the Fast Track IDN ccTLD to ensure continued compliance with the IDN standards and ICANN IDN Guidelines.

Furthermore, such expressed understanding should ensure a smooth transition of the Fast Track IDN ccTLD to the ccPDP IDN process once it is established”.

Position proposed by Edmon Chung, member IDNC WG on behalf of GNSO,
Affiliation: .ASIA

6. Overview of recommendations

Recommendation 1

The Fast Track should be an ongoing process, which ends at the time the overall IDN ccTLD policy is adopted by the ICANN Board.

Recommendation 2

The Fast Track should be a three stage process:

Stage 1. Preparation in the Territory.

This stage concludes when the selected delegate submits:

- The selected string for the IDN ccTLD in the identified language, a xn--- representation of that string, and a representation in UNICODE code points, and related documentation;
- A language/script table for the identified language/script, and related documentation.

Stage 2: Due diligence

This stage starts with the submission of the selected string and related documentation, and language/script table and related documentation by the selected delegate.

This stage ends with the publication of the selected string in the identified language and the xn—format on the ICANN website. Publication is dependent on completion of the report of the Technical Committee, completion of the report of the LEAP and evidenced endorsement/support by the relevant stakeholders in Territory for the selected string.

Stage 3. Delegation Request

This stage starts with request for delegation by selected delegate in accordance with current IANA practices. Such a request for delegation can be submitted as of the moment the selected string is published on the ICANN website.

Recommendation 3

An IDN ccTLD string should be a meaningful representation of the name of the Territory in an identified Official Language of that Territory. The Territory should be listed in the “International Standard ISO 3166-1, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country Codes”.

Recommendation 4

In the event that there is more than one Official Language in the Territory, it may be possible for the Territory to use the Fast Track for the delegation of an IDN ccTLD in each of those languages

Recommendation 5

A selected string must meet the technical and meaningfulness criteria.

Recommendation 6

A language/script table with the permissible code points under the relevant IDNA Protocol and IDN guidelines (see for current version: <http://www.icann.org/general/idn-guidelines-22feb06.htm>) must be submitted to IANA in accordance with the practices relating to the maintenance of the repository and requirements for an IDN table as defined.

Recommendation 7

For purposes of a Technical and Linguistic due diligence the selected delegate should submit:

- the selected meaningful string in the Official Language in writing,
- in the xn--- format;
- UNICODE code points; and
- other relevant, related documentation to enable the due diligence.

Recommendation 8

The ICANN Board should appoint a “Technical Committee” external to and independent of the ICANN structure to perform technical due diligence on behalf of the Board.

Recommendation 9

The ICANN Board should appoint a Linguistic Experts Advisory Panel (LEAP), external to and independent of the ICANN structure to perform due diligence on the meaningfulness of the selected string on behalf of the Board.

Recommendation 10

ICANN should publish the selected string in the identified language and other formats once the Technical Committee and LEAP have completed their due diligence.

7. Background IDNC WG and Process

At the San Juan meeting in June 2007, and the ICANN Board resolved inter alia that “... the ICANN community including the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC and ALAC provide the Board with responses to the published list of issues and questions that need to be addressed in order to move forward within ccTLDs associated with the ISO3166-1 two-letter codes in a manner that ensures the continued security and stability of the Internet.” Further, “...the Board also requested that technical limitations and requirements will be taken into consideration, to explore both an interim and an overall approach to IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes and recommend a course of action to the Board in a timely manner.”

In response, the ccNSO Council at its meeting on 2 October 2007, requested that an Issue Report be prepared to establish whether the ccNSO should launch a PDP to develop the policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes. A draft Issue Report is expected to be provided to the ccNSO Council on June 2008. The Issues Paper and

answers developed by various ICANN constituencies will become input to the ccPDP, should the ccNSO Council resolve to initiate a PDP.

The ccNSO also released two discussion documents regarding a possible interim approach to IDN ccTLDs: “Designing an Interim Approach” and the “Charter IDNC”. These documents were *inter alia* discussed by the GAC at the meeting in Los Angeles and the communiqué reaffirmed GAC support to the possibility of a fast track approach and welcomed the proposal of the ccNSO Council to create an IDN working group. The GAC agreed to actively engage in the process.

At its meeting in Los Angeles the Board [chartered](#) a joint IDNC Working Group ([IDNC WG](#)) and invited the Chairs of the ccNSO, GNSO, GAC, ALAC, and SSAC to set-up the IDNC Working Group and appoint members to this group. The IDNC WG task is to develop and report on feasible methods, if any, that would enable the introduction of a limited number of non-contentious IDN ccTLDs, in a timely manner that ensures the continued security and stability of the Internet while a comprehensive long-term IDN ccTLD policy is being developed. On 14 December the IDNC WG was established (membership of the IDNC WG: see <http://www.ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idncwg.htm>).

On 1 February 2008, the IDNC WG posted a “[Discussion Draft of the Initial Report](#)” (DDIR) for public comment and input from the ICANN community. The DDIR clarified the relationship between the “fast track” process and the broader long-term process IDN ccPDP. In the report two mechanisms were identified for the selection of an IDN ccTLD and an IDN ccTLD manager. Pursuant to the Charter those mechanisms were to be developed within the parameters of:

- The overarching requirement to preserve the security and stability of the DNS;
- Compliance with the IDNA protocols;
- Input and advice from the technical community with respect to the implementation of IDNs; and
- Current practices for the delegation of ccTLDs, which include the current IANA practices.

On 11 February 2008, during the ICANN meeting in New Delhi, India, a public workshop was held to discuss the DDIR and a comment period was opened on that document.

The IDNC WG has more recently produced a first draft of the IDNC WG Methodology in the form of an [Interim Report](#) that has also been made available for public comment. Discussions on the methodology were held at the ICANN Regional Meeting in Dubai, UAE (1-3 April 2008), The RIPE meeting in Berlin, 7 May 2008 and the APTLD meeting on 22 May in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. A final IDNC WG meeting is scheduled to take place at the ICANN meeting in Paris.

The IDNC WG itself has conducted several face-to-face meeting (two during the ICANN meeting in New Delhi and in Geneva on 12 May 2008). The IDNC WG has also conducted several conference calls as of the New Delhi meeting leading up to Paris. The recordings of these calls are available at:
<http://www.ccnso.icann.org/calendar/>.

Annex A: High Level Process Flow Diagram

