

Some notes on the Committee of Linguistic Experts and Technical Committee

Purposes are:

1. To check that the proposed string will not impact the security and stability of the DNS or causes confusion at a technical level; and
2. To check that the overarching principles of the Fast Track are being met and
3. To check that the Fast Track criteria are being met to avoid pre-emption of future policy

It is an overarching principle that the methodology has to take into account and be based on current practices for delegation and re-delegation. Under those IANA does due diligence to check that there is support/acceptance from the relevant stakeholders, including the relevant public authority in the territory. It is the responsibility of the proposed IDN ccTLD operator to submit satisfactory evidence of the demonstrated support/acceptance in territory. IANA reports to the Board who based on submitted material, decide whether to delegate or re-delegate.

In the event the a Fast Track methodology is adopted, the ICANN Board will be ultimately responsible for ensuring that the over arching principles and the criteria are met prior to delegating an IDN ccTLD.

Assuming that the currently suggested principles of 'official' language and meaningfulness are accepted as criteria then Board will need to be satisfies that they are met.

Could we limit meaningful representation to listed names?

There is currently no available list which covers all elements of the meaningfulness definition. The major deficiencies of the lists are:

Not all territories listed on ISO 3166-1 are listed on the UN list (in particular the UNGEG list contains 193 entries, excluding for example the entries on the exceptionally reserved names list).

The status of the "official" or "administrative" language on the UNGEG list and ISO 3166-1 list is 'for information' and hence not part of the standard.

The lists are also non-exhaustive with regard to the qualified languages. The process to add a language is not defined. Hence the use of the lists is limited for purposes of the fast track approach.

Given that the use of lists is limited how do we deal with circumstances where the proposed string is not listed, either because the territory is not on a list, or the language selected is not listed, or the proposed string is not exactly a copy of the name listed (even if the proposed string would be a more acceptable reference to the name of the territory in the territory).

a) Committee of linguistic experts to;

- i) assist the relevant stakeholders in territory in selecting a meaningful string that meets the criteria and,
- ii) indicate to the ICANN Board that the proposed string is meaningful as defined, in the same manner as currently IANA advises the ICANN Board whether or not the criteria for delegation and re- delegation are complied with in the opinion of the IANA.

b) Leave it to IANA and/or the Board;

- (i) Criteria remain in place (this is essential to maintain the integrity of the Fast Track and to ensure that it doesn't impinge on policy)
- (ii) Applicant provides as part of the delegation report to IANA supporting documentation that shows that the chosen string meets the criteria.
- (iii) As now with the delegation process, IANA assess the application report and either send to Board for approval or asks for more information from applicant etc.
- (iv) Board can also ask for more information etc or seek expert input as with current delegation process.

Either a) or b) will work. Possible benefits of a) are:

1. Relevant stakeholders will be informed at an early stage of the process in discrete manner whether or not proposed string is in accordance with criteria. This is particularly relevant in non clear cut cases (i.e. not listed name of a territory) and allows for early adaptation;
2. Expert impartial opinion available at early stage of process. This would greatly increase speed of process and acceptance of process by all relevant stakeholders in ICANN, including the ICANN Board.
3. Ensuring compliance with definition which is generally accepted within ICANN environment by all relevant entities;

4. Minimise risk of pre-emption on outcome of IDN ccPDP. The meaningfulness of the string criterion allows more generic approaches (authoritative list) in future in particular.
5. Expert opinion of committee is not decisive in designation process of IDN ccTLDs. Similar to current delegation and re-delegation practices it is and should remain an ICANN Board responsibility.
6. Although ICANN Board is diverse, the Board is not equipped nor is its role to ascertain all potential proposed strings for IDN ccTLDs. For that matter it relies on expert opinion and process. To increase transparency, consistency, and predictability expert opinion should be from outside the ICANN arena.
7. In the event an IDN ccTLD is not designated for whatever cause under the Fast Track, it is not excluded nor is the ability impaired for designation of the proposed string at a later stage (under the Fast Track or under overall policy), as is the case under current practices for delegation or re-delegations.