ICANN Public Comments on ccPDP3 RM and ccPDP4

On behalf of TWNIC on the Public Comments both ccPDP3 RM and ccPDP4 that have been currently posted on the ICANN website during the period for public comments. We would like to provide our comments from the role of ccTLD Manager to share with the ICANN Community.

Eventually, the two ccPDPs requesting for comments focus on the ccNSO's administration and management on the ccTLDs with sequent impacts so that we will share our comments based on the ccPDP3 RM and ccPDP4 and will post the same opinions and comments on the Public Comment forum for both ccPDP3 RM and ccPDP4.

Firstly, TWNIC, the Manager of .tw, IDN ccTLD 台灣(. xn--kpry57d), and 台湾(.xn--kprw13d), would like to express our appreciations on the efforts of the ccNSO Review Mechanism Working Group completed its work and sought support from ccNSO members through a vote, as required by the ICANN Bylaws. Out of 173 member representatives, 105 voted (60%), with 101 in favor, 2 opposed to the proposed policy, and 2 abstentions.

Apparently, from the results of the vote of ccNSO community, it indicated that the Review Mechanism is supported by the majority of ccNSO community with 101 out of 105 votes in favor and the results also should express that ccNSO would support their own policy development process to fulfill the mission of ccTLD Managers on maintaining the stable operation of ccTLDs in

accordance with the fundamental principles of RFC1591.

Based on the agreed relationship between ICANN, Governmental Authority, and ccTLD Manager of the ccTLD Sponsorship Agreement, as the role of the ccTLD Manager representing to meet the public interests on delegated ccTLDs and to operate ccTLD with Security, Safety, Stability and Resilience, given these considerations, the Review Mechanism retains ccNSO's community autonomy in managing country-code top-level domains and ensures alignment with its own policies and procedures, as well as the IFO's role in maintaining ccTLD domain functions within IANA, even though, in decisions involving significant issues, the option for approval by the ICANN Board is retained.

Additionally, according to the ICANN Bylaws on the definition of territory that is included in Article 10: "Territory" or "Territories" are defined as a country, a subdivision, 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 subdivision, or other area of particular geopolitical interest listed for an exceptionally reserved ISO 3166-1 code element.

Based on the ICANN Bylaws and practical operations on ccTLDs, we would like to suggest that the proposed policy not only includes the principles of RFC 1591 and ISO-3166 as indicated on ccTLDs adopted by IFO, furthermore, under

the consideration of keeping stable ccTLDs operation, the ccTLD sponsorship Agreements with ICANN that should be viewed as "Grandfathered" to apply to the contracted ccTLD Managers with ICANN to fulfil the purpose of the ICANN Bylaws even there were any possibilities on removal of any specific ccTLDs from ISO-3166 that the proposed policy should be included to further explore and settle the situation.

Therefore, this Review Mechanism concretely embodies the multi-stakeholder governance model of ICANN. Hence, it should be recommended to support this policy.

Regarding to the ccPDP4, we also wish to express our appreciation for the diligent efforts of the ccPDP4 Working Group in completing its work and for seeking feedback through the ICANN Public Comments process. Having thoroughly reviewed the presented policy recommendations, we are pleased to provide our formal opinion in support of these proposals.

Since the introduction of the Internationalized Domain Name country code Top-Level Domain Fast Track Process (IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process) on November 16, 2009, numerous countries and territories have successfully applied for IDN ccTLDs. This process has enabled them to offer registration services in local languages, thereby meeting the needs of their local communities.

We hereby express our support of these proposed policies. Particularly noteworthy is the commendable focus on advancing the Fast Track Process, a step taken because of consensus between the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) and the ICANN Board. This emphasis aims to gather further insights from the implemented process and evolve the Fast Track Process, incorporating valuable perspectives into the policy for introducing internationalized country code top-level domains.

Furthermore, regarding the transitional arrangements and review mechanism concerning the Internationalized Domain Name ccTLD Fast Track Process Final Implementation Plan (FIP), especially regarding the "Grandfathered" IDN ccTLD Strings, we have taken note of the provided statement:

"All IDN ccTLD strings that have been validated under the Fast Track Process will be deemed to be validated under the ccNSO policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and are grandfathered. The recommendations under this policy development process with respect to the deselection of IDN ccTLD strings shall be applicable to the grandfathered IDN ccTLD strings."

We also lend our support to the principles outlined in the policy, specifically addressing the handling of "Grandfathered" IDN ccTLD Strings. This approach ensures the continuous operation and compliance of delegated IDN ccTLDs, in alignment with ICANN policies.

Considering that several territories have been delegated IDN ccTLDs through the Fast Track Process and considering the retention measures for previously delegated IDN ccTLDs within the proposed ccPDP4 policy, which aligns with established principles such as RFC 1591 and ISO 3166, we concur with the policy's intention to safeguard acquired rights and uphold the principles it advocates and should maintain and keep the "grandfathered-in" right protected in the Agreement between ccTLD Managers and ICANN.

In conclusion, we extend our gratitude to the ccPDP3 RM and ccPDP4 Working Group for their invaluable efforts and hereby support the presented policy recommendations. These proposed policies signify a significant stride toward promoting diversity and inclusivity within the domain name community.