Dear Steve,

In December 2011, both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils discussed the current status of the introduction of Single Character IDN TLDs. Noting the ICANN Board resolution on this topic<sup>1</sup>, the discussions were initiated by concerns raised by the joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG).

Following their discussion, both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils reiterate their support for the introduction of Single Character IDN TLD's. However, the Councils also request further clarification from the Board on three matters.

Firstly, one of the issues raised by the JIG was the ambiguity on the timing of the delegation of Single Character IDN TLDs. According to the August 2011 resolution, the Board: 'Directs staff to publish a timetable for this work, clearly indicating that processes for delegation of single-character IDN TLDs will be made available after the first gTLD application round and conclusion of IDN ccTLD policy work.' The ccNSO and GNSO Councils would appreciate clarification on the meaning of the word "and" in the final part of the sentence, in particular whether it should be interpreted as a condition i.e. that both the IDN ccTLD policy development process and new gTLD processes need to have been concluded to allow the introduction of single character IDN TLDs.

Secondly, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils note that the Board envisioned further consultations with the SSAC, GAC and ALAC, following the submission of ccNSO and GNSO recommendations. It is our understanding that the SSAC has already been consulted and its advice published on 31 January 2012<sup>2</sup>. With regard to the other two consultations, we would appreciate an indication of their current status and associated timelines. We would also appreciate an indication of the steps, when the aforementioned consultations have been completed.

Finally, it is our understanding that concerns have been raised regarding the kind of script that will be used for the Single Character IDN TLDs. In particular, whether a pictographic or alphabetic script makes a difference, and these concerns are an additional factor. We would appreciate if the Board could indicate whether or not this understanding is correct.

Looking forward to your response, Kind regards,

Lesley Cowley OBE Chair of the ccNSO

Stephane van Gelder, Chair of the GNSO

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25aug11-en.htm#5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac052.pdf