

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Universal Acceptance (UA)

## CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
Wednesday, 27 May 2020, 19:00 UTC



## FOUNDATIONAL ISSUES

Topic/Area:	<b>[11] UNIVERSAL ACCEPTANCE (UA)</b>	Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	27.05.2020
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) [2.7.5]</li> <li>• Systems [2.4.3]</li> <li>• Universal Acceptance Initiative and UASG</li> </ul>				
Key Issues:	How to: (1) improve promotion of UA by the ICANN Community and (2) advocate for wider adoption of UA in the Internet community				
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of issues related to Universal Acceptance should be increased</li> <li>• Initiatives related to Universal Acceptance should be supported and promoted, as appropriate</li> </ul>				
Assigned CCT-RT Rec's:	None				
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 03. SubPro UA – CPWG Consensus affirmation, 27 May 2020</li> <li>• 02. SubPro UA – CPWG Consensus affirmation, 10 May 2020</li> <li>• 01. SubPro UA – CPWG consensus building, 6 May 2020</li> <li>• Production Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, 28 April 2020</li> <li>• SubPro PDP WG Foundational Issues_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</li> <li>• Working Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, 16 February 2020</li> </ul>				
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u></b>			Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?	
1. Support for UA initiative	<p><u>Affirmation (1)</u>: WG welcomes and encourages the work of the UA Initiative and the UASG.</p> <p><u>Affirmation (2)</u>, per 2012 round: WG affirms 2012 implementation elements addressing UA issues, and in particular, guidance per s.1.2.4 AGB (“Notice concerning Technical Acceptance Issues with New gTLDs”), as well as cl. 1.2 of the RA (“Technical Feasibility of String”).</p>			<p>See positions below.</p> <p>See positions below.</p>	

<p>2. Support for amending Principle B: “Some new gTLDs should be IDNs subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root.”<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><u>Recommendation (3)</u>: WG recommends revising Principle B to read “Some new gTLDs should be IDNs. Applicants should be made aware of UA challenges in ASCII and IDN TLDs. They should be given access to all applicable information about UA currently maintained on ICANN’s Universal Acceptance Initiative page, through the UASG, as well as future efforts.”</p> <p><u>Implementation Guidance</u>: ICANN should include more detailed info re UA issues either directly in the AGB or by reference to the AGB to additional resources produced by the UASG or other related efforts.</p> <p><u>WG’s Rationale for all the above</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirms importance of efforts related to UA, encourages work through UAI and UASG.</li> <li>• Acknowledged that language in the 2012 AGB and RA raises awareness about potential challenges that applicants and registries may face re: UA.</li> <li>• Belief that ICANN should more clearly and thoroughly illustrate to potential applicants the possible problems that registrants of IDNs in particular may face in usage of those domains, and other work.</li> <li>• IG and Rec seek to ensure that potential applicants have the info needed to make informed <u>decision before submitting application</u>.</li> </ul>	<p>See positions below.</p>
<p>What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?</p>	<p><b><u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u></b></p>	<p>Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?</p>
<p>3. <u>Some</u> say no additional work should be proposed beyond that being done by the UA Initiative and UASG.</p>	<p><u>There is some pushback on this via PC feedback.</u></p> <p>For eg. BC and ALAC have indicated ways for pushing the UA agenda further.</p>	<p>No, see positions below.</p>

<sup>1</sup> GNSO’s Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains

<p>Main Positions of Concern:</p>	<p>At-Large remains convinced that any expansion of the new gTLD market must actively and effectively facilitate the inclusion of the next billion Internet end-users – those who depend on IDNs and IDN-emails.</p> <p>Merely “welcoming and encouraging the work of UAI and UASG” even if “strongly” has no real effect on the goal of promoting Universal Acceptance.</p> <p>To this end, SubPro PDP WG must recommend for greater action towards UA-adoption in a number of ways:</p> <p><u>Adoption of UA</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. ICANN must include a metric on UA adoption by third parties as a measure of success for New gTLD Program because without greater adoption of UA, any expansion of the new gTLD Program would not facilitate inclusion of the next billion Internet end-users.</li></ol> <p><u>Promotion of UA-readiness</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. ICANN must invest in being itself able and ready to communicate to registrants and end-users in languages/scripts for LGRs that have been released under the IDN Variant TLD Implementation.</li><li>3. ICANN must strongly encourage Registries and Registrars which are owned by the same entity to be UA ready in any new gTLD application since these are the entities best positioned to offer IDN TLDs/SLDs.</li><li>4. The application process must require all Applicants to state:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The level of UA-readiness of their Registry operations (if not .brand TLD applicant), including whether they have policies in place to respond to IDN-email or to introduce IDNs.</li><li>• The level of readiness, both at Registry and Registrar levels, to accept IDN SL domain name registrations.</li></ul></li></ol>
-----------------------------------	--