At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard:
Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs)

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 11 February 2020, 19:00 UTC

APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	**[26] INTERNATIONALIZED DOMAIN NAMES (IDN) [2.7.5]**			Priority:	**HIGH**	Settled On:	

Related:	- IDN Variant TLD Implementation - Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGRs) <mark>Risk of DNS Abuse</mark> **TO NOTE: GNSO Council has convened scoping team to examine policy implications from IDN Varian TLD Implementation and Final Proposed Draft Version 4.0 of the IDN Implementation Guidelines – after examination, team will accordingly suggest to GNSO Council a mechanism (eg SubPro, new PDP/EPDP, other) to address issues**
Key Issues:	Promotion of IDNs and treatment of IDN variants
Policy Goals:	Principle B remains applicable, though can be modified slightly to acknowledge IDNs already in the new gTLD space: "Some new gTLDs should be internationalised domain names (IDNs) subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root."
Assigned CCT-RT Rec's:	None
References:	- SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 01. SubPro IDNs, 26 August 2019

What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	**What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?**	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
1. IDNs should continue to be an integral part of the program going forward	Recommendation for Principle B to remain		
2. Compliance with RZ-LGRs should be required for generation of IDN TLDs and valid variant labels	Compliance with Root Zone Label Generation Rules should be required for generation of IDN TLDs and valid variant labels		

3.	1-Unicode character gTLDs permissible for script/language combinations in specific circumstances	1-Unicode character gTLDs may be allowed for script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram) and do not introduce confusion risks that rise above commonplace similarities, consistent with SSAC and Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Workgroup (JIG) reports		
4.	Automation of compliance with IDNA2008 and applicable RZ-LGRs desirable	To the extent possible, compliance with IDNA2008 (RFCs 5890-5895) or its successors and applicable RZ-LGRs Rules be automated for future applicants		
5.	Whether compliance with IDNA2008 and applicable RZ-LGRs removes need for PDT	Compliance with IDNA2008 and applicable RZ-LGRs for scripts an applicant intends to support, then PDT should be unnecessary for the relevant scripts	Not necessarily. We commented that the prudent path would be to maintain PDT regardless. Because PDF covers testing of aspects that could potentially impact stability and manageability of RO operations – DNS, WHOIS, EPP, IDN, Data Escrow and Documentation – and IDN variants introduce added complexity to RO operations even if compliant with IDNA2008 or RZ-LGRs.	<mark>Suggest to maintain PDT regardless of compliance with IDNA2008 or RZ-LGRs?</mark>
6.	Same-entity rule for IDNs and their respective variants	IDN gTLDs deemed to be variants of already existing or applied for TLDs will be allowed provided (1) they have the same RO implementing by force of written agreement, a policy		

	of cross-variant TLD bundling and (2) the applicable RZ-LGR is already available at time of application submission		
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	**What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?**	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
7.			
PENDING ISSUES:	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
8. RZ-LGRs limited to generating IDN variants?	What about when RZ-LGRs are not yet in existence? Should absence lead to variant label being blocked or not allocatable?		
9. Bundling of SL IDN variants			
10. Making definition of 1-Unicode character gTLDs more precise			Especially relevant to CJK, should get additional inputs from CKJ communities
11. Coordination with IDN Variant Management Framework		Risk of DNS Abuse addressed?	
Position:			