At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard:
String Similarity

CPWG SubPro Small Team

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

APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	**[25] STRING SIMILARITY [2.7.4]**		Priority:	**HIGH**	Settled On:	

Related:	• String Similarity Review • String Confusion Objection (under Objections [2.8.1]) • Accountability Mechanism [2.8.2]
Key Issues:	More guidance in treatment of singular vs plural versions of same words in same language/script vis a vis application, review in order to reduce risk of consumer confusion
Policy Goals:	Recommendation 2 "Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain" continues to be an appropriate policy objective
Assigned CCT-RT Rec's:	Rec. 35: Consider new policies to avoid potential inconsistent results in string confusion objections; in particular: 1) Determining through the initial string similarity review process that singular and plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated 2) Avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural vs singular strings are examined by the same expert panellist …..
References:	• SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 • 01. SubPro String Similarity, 16 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. More guidance on the standard of confusing similarity in singular vs plural words; insufficient clarity in 2012 round	Recommendation for adding detailed guidance on the standard of confusing similarity as it applies to singular and plural versions on the same word, specifically: • Prohibiting plurals and singulars of the same word within the	Yes, in general, but which dictionary?	• <mark>Any particular concern with IDN variant TLDs?</mark> • <mark>Any further need to **discuss with SSAC** on their comment re: a clear and consistent set of rules for 'confusing similarity' to be</mark>

			developed in accordance with the Conservatism Principle?
	same language/script to reduce risk of consumer confusion (eg. .CAR and CARS) • Expanding scope of String Similarity Review to cover singular/plurals of TLDs on a per language basis: (1) if these are confusingly similar then place in a contention set (2) disallow application for a single/plural variation of an existing TLD (3) consider meaning of strings and not automatically disqualify on basis a single letter difference (eg. .NEW and .NEWS) (4) by using a dictionary		
2. Eliminating SWORD tool	Recommendation to not use SWORD in subsequent procedures	Yes, SWORD was a disaster	Review replacement process/tool
3. Non- possibility to apply for string "still in system"	Recommendation to disallow fresh applications for any string that is still being processed from a previous application opportunity	• Yes, logically correct, otherwise may lead to unintended contention set. • Also need to have process to terminate any application that has little chance of succeeding and which are not withdrawn in subsequent procedures	Monitor implementation
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?

4.			
PENDING ISSUES:	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
5. Synonyms in String Similarity Review			Revisit with GAC especially in context of Verified TLDs / standard for strings in highly-regulated sectors
6. Treatment of homonyms			Thoughts?
7. Timing of review vs objection			Monitor implementation – String Similarity Review should be concluded before Objection period starts to allow for meaningful objections and appeal processes.
Position:			