Reminder of Key Issues in SubPro

Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs)

- Whether IDNs should continue to be integral to the New gTLD Program and how to ensure this?
- Role of and compliance with RZ-LGRs in IDN TLDs and valid variant labels
- Should 1-Unicode character gTLDs be permissible? How to define these more precisely?
- Bundling of TL IDNs versus SL IDN variants
- Coordination with IDN Variant TLD Implementation and Final Proposed Draft Version 4.0 of the IDN Implementation Guidelines
- ❑ *Additionally, whether there should be some sort of priority in evaluation extended to IDN new gTLD applications? This question is likely taken up in another topic.*

- **What is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures ("SubPro")?**
    - ❖ The set of rules and mechanisms applicable to the <u>next round</u> for New gTLDs, i.e. they DO NOT apply to legacy TLDs, ccTLDs, or delegated new gTLDs or those still unresolved from the 2012 application round
    - ❖ "An update" to the 2012 Round rules and mechanisms

Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs): Consensus Building

ALAC STATEMENTS touched on:

Integral
- IDNs as an integral part of the New gTLD Program

Compliance
- Compliance with LGRs as LGRs are recommended manner in which IDN TLDs and variants are identified

1-Unicode
- 1-Unicode character gTLDs for script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph or ideogram

Automation
- Implementation Guidance: automate compliance to IDNA2008 and applicable LGRs

PDT
- Implementation Guidance: Pre-Delegation Testing for applicants of IDN TLDs

TL Allocation
- IDN variant allocation

SL Bundling
- Bundling of SL IDN variants

RELATED SubPro Areas/Topics include:
- Root Zone Label Generation Rules (LGRs)
- IDNA2008 (RFCs 5890-5895) or its successors
- IDN Variant TLD Implementation and Final Proposed Draft Version 4.0 of the IDN Implementation Guidelines

COMPETITION, CONSUMER CHOICE & TRUST (CCT) RECOMMENDATIONS
- None

SubPro PDP WG

Affirmation #1 with modification

- WG affirms Principle B from 2007 policy with amendment, "Internationalised domain name (IDNs) new generic top-level domains _should continue to be an integral part of the New gTLD Program_." Principle B originally stated, "Some new generic top-level domains should be internationalised domain names (IDNs) subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root."

WG's Rationale
- Continued support for IDNs being available in the New gTLD Program. The modification here is merely grammatical to note that IDNs already exist in the DNS.

Impact
- IDNs remains an integral part of the New gTLD Program

Integral

From SubPro PDP WG, not limited to recommendations, but also affirmations and implementation guidance

Impact of SubPro Recommendations

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #2

Compliance with Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR) must be required for the generation of IDN TLDs and variants labels, including the determination of whether the label is blocked or allocatable.

Implementation Guidance
- To the extent possible, compliance with IDNA2008 (RFCs 5890-5895) or its successor(s) and applicable Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR, RZ-LGR-2, and any future RZ-LGR rules sets) should be automated for future applicants. The Working Group recognizes that some instances of manual analysis may be required.
- If a script is not yet integrated into the RZ-LGR, applicants should be able to apply for a string in that script, and it should be processed up to but not including contracting

WG's Rationale
- Understanding that label generation rules provide a consistent and predictable set of permissible code points for IDN TLDs, as well as a mechanism to determine whether there are variant labels (and if so, what they are).
- Evaluating all TLDs using Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR) allows for a consistent approach and one that complies with community-driven and community-vetted outcomes.

WG's Rationale (cont'd)
- Further to the purpose of consistency and efficiency, WG welcomes any automation of the RZ-LGR in the evaluation processes, although it recognizes that automation may not be feasible in some circumstances.
- Fully supportive of requiring IDN TLDs to comply with RZ-LGR, it's cognizant that this may impact potential applicants who want to apply for an application in a script that is not yet integrated into the RZ-LGR.
- Belief that applicants should be provided the opportunity to apply for a string in a script that is not yet integrated into the RZ-LGR, although it should of course not be delegated until it is compliant – burden in this case is on the applicant, who may have to wait for an indeterminate amount of time but is not aware of any other serious concerns

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

Compliance

Additional intervention
- Any concerns? What else needs to be done?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #3

1-Unicode character gTLDs may be allowed for limited 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.

WG's Rationale
- Belief that 1-Unicode character gTLDs should be allowed for limited script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram), in support of choice and innovation, but recognizes that care should be taken in doing so.
- Belief that it is appropriate to limit 1-Unicode character gTLDs to only certain scripts and languages, though it does not believe it has the relevant expertise to make this determination.
- Would welcome the identification of the limited set of scripts and languages (e.g., during implementation), which will substantially increase the predictability of what will likely still remain a case-by-case, manual process. This conservative approach is consistent with both the SSAC and Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Workgroup (JIG) reports.

Impact

1-Unicode

Additional intervention
- Any concerns? What else needs to be done?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations

SubPro PDP WG

Recommendation #4

IDN gTLDs deemed to be variants of already existing or applied for TLDs will not be allowed for separate application and allowed for activation by ~~provided they have~~ the same registry operator [and back-end registry service provider,] implementing by force of written agreement a policy of cross-variant TLD bundling.

WG's Rationale

- In support of security and stability, and in light of the fact that IDN variants are considered to essentially be identical, WG believes that IDN variant TLDs must be owned and operated by the same Registry Operator.
- To the extent that the TLD were to change hands at any point after delegation, the IDN variants TLDs must remain bundled together. Accordingly, IDN variant TLDs should be linked contractually.

Impact

TL Allocation

Additional intervention

- IDN-WG Co-Chair Edmon Chung proposed text change to address concern – *"The recommendation seems to expect that an IDN Variant TLD go through the same "application process" when in fact any IDN Variant TLD should only be "activated" not "applied for" by the same Registry Operator. This is consistent with how the 2012 round was envisioned and handled. Allowing IDN Variant TLDs to be "applied for" is problematic for the concept of IDN Variants."*

- Any other concerns? What else needs to be done?

Impact of SubPro Recommendations

Recommendation #5

- A given second-level label under any allocated IDN variant TLD must only be allocated to the same entity/registrant, or else withheld for possible allocation only to that entity (e.g., s1 under {t1, t1v1, …}, e.g., s1.t1 and s1.t1v1).
- For second-level IDN variant labels that arise from a registration based on a second-level IDN table, all allocatable IDN variant labels in the set must only be allocated to the same entity or withheld for possible allocation only to that entity (e.g., all allocatable second-level labels {s1, s1v1, …} under all allocated variant TLD labels {t1, t1v1, …}).

WG's Rationale
- For similar reasons as indicated in rationale 4 (i.e., security and stability, that IDN variants should be considered as identical), WG believes that second-level IDN variants should only be allocated (or reserved for allocation) to the same registrant.
- This applies both when it is a certain second-level label under multiple variant IDN TLDs (e.g., s1 under {t1, t1v1, …}, e.g., s1.t1 and s1.t1v1) and variants at the second-level derived from the registry operator's approved IDN table (e.g., all allocatable second-level labels {s1, s1v1, …} under all allocated variant TLD labels {t1, t1v1, …}).

WG's Rationale (cont'd)
- However, the WG, in taking note of public comments received from the SSAC, agrees that second-level variants should not be required to behave exactly the same. Ensuring that second-level domains behave the same has not been found to be technically feasible in the DNS.
- In addition, there are practical reasons for second-level variants to not be the same (e.g., Simplified and Traditional Chinese second-level variants could have the content on the respective web pages available in Simplified or Traditional Chinese, consistent with the DNS label)

For At-Large Consensus Building

Impact

SL Bundling

Additional intervention
- Any concerns? What else needs to be done?