

Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs EPDP) - Request for Early Input

Date statement submitted: **10 November 2021**

Background¹

The GNSO IDNs EPDP Working Group (WG) is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with policy recommendations on:

- 1) the definition of gTLDs and the management of variant labels; and
- 2) how the IDN Implementation Guidelines, which Contracted Parties are required to comply with, should be updated in the future.

IDNs EPDP workspace <https://community.icann.org/display/epdpidn/EPDP+on+IDNs+Home>

On 29 September 2021, the GNSO IDNs EPDP Working Group (WG) reached out to Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and GNSO Stakeholder Groups / Constituencies.

Registries Stakeholder Group comment

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) thanks the IDN EPDP Working Group for its request for input so early in their process and appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on areas of interest to the RySG.

In general, we call attention to existing and potential overlaps between the work of the IDN EPDP and other ongoing PDPs and IRTs, such as the PDP Review of Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) in gTLDs, Transfer Policy review PDP, and Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data IRT. All of these groups are considering issues with potential impacts on existing policies and procedures that the IDN EPDP's work is also likely to discuss or reference. We urge the IDN EPDP to consider these dependencies and coordinate with these, and other, efforts to plan its work to avoid overlaps and potential inconsistencies between the various work streams.

In consideration of questions in sections "D" and "G" of the Early Input Request, the RySG stresses that implementation of any outputs should adhere to established contractual and procedural mechanisms. This is key to preserving a stable and predictable contractual and operational environment. Suggesting specific language or contractual processes for Registry Agreements would be inappropriate for this work and out of the scope of the IDN EPDP as contractual changes cannot be initiated or made unilaterally by the Board or ICANN Org. The RySG believes that existing contractual structures should be maintained and contractual considerations should take place only between the two parties of the contract, understanding that contracted parties do comply with Consensus Policy requirements as part of our obligations under the Registry Agreement.

¹ Background: intended to give a brief context for the comment and to highlight what is most relevant for RO's in the subject document – it is not a summary of the subject document.

The RySG also strongly supports clear separation of Guidelines (i.e. recommendations, guidance) from contractual obligations as it provides predictability and is in line with the provisions of the Registry Agreement and existing procedures. The RySG also acknowledges that certain contract obligations are tied to strict compliance to Internet Standards, such as those from the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). However, unlike IETF Internet Standards, the IDN Guidelines define policy. In this sense, the RySG looks forward to contributing to the deliberation of this important topic to determine the appropriate process to amend or update work that has contractual impacts to contracted parties.

The RySG understands that the IDN EPDP is still in its early stages and we look forward to supporting our RySG IDN EPDP representatives and offering further comments on specific issues as the work progresses.
