Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process

ccPDP4 Update, E5

IDN-EPDP Team Meeting #31 | 21 April 2022

Agenda

1. Roll Call & SOI Updates (2 minutes)
2. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 minutes)
3. ccPDP4 Update (30 minutes)
4. E5 - Reserved Names (50 minutes)
5. AOB (3 minutes)

ccPDP4 Update

ccPDP4 vs. IDN-EPDP Recommendations

01
Ongoing
	GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names (EPDP-IDN)	• **Compliance with RZ-LGR** for generation of variants of existing gTLDs, including their disposition values
		  ○ Application submission system issues warning when **algorithmic checking** finds non-compliance
		  ○ **Limited challenge mechanism for DNS Stability Review** applies in cases where applicant believes the label has been incorrectly assessed as “invalid”

02 Ongoing	**ccNSO Policy Development Process on (De-)Selection of IDN ccTLD Strings (ccPDP4)**	• **Compliance with RZ-LGR** for validation and selection of ccTLD strings as variants

ccPDP4 vs. IDN-EPDP Recommendations (Cont.)

Topic	IDN-EPDP	ccPDP4
Limit Activated Variants 	**No ceiling value necessary** to keep the number of activated top-level variants conservative	**Have limited number of variants** to ensure **meaningful representation** of the names of territories
Delegated TLDs Not Validated by RZ-LGR Update 	Delegated gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels **must be grandfathered**	Delegated IDN ccTLDs **must be grandfathered, unless** grandfathering would demonstrably **threaten the stability and security of the DNS** and **deselection** is demonstrably the **only measure to mitigate such a threat**

E5 - Reserved Names

Charter Question E5

e5) Should the reserved strings ineligible for delegation for existing and future gTLDs be updated to include any possible variant labels? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the “Data and Metric Requirements” section of this charter.

- Data and Metric Requirements: Using the latest version of the RZ-LGR to determine the variant labels, if any, of all ICANN reserved TLD labels. Determine whether the calculation is consistent with reality or whether any exceptions need to be considered

Background in 2012 Round

Reserved Names

- Section 2.2.1.2.1 of AGB
- e.g., ALAC, ICANN, TLD, etc.
- Cannot be applied for by any party
- ARE included in the String Similarity review

AFRINIC	*IANA-SERVERS*	*NRO*
ALAC	*ICANN*	*RFC-EDITOR*
APNIC	*IESG*	*RIPE*
ARIN	*IETF*	*ROOT-SERVERS*
ASO	*INTERNIC*	*RSSAC*
CCNSO	*INVALID*	*SSAC*
*EXAMPLE**	*IRTF*	*TEST**
GAC	*ISTF*	*TLD*
GNSO	*LACNIC*	*WHOIS*
GTLD-SERVERS	*LOCAL*	*WWW*
IAB	*LOCALHOST*	
IANA	*NIC*	

*Note that in addition to the above strings, ICANN will reserve translations of the terms "test" and "example" in multiple languages. The remainder of the strings are reserved only in the form included above.

String Ineligible for Delegation

- Section 2.2.1.2.3 of AGB
- i.e., International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement
- Cannot be applied for by any party
- Are NOT included in the String Similarity review

International Olympic Committee		
OLYMPIC	OLYMPIAD	OLYMPIQUE
OLYMPIADE	OLYMPISCH	OLÍMPICO
OLIMPÍADA	أوليمبي	أولمبياد
奥林匹克	奥林匹亚	奥林匹克
奥林匹亞	Ολυμπιακοί	Ολυμπιάδα
올림픽	올림피아드	Олимпийский
Олимпиада		

International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement		
REDCROSS	REDCRESCENT	REDCRYSTAL
REDLIONANDSUN	MAGENDDAVIDADOM	REDSTAROFDAVID
CROIXROUGE	CROIX-ROUGE	CROISSANTROUGE
CROISSANT-ROUGE	CRISTALROUGE	CRISTAL-ROUGE
מגן דוד אדום	CRUZROJA	MEDIALUNAROJA
CRISTALROJO	Красный Крест	Красный Полумесяц
Красный Кристалл	الصليب الأحمر	الأحمر الهلال
الصليب الأحمر	الكريستالة الحمراء	紅十字
紅十字	紅新月	紅新月
紅水晶	紅水晶	

Recent Developments

Reserved Names

SubPro considered the Reserved Names:

- Affirmed the Reserved Names
- Added "PTI" for Public Technical Identifiers to the next version of the AGB
- Details: pp.1-2 of the Google Doc

String Ineligible for Delegation

Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP carefully considered these strings:

- Recommended to provide preventative protections to a finite and specific list of strings at the top-level, based on internationally recognized treaties
- The following names are to be included in the next version of the AGB as Ineligible for Delegation:
  - **"Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Lion and Sun", "Red Crystal"** (UN6 languages)
  - **"Olympic", "Olympiad"** (UN6 languages + German + Greek + Korean)
  - **Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs)** - Exact Match & Full Name (up to two languages)
  - **International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO)** - Exact Match & Full Name (English only)
- Details: the Reserved Names list referenced in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement provides the specific names (except for INGOs) that will eventually be included in the next version of the AGB

Discussion

- ❏ Charter Question E5 asks if the Reserved Names (and presumably the Ineligible for Delegation) strings should also include any possible variant labels; it also requests that the variants be calculated for these strings
- ❏ While this data analysis can be done utilizing the RZ-LGR, **E5 should be considered at the principle level**

Reserved Names

- All strings are in the Latin script and have zero allocatable variants
- 11 IDN "test" strings are the exceptions: they only serve testing purposes & no longer delegated
- **Discussion: Is there a need to update the Reserved Names to include any possible variant labels?**

String Ineligible for Delegation

- Preventative protections at the top-level were agreed to through the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP, and 1) are for a fixed and finite list of names, including additional languages where relevant and 2) are based on internationally recognized treaties (e.g., Geneva Convention, Article 6ter of the Paris Convention)
- **Discussion: Would extending preventative protections for variants**
  - **circumvent the careful work of the IGOs PDP?**
  - **extend rights beyond those that are expressly identified in relevant treaties?**
  - **in other words, are variants for these string in scope for the IDN-EPDP?**