ccPDP4-IDN EPDP Joint Meeting

ICANN

26 July 2022

Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Introduction: ccNSO PDP4

3. Introduction: GNSO IDN-EPDP

4. **Item Comparison**

5. Next Steps Per Group

6. AOB

7. Closure

Overview

Goal: To fulfill the Board request that the GNSO and ccNSO keep each other informed of the progress in developing the relevant details of their policies and procedures to ensure a consistent solution for IDN variant gTLDs and IDN variant ccTLDs

Focus: Discuss draft recommendations developed by both groups to understand the similarities and differences

General Comparison

	ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Topic	- Principles and basic criteria for selection of IDN ccTLD strings - Deselection of IDN ccTLDs - Variant management - Confusing similarity - Stress testing	- Definition of all gTLDs - Variant management - IDN Implementation Guidelines
Procedure	- A sub-group developed the variant management related draft recommendations - Full working group has not yet discussed the variant management draft recommendations	- All draft recommendations have been developed by the full working group - Exception: String Similarity Small Group is developing recommendations on String Similarity Review and Objection Processes for the consideration by full WG
Scope of Policy	Top-level only	- Top-level - Second-level
Implementation	- No contractual obligations for ccTLD managers - Ongoing nature of ccTLD application process	- Contractual obligations for gTLD registries and registrars - Application rounds for gTLDs

RZ-LGR Utilization: Consistent Recommendations

Topic	ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Compliance with RZ-LGR for the definition of TLDs and calculation of variants	**3.2.1 Definition of Variants** Compliance with Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR, RZ-LGR-2, and any future RZ-LGR rules sets) MUST be required for the generation of IDNccTLDs and variants labels, including the determination of whether the label is blocked or allocatable. IDN TLDs must comply with IDNA2008 (RFCs 5890-5895) or its successor(s).	**Recommendation 1.1**: The RZ-LGR be the sole source to calculate the variant labels and disposition values for existing delegated gTLD labels.
Using RZ-LGR for TLD validation and variant calculation	**3.2.2 Scripts integrated into RZ-LGR** For the scripts and writing systems which have been integrated into the RZ-LGR, the RZ-LGR must be the only source for processing the following cases: ● Validate an applied-for TLD string and determine its variant string(s) with corresponding dispositions ● Calculate variant strings, and corresponding disposition values, for each one of the already delegated TLD Strings **4.1.1 Technical Criteria** **4.2.2 Process for Technical Validation & RZ-LGR conformity review**	**Implementation Guidance 1.3**: When the initial algorithmic check finds that the applied-for label does not conform to the RZ-LGR, the application submission system must issue a warning. However, the applicant should be allowed to submit the application if the label passes the mandatory string requirements and the IDNA 2008 requirements. This recognizes the unlikely, but possible situation, that the RZ-LGR was programmed or incorporated in the application submission system incorrectly.
Backward compatibility of RZ-LGR update	**3.2.4. Impact of possible amendment of RZ-LGR** It is expected that the LGR for the root zone will be subject to modification from time to time. Because the implications of removing delegations from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce incompatible results with historical (existent) activations.	**Recommendation 1.8:** For all future versions of the RZ-LGR, Generation Panels (GPs) and the Integration Panel (IP) must make best efforts to retain full backward compatibility with existing gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels (if any). The LGR Procedure must be updated to specify the exceptional circumstances, to the extent known to the GPs and IP, that could result in a proposed update to the RZ-LGR not being able to retain full backward compatibility.

RZ-LGR Utilization: Potential Difference

Topic	ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Limiting number of delegated variants	**3.2.3. Limitation of delegation of variants.** Only Allocatable VARIANTS of the selected IDNccTLD string that are according to section 1.1-1.8 and section 2.1 and 2.2 to be Meaningful Representations of the name of the Territory in the Designated Language are eligible to be delegated.	**Recommendation 1.4**: No ceiling value is necessary as existing measures in the RZ-LGR to reduce the number of allocatable top-level variant labels, as well as economic, operational, and other factors that may impact the decision to seek to activate variant labels will keep the number of activated top-level variant labels conservative.
Grandfather existing TLDs after RZ-LGR update	**Section Number TBD** 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	**Recommendation 1.7**: Existing gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels not validated by a proposed RZ-LGR update must be grandfathered

RZ-LGR Utilization: Additional Recommendations

ccPDP4

4.2.3 Conformity to RZ-LGR
If the LGR for the writing system or script in which the Designated Language is expressed has not been generated or is not yet integrated in the RZ-LGR…ICANN shall inform the requester and section 5.2.2 sub C. applies accordingly.

IDN-EPDP

Recommendation 1.2:
SubPro's limited challenge mechanism for DNS Stability Review applies in cases where the applicant believes that the label is valid as per the RZ-LGR and that the DNS Stability Panel has incorrectly assessed the label as "invalid"

Recommendation 1.9 & Implementation Guidance 1.10:
In the event where a proposed update of the RZ-LGR is unable to retain full backward compatibility, the relevant GP must call out the exception during a public comment period

Recommendation 1.11:
Single character gTLDs may only be allowed for limited scripts and languages where a character is an ideograph

Recommendations 1.12 & 1.13:
Variants' label states and possible label state transitions

Same Entity at Top-Level: Consistent Recommendations

Topic	ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Allocation of variant TLD to same entity	**3.3.1 Allocatable IDNccTLD variant strings** The set of allocatable variant strings that is generated from the selected IDNccTLD string by applying the RZ-LGR, must be allocated to one and the same entity: the requestor (the entity that submits the selected IDNccTLD string), delegated to one and the same entity: the IDN ccTLD Manager or withheld for possible future delegation to the IDNccTLD Manager. In other words, for a selected top-level label T1, its allocatable variant label(s) T1V1,…, T1Vx shall only be allocated to the IDN ccTLD requestor, or - after the delegation process for the selected IDNccTLD string has been initiated - delegated to the same IDNccTLD Manager or withheld for possible delegation to that IDNccTLD Manager.	**Recommendation 2.1:** Any allocatable variant labels of an existing gTLD, as calculated by the RZ-LGR, can only be allocated to the registry operator of the existing gTLD or withheld for possible allocation only to that registry operator. **Recommendation 2.4**: Any existing or future IDN gTLD along with its their variant labels (if any) will be subject to one Registry Agreement with the same registry operator.
Registry operators and back-end registry service providers for variant TLDs	**Section 9, A3** **All delegated variant IDNccTLD strings must be operated by the same entity** If a specific IDNccTLD is operated by the IDNccTLD Manager all variants MUST be operated by the IDNccTLD Manager (Defintion: the IDNccTLD Manager is the entity or organisation listed in the IANA rootzone database as the ccTLD Manager for a specific IDNccTLD). If a specific IDNccTLD is operated by a "back-end" registry service provider under arrangement with the IDNccTLD Manager, or will be operated by a "back-end" registry service provider under arrangement with the IDNccTLD Manager, that "back-end" service provider MUST operate all delegated variants of that specific IDNccTLD.	**Recommendation 2.2:** The registry operator of an existing IDN gTLD must use the same back-end registry service provider, the organization providing one or more registry services (e.g., DNS, DNSSEC, RDDS, EPP), for operating any additional delegated variant labels of that gTLD. **Recommendation 2.3**: If the registry operator operating a variant gTLD label changes its back-end registry service provider, all the variant gTLD label(s) in the set must also simultaneously transition to the same new back-end registry service provider.

Same Entity at Top-Level: Additional Recommendations

ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Section 9 A2: All ccTLD related policies MUST apply to variant IDNccTLDs as well	**Recommendation 1.5 & Implementation Guidance 1.6:** Best practice guidelines for the management of variant gTLDs
Confusing Similarity Sub-Group Recommendation TBD - deliberation ongoing	**Recommendations 2.5-2.7:** Process to apply for a new IDN gTLD and seek to obtain any allocatable variant(s), as well as associated fee consideration
	Recommendation 2.8: The primary applied-for gTLD and requested allocatable variant labels will be bound by the same restrictions
	Recommendations TBD - deliberation ongoing Policies and procedures related to the New gTLD Program, as impacted by variants, such as: - string similarity review - objection processes - string contention resolution - reserved strings - Registry Transition Process; EBERO provisions; reassignment of the TLD as a result of TM-PDDRP - data escrow policy

Same Entity at Second-Level

Topic	ccPDP4	IDN-EPDP
Allocation of variant SLD to same entity	*To be discussed with full WG regarding whether this topic is within or outside of scope* **Section 9, A4** A Second Level string registered under a delegated variant IDNccTLD strings MUST be registered for the same entity under all other variant IDNccTLD strings.	*Deliberation started*
Registration of variant SLD under variant TLD to same entity	*To be discussed with full WG regarding whether this topic is within or outside of scope* **Section 9, A5** All variants of a Second-Level string registered under all delegated variant IDNccTLD strings MUST be registered to the same entity under all IDNccTLD variant strings.	*Deliberation started*
IDN Tables	*Considered outside of scope. Advice to ccTLD manager*	*Deliberation started*

IDN-EPDP Upcoming Work

Group 4: "Same Entity" Principle at Second-Level
C1, C2, C3, C3a, C4, C4a, C5, C6

Group 5: Domain Name Lifecycle
D4, D5, D6, D6a, D7, D7a, D8, E6

Group 6: Registration Dispute Resolution and Trademark Protection
F1, F2

Group 7: IDN Implementation Guideline
G1, G1a