

Overview Stress test

Version 4, 12 April 2023

Changes are highlighted in "yellow"

Further, the stress test have ben numbered through (for ease of reference).

Column: Discussed has been updated.

Eligibility of Application

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy?	Discussed? Y/N
1.	What if the applicant/ intended IDNccTLD Manager is not member of the ccNSO, does proposed policy apply? Does IDN ccPDP policy and the delegation /transfer /revocation policy apply?	Scope of policy to be included in introduction section	Any Policy developed by the ccNSO is by definition only targeted at ICANN (see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws). Whether an applicant / requester of the IDNccTLD is member of the ccNSO is immaterial. The applicant / requester has to meet all conditions set by the policy.	To be included in introduction of Initial report scope of policy and reference to Issue Report	Accepted second reading (12 March 2023)

(De)-selection Criteria/ retirement related scenario's

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
2.	Country name is replaced by other country name (in designated language). What if the English/French name of the country doesn't change, but the name of the country changes in the national language?	Section 1.2.1 and section 1.3.1	If the change of the name of the Territory changes in the Designated Language this is considered a change in a basic requirement for IDNccTLD. The proposed policy deals with this situation in section 1.3.1, including when such a change is considered to be a "Trigger Event".	N	Accepted second reading 4 April
3.	What if an IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD? Is retirement needed?	Section 1.3, section 2 and Section	As a general statement it cannot be answered, but depends on circumstances. However as general principal, if after a change in circumstances the IDNccTLD no longer qualifies as such, such a change could result in a "Trigger Event". The ccPDP4 was tasked to define "Trigger Events" that could initiate the retirement process.	No	Accepted second reading 4 April
4.	What if IDN ccTLD manager refuses to go through retirement process?	Retirement policy section 4.3, stress test iii Retirement policy, Section 4 Fol	The Retirement Process is considered out of scope of the IDNccPDP policy effort. The stress tests of the retirement policy address the test.	No	Concluded reading 12 March
5.	What if IDNccTLD Manager is no (longer) member of	Stress testing	The Retirement Process is	No	Concluded

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
	the ccNSO, do de-selection and retirement policy apply?	Retirement policy, Annex C ICANN Bylaws	considered out of scope of the IDNccPDP policy effort. The stress tests of the retirement policy address the test.		reading 12 March
6.	What if the IDN ccTLD that is going to be retired is widely used by another community (e.g. tech community (not necessarily local community))?	Retirement Policy section 4.3 and 4.4, Retirement stress test # ii and xii.	The Retirement Process is considered out of scope of the IDNccPDP policy effort. The stress tests of the retirement policy address the test.	No	Concluded reading 12 March
7.	What if the Country name as listed on standard is changed (ENG/FR)	Section 1.2.2	If a Designated Language of the Territory is not French or English, and if only the English and/or French version of the name of the Territory is changed, then such a change does not have any impact.	No	Concluded reading 12 March
(New) 7. a	<p>Assuming the removal of an IDNccTLD string is the result of the change of the name of the territory in the Designated Language.</p> <p>Under ISO3166-1 there is a standard cool down - period (or a removal of the territory from the ISO3166- 1 standard. Accordingly (section 7.6.2) <i>Country code elements that the ISO 3166/MA has altered or deleted should not be reassigned during a period of at least fifty years after the change. The exact period is determined in each case on the basis of the extent to which the former code element was used.</i></p> <p>Is this period relevant for the re-use of the country</p>	Principle I and Section 1.3	<p>Support for introduction of “cooling down” period to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Proposed start of “cooling down” period is the moment removal of the relevant IDNccTLD(s) from the root-zone file. Note that that the act of removal is the conclusion of the retirement process, but not part of it.</p> <p>What is considered a reasonable</p>	Yes: included new section in applicability of policies?	First reading 4 April 2023

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
	name as an INDccTLD? Or its variants?		<p>period needs to be determined. In first reading the suggestions varied from 10-30 years (not considering the duration of the retirement procedure)</p> <p>Factors to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of the IDNccTLD before retirement - Cause of retirement - Possible re-use of the IDNccTLD string - Mechanism to allow re-use 		
New 7.b	<p>Assume an IDNccTLD is removed from the root-zone file. Who determines the IDNccTLD can be re-used again? ICANN, ccNSO, external organization?</p> <p>For Country Code elements to be assigned by the ISO 3166/MA, a code will be re-assigned by the ISO 3166/MA.</p>	<p>Not addressed</p> <p>Basic Principle RFC 1591: IANA (read ICANN) is not in the business to determine what is and what is not a country.</p>	<p>In first reading various mechanisms were initially discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appoint external panel to determine re-use - Leave it to ICANN - Start a ccNSO PDP after retirement of one or more IDN ccTLDs has been completed (ccNSO is policy making body) <p>To be further discussed in second reading</p>	Yes	First reading 4 April
8.	What if a selected IDN ccTLD string and all its variants are retired and someone else applies for the retired label. What happens?	Principle IV, Section 1.2	If all criteria are met, including but not limited to the requirements that the new to be	No	First reading 12 March

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			<p>requested selected IDNccTLD string is a meaningful representation of the name of Territory etc., then nothing withstands such a new request.</p> <p>However, this depends on the outcome of stress test 7.a and 7b.</p>		2023
9.	<p>What if a ccTLD Manager wishes to retire the selected IDNccTLD strings (due to natural reasons, such as removal of support of the script on the governmental level), and the ccTLD IDN to be retired is the selected (primary) IDNccTLD?</p>	<p>Section 1.3, see also other more specific tests for example # 1, 6, 10 and 11</p>	<p>If the selected string is to be retired, all delegated variants should follow. By definition variants are derived from and are considered related to the selected IDN ccTLD sting. Hence, the variants follow the fate of the defining IDNccTLD string.</p>	<p>Include a general statement, that if a selected cctld string is retired, all degetable variants which have been delegated, follow the fate of the selected IDNccTLD string. There should be no confusion as to whether the delegatable variants can remain in the root zone. In addition all non-delegated delegatable variants shall be non-eligible as IDNccTLD for this Territory .</p>	<p>Second reading, 04 April 2023, was supported.</p>
9.	What if two countries are merged, like Eastern and	Principle 1	This test is subsumed in test 16.		No longer

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
	Western Germany, i. what if they used the same IDNs Scripts? ii. What if they would use different scripts iii. What if Eastern Germany had an IDN ccTLD that was retired?				a scenario subsumed in #16
10.	What if the script of the local language changes and the country has decided to change the script it uses?	Section 1.3.2 & section 1.3.3	This situation is covered in section 1.3.2 and 1.3.3. In principle a change of the Designated Language and change of the script in which the Designated Language is expressed could initiate the procedure ending in a “Trigger Event”.	N	
11.	What if a territory script and language do (not?) match, but a significantly interested party withdraw from the existing script and would like to propose a new script, is Deselection process triggered?	Section 1.2.3 Section 1.2.7 and section 2.2 & 2.3	Whether a significant interested party support or not supports the script is not relevant: SIPs need to support the selected string. Whether a language is a Designated Language is considered in section 1.2.2 and related 1.2.7. If the SIP no longer support the selected sting section 2. 3 applies.	N	
12.	What if a country name is changed and the script and language remains the same, however the relevant people would like to retain the same name as they had before the same?	Section 1.3 & Section 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3	If the country name is changed, the initial selected IND ccTLD is no longer a meaningful representation of the name of the	N	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			country in the designated language. In principle this could end up in a “trigger event”, However according to section 1.3.1, ICANN is not expected to monitor actively, but as soon as changes are needed the procedure leading to the “Trigger Event” will start.		
13.	Country split from AA to AA and XX and the ISO3166-1 2 letter code AA remains for one country. Split results in assigning different ISO3166-1 code XX to other part. Before split (XX)IDN ccTLDs was related to AA and will be kept, including languages and variant subject to local decision only. This will ‘block’ the names for the split off. What if XX applies for XX IDNccTLD? Is there a way for XX to trigger deselection?	Section 1.2.1 & 1.3.1	According to scenario XXIDNccTLD was delegated and hence a meaningful representation of country AA. The split of AA into AA and XX does not change that XXIDNccTLD is still a meaningful representation of AA in the Designated Language and related script. As a result XXIDN ccTLD still meets all the criteria, including the meaningful criteria even if SIP of XX would like to have it.	N	
14.	What if the script of the local language changes and the country has decided to change the script it uses?	Section 1.3.2 and section 1.3.3	The IDN ccTLD does not meet all the criteria and the procedure of section 1.3.3 applies.	N	
16.	‘Merger’ scenario - Western Germany (BRD, Bundes Republic Deutschland) has .DE. Eastern Germany	Principle I	If the name of a Territory is removed from the ISO3166	Y, adjust Principle I and possibly section	First reading

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
	<p>(DDR, Deutsche Demokratische Republic) has .DD and the IDN ccTLD in German language .DEUTSCHLAND. After the merger .DD is to be retired. What will happen with .DEUTSCHLAND ?</p>		<p>because two or more Territories have merged, the removal is considered a “trigger event” and causes the initiation of the process for the retirement of all the selected IDNccTLD(s) (and their variants), which are a meaningful representation of the name of the Territory. However, if the Significantly Interested Parties of the “merged” Territory support the IDNccTLD (.DEUTSCHLAND) it should not be retired. However, the basic criteria only one (1) IDN ccTLD string per Designated Language applies (section 1.3.2).</p>	<p>2.2 and 2.3 applies</p>	<p>First reading 04 April 2023</p>

Variant and variant management test

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
17	EPDP scenario. An IDN ccTLD seeks supports for variant set, along the way something happens with selected string, primary (i.e selected string) is no longer eligible.	Section 3.2.1 See stress # 8 Criteria (above)	<p>If a selected IDNccTLD is not valid (for whatever reason) variants cannot be calculated anymore.</p> <p>Note there is no general statement that if a selected string is not deemed to be valid the variants are not considered valid anymore. The CS sub-group agreed to the following:</p> <p>If the selected string is not valid, all related variant strings are invalid.</p> <p>Rationale: The selected string is considered the core or primary string. All delegatable variants strings are derived from this string through the RZ-LGR. So if the core or primary string is considered invalid, all strings that are derived from the this core or primary string should be invalid as well.</p> <p><i>Notes and Observations</i> It is noted that if the selected string is not valid, but a delegatable variant IDNccTLD string is valid, this string could be considered the selected IDNccTLD string, and pass. To avoid unnecessary</p>	Full group needs to confirm the recommendation of the CS sub-group. Further, this recommendation may need to made more general	Start 18 April 2023

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			<p><i>administrative burden by renewed submission, which is always possible, ICANN is advised to accept a note confirmation that one of the delegatable IDNccTLD strings that is valid, is deemed to be the selected IDNccTLD string. The note of confirmation shall need to be supported by the Significantly Interested Parties that support the original request.</i></p>		
18.	<p>What if IDNccTLD Manager applies for a Variant string that is not in official language of country. The IDN ccTLD managers wants to serve non-official language users. Limitation of usability by limitation of criteria?</p>	<p>Section 3.2.3, Annex C ICANN Bylaws</p>	<p>According to the proposed policy only Allocatable VARIANTS of the selected IDNccTLD string that are Meaningful Representations of the name of the Territory in the Designated Language according to section 1.1-1.8 and section 2.1 and 2.2, are eligible to be delegated.</p> <p>The national consideration which community is to be served, and hence the registration policy is out of scope of this and other ccNSO PDPs</p>	No	
19	<p>Asymmetrical variants. Sometimes variants are asymmetrical: if you go from label A to label B, label B is allocatable, however vice versa is not possible. How will this play out under the policy?</p>	<p>Section 3.2.1& section 3.2.3</p>	<p>Variants are derived from the selected IDNccTLD string through the RZ-LGR. Assuming string A is the selected IDNccTLD string and string B an allocatable variant of A, then string B could be a delegatable variant of the selected IDNccTLD A if all criteria are met. However, assuming asymmetry, and string B is the selected string and string A an non-allocatable</p>	No	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			variant of string B then by definition variant IDNccTLD string A is eligible.		
20.	Chinese applicant IDN 1, and IDN2 with IDN3 blocked under Chinese RZ-LGR. However Japanese applicant applies for IDN 3 under Japanese variant table. Who will win IDN3?	Section 3.2.3	By definition only Allocatable VARIANTS of the selected IDNccTLD string that are Meaningful Representations of the name of the Territory in the Designated Language according to section 1.1-1.8 and section 2.1 and 2.2, are eligible. This being said IDN3, because it is blocked is not eligible as an IDNccTLD. Assuming that all criteria are met, including that the IDN3 in Japanese is not confusingly similar with IDN3 in Chinese, it is eligible as (IDN delegatable variant) string	No	
21.	Asymmetrical variants () a-> B works (B-> A does not work) because of RZ-LGR. Scenario applicant applied for B first, before RZ-LGR became what will happen ? What If applicants want both?	Section 3.2.1 & 3.2.2	Before RZ-LGR became effective the applicant could not request any variants. Only after a script has been integrated into the RZ-LGR variants can be calculated. If according to the RZ-LGR A is not a variant of B, A cannot be requested.	N	
22.	The application of RZ-LGR makes the currently delegated ccTLDs become variant of each other. How will this play out?	Section 3.2.4, Section 9C	To date (March 2023), IDNccTLD are selected and delegated without applying the RZ-LGR. According to the proposed policy under section 9 C each of the currently delegated IDNccTLDs are grandfathered, irrespective of whether they are considered variants through the RZ-LGR.	N	
23.	Label A has allocatable variants: A1, A2. But A1 -> A2 blocked variant A2 -> A1 blocked variant A, A1, A2 all exist in the DNS/Root Zone. What happens if A is deselected? Can A1 and A2	Section 3.2.1& 3.2.2 and 4.2.2	According to section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 Variants of the selected sting are derived from and directly related to the selected IDNccTLD through the RZ-LGR. If no selected IDNccTLD, no variants.	? To be made explicit in the policy?	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
	remain, even if they wouldn't be allowed to co-exist without the initial label A?		One could argue that it is implied that variants need to be de-selected, however one could also argue to make it needs to be made explicit.		
24.	How to synchronize blocked IDN strings between ccNSO and GNSO sets of recommendation, because in the end it is going to be in IANA for the IDN variants. if a particular IDN string is applied for with variants then the applicant has the right to register later all the variants of the string, one of the notions is to keep roster in (IANA repository?)	Principle IV and V, Section 1.2.3 and 3.2.3	<p>In principle (Principle IV) the IDNccTLD selection process is open, implying there is no time limit for selection of a string in a territory and request for a IDNccTLD string or its delegatable variant.</p> <p>Further, according to Principle V, criteria determine the number of IDNccTLD per territory, including the number of variants to be delegated.</p> <p>According to section 1.2.3 the number INDccTLDs strings is limited to one IDNccTLD pers Territory, with the exception of delegatable variants. If a delegatable variant meets all the criteria (other than one string per Territory). Thus is again re-stated in section 3.2.3 only allocatable variants of the selected IDNccTLD that are a meaningful representation of the name of the country are eligible.</p> <p>According to the notes and observations of section 3.2.2: <i>For variants to be eligible for delegation, section 3.2.3 implies that all criteria apply and the required documentation and support from the Significantly Interested Parties must be available for all requested</i></p>	Suggestion is no change	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			<p><i>variants before validation.</i></p> <p>Section 3.2.3 also implies that if - for example – a delegatable variant of a selected string is considered confusingly similar to an already delegated IDNccTLD, not associated with the same territory it is not valid. Therefore the right to all variants cannot be assumed.</p>		
25	How does an IDN ccTLD Manager of an already selected and delegated IDNccTLD string apply for a delegatable variant TLD - is it the same process given the primary string is already delegated?	Principle IV Section 3.2.2 and Section 5.2	According to Principle IV the request for (and delegation) of IDNccTLDs is an ongoing process. It is implied in section 3.2.2 that variants can be requested after the selected string was delegated (at least variants from IDNccTLD strings that were delegated under the Fast Track Process. All requests have to follow the same validation process as defined through section 5.2 the String Validation stage.	Make explicit that delegatable variants can always be requested. This is implication of Principle IV and implied in section 3.2.2 transitional arrangement. validation also applies to request of delegatable variants of the selected IDNccTLD string?	
26.	What if a Delegatable variant IDNccTLD string is delegated and Selected IDNccTLD is not delegated?	Section 3.2.3	See Notes and observations of Section 3.2.3 implies that all criteria apply and the required documentation and support from the Significantly Interested Parties must be		

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			available for all requested variants before validation.		
27.	Assume IDN 1 is delegated. Manager IDN 1 applies for variant IDN 2. IDN2 is variant of IDN 1. Will IDN2 be eligible for delegation and can it be delegated?	Principle IV, Section 1.2.3,	The IDNccTLD process is open (see Principle IV), meaning IDNccTLD strings and their delegation can be requested any time. It is not explicitly stated that Delegatable variants can be requested any time independent, but after the request of the selected IDNccTLD string.	Update the document to make explicit that delegatable variants can be requested at the time or after the request for the selected IDNccTLD string has been submitted?	
28	Assume that the amendment of the RZ-LGR will cause a demonstrably threat. This would imply that the IDNccTLD will need to be retired. Retirement of a ccTLD (including IDNccTLD) takes at least 5 years as of the Notice of Retirement). When will amendment of the RZ-LGR become effective?	Section 3.2.4 Impact of possible amendment of RZ-LGR. Retirement policy.	According to section 3.2.4 the basic rule is that the IDNccTLD should be grandfathered when the RZ-LGR is amended. Only when as a result of the change of the RZ-LGR it is demonstrated that the stability and security of the DNS is demonstrably threatened and deselection the only demonstrably measure to mitigate such a threat, such an IDNccTLD should be deselected. However de-selection is the identification of the events that may result in a retirement of the IDNccTLD. The retirement itself is not governed by this policy, but the retirement policy. According to the latter policy retirement will take at least 5 years. If the RZ-LGR would be become effective	N	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed Y/N?
			immediately the demonstrable threat would emerge because of the change. The effective date therefore has to be after the IDNccTLD has been removed.		
New 29	An applicant, request a single character IDNccTLD, which meets all criteria (Meaningful, Designated Language, supported by SIP, etc.). Is string eligible under the policy?	Section 1, 2 and 4	If the string meets all criteria, nothing prevents it from being requested. However note the criteria of only one IDNccTLD string per Designated Language applies	Include in notes and observations to Principle V? (Criteria determine the number and kind of request)	

Confusing Similarity Tests

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy	Discussed? Y/N
29	New manager applies for a CS of incumbent's non-delegated but allocatable variant. What options are open for incumbent, what is impact of CS				
30	Applicant IND 1 and IDN2 and are not Confusingly Similar, IDN 3 is blocked. Assume IDN 3 is Confusingly Similar with delegated IDN, how will this play out?				
31	Comparison for string confusion is delegatable x delegatable for ccTLD applications. However, for comparison between a ccTLD string and a gTLD string, what will be the case given gTLDs do not have delegatable subset but only have allocatable or blocked?				