

# Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process

C4, C5, C6, cont.



IDN-EPDP Team Meeting #82 | 18 May 2023

# Agenda

---

1. Roll Call and SOI Updates (2 mins)
2. Welcome and Chair Updates (5 mins)
3. Continued IDN table harmonization (charter questions C4, C5, C6) (110 mins)
  - Recap from previous meeting
  - Continued deliberations
4. AOB (3 mins)

# Charter Questions: C4, C5, C6

## Mutually Coherent = Harmonized

### **Harmonization Core Question**

C4) Should the second-level IDN tables offered under a TLD, including IDN variant TLDs, be required to be mutually coherent? If yes, how should existing registrations which may not meet the “mutually coherent” requirement of second-level IDN tables be addressed?

### **Harmonization Mechanism**

C5) The Staff Paper suggests maintaining a common set of harmonized second-level IDN tables for all IDN variant TLDs and then (a) choosing all these IDN tables to offer for all IDN variant TLDs, or (b) choosing a relevant different subset of IDN tables to offer for each different IDN variant TLD. Are the above suggested methods in the Staff Paper sufficient for IDN table harmonization purposes? Should any additional implementation guidance be provided for a registry?

### **Harmonization Mechanism - IDN Table Format**

C6) Should Registry Operators be required to use the machine readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second-level IDN tables? Or should Registry Operators have the flexibility to resolve the harmonization issue so long as it can predictably and consistently produce the same variant labels, albeit with different disposition values, across the same-script IDN tables?

# Recap of Deliberations - C4

## Mutually Coherent = Harmonized

### Harmonization Core Question

C4) Should the second-level IDN tables offered under a TLD, including IDN variant TLDs, be required to be mutually coherent? If yes, how should existing registrations which may not meet the “mutually coherent” requirement of second-level IDN tables be addressed?

### Harmonization Mechanism

C5) The Staff Paper suggests maintaining a common set of harmonized second-level IDN tables for all IDN variant TLDs and then (a) choosing all these IDN tables to offer for all IDN variant TLDs, or (b) choosing a relevant different subset of IDN tables to offer for each different IDN variant TLD. Are the above suggested methods in the Staff Paper sufficient for IDN table harmonization purposes? Should any additional implementation guidance be provided for a registry?

### Harmonization Mechanism - IDN Table Format

C6) Should Registry Operators be required to use the machine readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second-level IDN tables? Or should Registry Operators have the flexibility to resolve the harmonization issue so long as it can predictably and consistently produce the same variant labels, albeit with different disposition values, across the same-script IDN tables?

# Recap of Deliberations for Future Applicants - C4

## For new IDN Tables to be submitted by future applicants:

1. Should harmonization be a requirement?
  - a. In other words, should it be a requirement that the variant relationship between any two given second-level labels is consistently defined across all of the IDN Tables offered by a gTLD and its variant gTLD(s)
    - The Team understands what Harmonization is and why it is important (i.e., avoid inconsistent identification of variants).
    - Members need to check with their groups, but from a principles level, most seem to support the conservative approach of **requiring that applicants/Registry Operators must harmonize their IDN tables for a given gTLD and any variant gTLD(s).**
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, should any specific harmonization mechanism be recommended?
  - a. Specifically, should the Reference LGR, including the Common LGR, be recommended as a reference for developing IDN Tables by future applicants?
  - b. Should the XML format, as recommended by RFC 7940, be required for IDN Tables to be submitted by future applicants?

# Recap of Deliberations - C5/C6

## Mutually Coherent = Harmonized

### Harmonization Core Question

C4) Should the second-level IDN tables offered under a TLD, including IDN variant TLDs, be required to be mutually coherent? If yes, how should existing registrations which may not meet the “mutually coherent” requirement of second-level IDN tables be addressed?

### Harmonization Mechanism

C5) The Staff Paper suggests maintaining a common set of harmonized second-level IDN tables for all IDN variant TLDs and then (a) choosing all these IDN tables to offer for all IDN variant TLDs, or (b) choosing a relevant different subset of IDN tables to offer for each different IDN variant TLD. Are the above suggested methods in the Staff Paper sufficient for IDN table harmonization purposes? Should any additional implementation guidance be provided for a registry?

### Harmonization Mechanism - **IDN Table Format**

C6) Should Registry Operators be required to use the machine readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second-level IDN tables? Or should Registry Operators have the flexibility to resolve the harmonization issue so long as it can predictably and consistently produce the same variant labels, albeit with different disposition values, across the same-script IDN tables?

# Recap of Deliberations for Future Applicants - C5/C6

## For new IDN Tables to be submitted by future applicants:

1. Should harmonization be a requirement?
    - a. In other words, should it be a requirement that the variant relationship between any two given second-level labels is consistently defined across all of the IDN Tables offered by a gTLD and its variant gTLD(s)
  2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, should any specific harmonization mechanism be recommended?
    - a. Specifically, should the Reference LGR, including the Common LGR, be recommended as a reference for developing IDN Tables by future applicants?
    - b. Should the XML format, as recommended by RFC 7940, be required for IDN Tables to be submitted by future applicants?
- The Team considered the proposals from the staff paper (i.e., Extend Each IDN Table, Extend Label Check Process) and the anecdote from Michael.
  - However, while the Team recognized these as viable options, initial reactions seemed to indicate a **preference for allowing Registry Operators to determine how to achieve harmonization.**
  - The Team reviewed the evolution of IDN Table Format RFCs (RFCs 3743, 4290, and 7940) and what was shared is that at least some registries do not take IDN tables as inputs into their systems. Rather, they export the IDN tables to meet ICANN requirements. If XML were required, it would mean that registries would have to change how they export the table; wouldn't change system inputs.
  - Anecdote from Zuan Zhang re: how Chinese Domain Name Consortium (CDNC) coordinates/manages Chinese IDN table
  - Concerns expressed about considering adoption of 7940 or Reference LGR - both appear outside scope of C6.

# Discussion Questions - Existing ROs

For existing IDN Tables already implemented by existing ROs:

1. Should harmonization be a requirement?
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, should any specific harmonization mechanism be recommended?
  - a. Should the XML format, as recommended by RFC 7940, be required retroactively for already implemented IDN Tables?
3. If the answer to question 1 is yes, what would be the effect of the harmonization on existing registrations?



# Discussion Questions - Existing ROs (Cont.)

For new IDN Tables to be submitted by existing ROs (e.g., as part of the variant gTLD application):

1. Should harmonization be a requirement?
  - a. If the answer to question 1 is yes, how to manage any potential inconsistency with any of the ROs' already implemented IDN Tables?
2. If the answer to question 1 is yes, should any specific harmonization mechanism be recommended?
  - a. Specifically, should the Reference LGR, including the Common LGR, be recommended as a reference for developing new IDN Tables to be submitted by existing ROs?
  - b. Should the XML format, as recommended by RFC 7940, be required for new IDN Tables to be submitted by existing ROs?