

Overview Stress test

Version 6, 12 May 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 addresses 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 |
| 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: to be included in new section (most likely in Miscellaneous (section 9) | Second reading 18 April 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|---|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | name as an INDccTLD? Or its variants? | | <p>period will be determined in new ccPDP.</p> <p>In first reading the suggestions varied from 10-30 years (not considering the duration of the retirement procedure).</p> <p>In second reading the agreed upon minimum period is 10 years.</p> <p>Although a request for re-use may be very unlikely (taking into account the selected string has to be a meaningful representation of the name of the Territory, cooling down is believed to be warranted to avoid overlap with cached entries with a very high ttl and other uses.</p> | | |
| 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</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 | Yes | Second reading 18 April |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|--|---|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | determine what is and what is not a country. | <p>more IDN ccTLDs has been completed (ccNSO is policy making body)</p> <p>Discussion ended in agreement that ccNSO should launch a ccPDP after removal of the IDNccTLD string(s) from the Root Zone file, taking into account the 10 year suggested “cooling down” period of 10 years.</p> <p>Factors to consider in ccPDP to determine in the “cooling down” period before possible re-use 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 | | |
| 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 requested selected IDNccTLD string is a meaningful representation of the name of Territory etc., then nothing withstands such a new request. | No | Second reading 18 April 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|---------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | | However, the cooling down period and the newly to be developed policy will determine when and how the retired string(s) can be applied for (again) | | |
| 9. | 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? | Section 1.3, see also other more specific tests for example # 1, 6, 10 and 11 | 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>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.</p> <p>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> | Second reading, 04 April 2023, was supported. |
| 9. | What if two countries are merged, like Eastern and Western Germany, i. what if they used the same IDNs Scripts? | Principle 1 | This test is subsumed in test 16. | | No longer a scenario subsumed |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | ii. What if they would use different scripts iii. What if Eastern Germany had an IDN ccTLD that was retired? | | | | 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 | Adopted second reading 2 May 2023 |
| 11. | What if a territory script and language match, but a significantly interested party withdraws from the existing script and would like to propose a new script. Would the Deselection process be triggered? | Section 1.2.2, 1.2.3 Section 1.2.7 and section 2.2 & 2.3 | Whether a significant interested party supports or does not support the script is irrelevant. The SIP is only expected to support the selected string. Note that the for the term Designated Language in other contexts the term “Official Language” is used. To be considered “Designated” under the policy the Language should meet one of the criteria listed in section 1.2.2. | N | Adopted second reading 2 May 2023 |
| 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, and after this change the initial selected IND ccTLD is no longer a meaningful representation of the | N | Adopted second reading 2 May 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | name of the country in the designated language, the selected string no longer meets the criteria. 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 A'A' . The ISO3166-1 two (2) letter code AA remains for one country. The split results in assigning different ISO3166-1 code A'A' to other part. Before the split (A'A')IDN ccTLDs was related to AA and will be kept, including the variant(s), subject to local decision only. This will 'block' the names for the split off Territory A'A'. Is there a way for A'A' to trigger deselection of (A'A') IDNccTLD? And if so can (A'A') request (A'A') IDNccTLD | Section 1.2.1 & 1.3.1 | According to scenario A'A'IDNccTLD was delegated and hence a meaningful representation of country AA. The split of AA into AA and A'A' does not change that A'A'IDNccTLD is still a meaningful representation of AA in the Designated Language and related script. As a result A'A'IDN ccTLD still meets all the criteria, including the meaningful criteria even if SIP of A'A' would like to see it differently. | N | Confirmed second reading 2 May 2023 |
| 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 | |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| 15 (was 16.) | 'Merger' scenario – The ASCII for West Territory is .WT, and the abbreviated name is Territory. West Territory merges with South Territory. For this South Territory for which the ccTLD .ST was delegated. Under this test only South Territory uses an IDN ccTLD in the Dutch language .Territory. After the merger .ST will be retired in accordance with the ccTLD retirement policy. What will happen with the IDNccTLD .Territory? | Principle I | The basic principle of the proposed policy is that if the reference to a Territory is removed from the ISO3166 – 1 standard because two or more Territories have merged, this removal is considered a “trigger event” . This will cause 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 DEUTSCHLAND is a meaningful representation in the Designated language of the merged Territory, and the Significantly Interested Parties of the “merged” Territory support the IDNccTLD, it should not be retired. However, the basic criteria only one (1) IDN ccTLD string per Designated Language still applies (section 1.3.2). So if there is already a IDNccTLD for the merged territory in the same Designated Language, . DEUTSCHLAND shall need to be | Y, adjust Principle I and possibly section 2.2 and 2.3 applies | Second reading 18 April 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|----------|-------------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | | | retired. | | |

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 does not meet any of the criteria (hereafter is “not valid” or “invalid”), variants are not be calculated anymore.</p> <p>Note there is no general statement that if a selected string does not meet all requirements, the variants are considered not valid anymore.</p> <p>The CS sub-group agreed to the following: 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> <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 administrative burden by renewed</i></p> | Confirmed in first reading that only if selected string meets all criteria the variant set is valid. This recommendation needs to made general | Confirmed in second reading 2 May 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | | | <i>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> | | |
| 18. | 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? | Section 3.2.3, Annex C ICANN Bylaws | <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 | Confirmed in second reading 2 May 2023 |
| 19 | Asymmetrical variants. Sometimes variants are asymmetrical: if you go from label A to label B, label B is allocatable, however sometimes going from Label B to label A it is blocked. How will this play out under the policy? | Section 3.2.1& section 3.2.3 | <p>Variants are derived from the selected IDNccTLD string through the RZ-LGR.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>However, assuming asymmetry, and string B is the selected string and string A is blocked variant of string B, then by definition variant IDNccTLD string A is non-eligible.</p> | No | Confirmed in first reading 2 May 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 20. | IDN1 is selected IDNccTLD string in Chinese, and IDN2 and IDN3 are variants under Chinese RZ-LGR. IDN3 is also meaningful representation in Japanese. Another applicant applies for IDN 3 which is meaningful representation in Japanese. Is IDN3 in Japanese eligible? | Section 3.2.3, 3.3 | <p>According to section 1.1-1.8 and section 2.1 and 2.2 only Allocatable VARIANTS of the selected IDNccTLD string that are Meaningful Representations of the name of the Territory in the Designated Language are eligible.</p> <p>This being said IDN3, although a meaningful representation on another Designated Language can only be requested by the requestor of IDN1.</p> | No | First reading on call 2 May 2023 |
| New 20 a. | IDN1 is selected IDNccTLD string in Chinese, and IDN2 and IDN3 are variants under Chinese RZ-LGR. | | | | |
| 21. | Asymmetrical variants (A-> B allocatable, B-> A is blocked) because of RZ-LGR. Scenario applicant applied for B first, before RZ-LGR became effective, 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 | First reading on call 2 May 2023 |
| 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 | <p>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.</p> <p>In case such a change is brought in RZ-LGR, it could cause a “collision” between ccTLDs. Point out that the generation panel should call out that change. Share the motivation of still doing that change, to ensure all are informed.</p> | N | First reading on call 2 May 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rz-lgr-technical-utilization-recs-07oct19-en.pdf Recommendation 12. | | |
| 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 remain, even if they wouldn't be allowed to co-exist without the initial label A? | 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. 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. | To be made explicit in the policy? | First reading on call 2 May 2023 |
| 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 | 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. Further, according to Principle V, criteria determine the number of IDNccTLD per territory, including the number of variants to be delegated. 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). As 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. According to the notes and observations of | Suggestion is no change | First reading on call 2 May 2023 |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|---|---|--|----------------|
| | | | <p>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 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 | |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|--|--|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | 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 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. However, note that IDN2 can only be delegated to the same ccTLD Manager. | 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 he 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, note de-selection is demarcates the start of the retirement process of the IDNccTLD. This process itself will take at least 5 years, and is not | | |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | | <p>governed by this policy but by the retirement policy.</p> <p>If the RZ-LGR would be become effective immediately the demonstrable threat would emerge because of the change. The effective date therefore has to be after the IDNccTLD has been removed.</p> | | |
| 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 | <p>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.</p> <p>However note SAC 052 (2012) : https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-052-en.pdf</p> <p>The recommendations included were suggested until ICANN completes its work on user confusion/string similarity and IDN variants (page 8).</p> <p>Questions: has ICANN's work in these areas been completed?</p> <p>If so, have any additional concerns been raised ?</p> <p>If work is not completed: is work still on-going, and</p> | Include in notes and observations to Principle V? (Criteria determine the number and kind of request) | First discussion 2 May 2023. |

| Item # | Scenario | Relevant sections in document | Assessment | Adjust proposed policy | Discussed Y/N? |
|--------|----------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|----------------|
| | | | <p>or will it be completed in foreseeable future?</p> <p>Are concerns raised addressed by the work on the RZ-LGR/ variant management and confusion/string similarity?</p> | | |

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? | | | | |