

Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names (EPDP on IDNs)

Presentation #4 on the Phase 1 Initial Report

Satish Babu
Abdulkarim Oloyede

Hadia Elminiawi
Justine Chew

24 May 2023



Agenda

- Recap
- Discussing limitation on the number of variants
- Recommendations that support the conservative approach
 - Language communities' limitation
 - Application and evaluation
 - Fees' structure
 - String similarity review
 - Market limitations
- Do we need to do more?

Recap

The EPDP Team is expected to

- Determine the approach for a consistent definition of all gTLDs; and
- Develop policy recommendations that will eventually allow for the introduction of variant gTLDs at the top-level.

Four main underlying principles

- RZ-LGR as the Sole Source
- Same Entity
- Integrity of the Set
- Conservatism

Discussing Limitation on the number of variants

There is no limit on the number of variants that an entity can apply for

8.1

No ceiling value for delegated top-level variant labels from a variant label set 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 apply for variant labels, will keep the number of delegated top-level variant labels conservative

Discussing limitation on the number of variants

Underlying principle: Conservatism

SAC060 notes

variant code points in LGR may introduce a “permutation issue”, possibly creating a large number of variant domain names, which “presents challenges for the management of variant domains at the registry, the registrar and registrant levels.

SAC060 advises

“ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.”

Natural limitations on the number of variants:

Language communities' limitation

1.1

The RZ-LGR must be the sole source to calculate the variant labels and disposition values for existing delegated gTLDs from the 2012 round.

Of the 26 scripts integrated in the RZ-LGR version 5, 4 scripts have no variant labels and 15 scripts have no allocatable variant labels. Only 7 scripts have allocatable variant labels, namely: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Greek, Latin, Myanmar, and Tamil.

Except for Arabic, the language communities of the other six scripts have already limited the number of allocatable variant labels (one to four variant labels of the primary label are allocatable)

Natural limitations on the number of variants:

Application submission and evaluation

3.5

A future IDN gTLD applicant must be required, as part of the application process, to explain why it seeks one or more allocatable variant label(s) of its applied-for primary IDN gTLD string. The same requirement applies to existing registry operators from the 2012 round who wish to apply for allocatable variant label(s) of their existing IDN gTLDs

Natural limitations on the number of variants:

Application submission and evaluation

3.6

Criteria for evaluating the explanations submitted by applicants on the need for variant label(s) should be pre-identified and applied consistently by evaluators with the requisite expertise.

Natural limitations on the number of variants:

Application submission and evaluation

3.7

A future IDN gTLD applicant must be required to demonstrate its ability to manage the applied-for primary IDN gTLD string and applied-for allocatable variant label(s) from both a technical and operational perspective.

The same requirement applies to existing registry operators from the 2012 round who wish to apply for allocatable variant label(s) of their existing IDN gTLDs

Natural limitations on the number of variants:

Application submission and evaluation

3.8

The evaluation of capability to manage the variant label set should be closely tied to the overall technical capability evaluation.

The evaluation should be based on measurable criteria including, but not limited to, the performance of Critical Functions with respect to second-level registrations under the primary IDN gTLD string and the applied-for allocatable variant label(s)

Recommendations that support the conservative approach

Natural limitations on the number of variants: **Fees' structure**

3.10

The fee structure associated with future IDN gTLD applications that include variant label(s), as well as applications for variant label(s) of existing IDN gTLDs from existing registry operators from the 2012 round, must be consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and affirmed by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

3.12

Any applicant applying for more than four (4) allocatable variant labels of a primary IDN gTLD string in an application round may incur additional fees that ICANN org considers to be proportionate to any additional cost

Natural limitations on the number of variants: **Fees' structure**

3.14

If an existing registry operator from the 2012 round applies for more than four (4) allocatable variant labels of its existing IDN gTLD, in the immediate next application round, that application may incur additional fees as set out in Preliminary Recommendation 3.12

Recommendations that support the conservative approach

Natural limitation on the number of variants: **String similarity review**

Hybrid Model	Compare	Against
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each applied-for gTLD string (as the primary gTLD string)• All allocatable variant labels of the applied-for primary gTLD string	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All existing gTLDs and ccTLDs and all allocatable and blocked variant labels of those TLDs• All other applied-for primary gTLD strings and all allocatable and blocked variant labels of those strings• All requested primary ccTLD strings and all allocatable and blocked variant labels of those strings• All strings on the Reserved Names list and all allocatable and blocked variant labels of those strings• Any other two-character ASCII strings and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels (if the applied for IDN primary gTLD string is a two-character string)

Recommendations that support the conservative approach

Natural limitation on the number of variants: **String similarity review**

Hybrid Model	Compare	Against
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All blocked variant labels of each applied-for	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All existing gTLDs and ccTLDs and all allocatable variant labels of those TLDs• All other applied-for gTLD strings and all allocatable variant labels of those strings

Recommendations that support the conservative approach

Natural limitations on the number of variants: **Market limitations**

Rational of 8.1

The EPDP Team considered that there will be several factors that will likely result in a conservative approach to applying for variant labels, such as cost, operational competence, and potential challenges associated with managing a gTLD and its variant labels at the registry, registrar and registrant levels.

variant label(s) are not necessarily intended as a commercial opportunity to explore a new market, but are intended for users to have a complete online experience, as users consider the variant label set as one single gTLD

Do we need to do more?

Natural limitations on the number of variants through:

Language communities' limitation

Application and evaluation

Fees' structure

String similarity review

Market limitations

Do we need to do more?

- ⊙ Do you agree with having no ceiling value on the number of variants that could be applied for?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No opinion

- ⊙ Do you think the recommendations included in the report are enough to provide a natural ceiling on the number of variants that could be applied for?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No opinion

- ⊙ Do you think we need to have more binding implementation recommendations to limit the number of possible variants that could be applied for?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No opinion

End

Thank you for your input.