

Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process

C4a, Preliminary Agreement



IDN-EPDP Team Meeting #85 | 29 June 2023

Agenda

1. Roll Call and SOI Updates
2. Welcome and Chair Updates
3. Phase 1 Initial Report Public Comment Overview
4. Review Preliminary Agreement
5. Discuss Variant Label Behavior in Domain Name Lifecycle: C4a
6. AOB

Phase 1 Initial Report Public Comment Overview

Public Comment Statistics

No. of Submissions	12 (2 late submissions)
No. of Commenters	10
Commenters	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ALAC• BC• CCWP-HR• CORE Association• GAC• ICANN org• Julius Kiriimi• PointQuebec• RrSG• RySG
No. of Recs that Received Comments	42 out of 68
No. of Recs that Received Significant Concerns or Objections	21 out of 68 (some are staff designations, as some commenters did not explicitly indicate the level of support or non-support)

Public Comment Review Tool will be used to assist EPDP Team's deliberations on public comments received

Recommendations with Higher Concentration of Comments

- **Rec 3.5-3.6:** What to include in variant label application
- **Rec 3.11-3.14:** Tiered application fee structure
- **Rec 3.15:** One-time exception for priority in processing order for existing ROs
- **Rec 7.3:** Approved variant label(s) subject to separate RA, but linked to existing RA
- **Rec 7.7-7.10, 7.12-7.13:** Apply “same entity” principle in registry agreement
- **Rec 8.1-8.2:** No ceiling value for delegated variant gTLDs is necessary; framework for developing guidelines
- **Rec 8.11:** Removal of delegated variant label

Other Comments & Developments

Other Comments & Developments

- **Proposal from PointQuebec and Core Association** to develop an exception procedure to String Similarity Review, similar to that in ccTLD Fast Track process, to evaluate confusingly similar IDN and ASCII strings that are not identified as variants according to RZ-LGR
- Comments from PointQuebec regarding **treatment of GeoTLD applications**
- ICANN Board's **possible non-adoption of SubPro Recommendations 32.2 and 32.10** regarding the challenge / appeal mechanisms
- **Pending input from Chinese / Japanese / Korean Generation Panels** on single-character gTLD guidelines

Review Preliminary Agreement

IDN Table Harmonization (C4, C5 & C6)

C4: *Should the second-level IDN tables offered under a TLD be required to be mutually coherent?*

C5: *Are the suggested methods in the Staff Paper sufficient for IDN table harmonization purposes? Should any additional implementation guidance be provided for a registry?*

C6: *Should Registry Operators be required to use the machine readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second-level IDN tables?*

Preliminary Agreement:

1. All of the IDN Tables for a gTLD and its variant gTLDs must be **harmonized**. This means that these IDN Tables must produce a consistent **variant domain set** for any second-level label requested to be registered under a given gTLD or its variant gTLD, if applicable
 - This requirement applies to both:
 - Existing IDN Tables already implemented by existing Registry Operators; and
 - Future IDN Tables to be submitted to ICANN org for review and approval by existing and future Registry Operators as well as New gTLD applicants
2. Existing and future Registry Operators as well as New gTLD applicants should determine the appropriate mechanism to harmonize their IDN Tables

Same Entity Requirement (C1 & C2)

C1: Should the “same entity” requirement be extended to existing second-level labels?

C2: Should the same registrant be required for already activated IDN variant labels at the second-level? How does the “same entity” requirement impact the current rules for Registry Operators for activating IDN variant labels?

Preliminary Agreement:

1. An allocatable variant domain of an existing domain can only be allocated to the same **registrant** of the existing domain or withheld for possible allocation to that registrant
 - A variant domain refers to a second-level variant label that arises from a registration based on an IDN Table under a gTLD and its allocatable variant label at the top-level, if applicable (e.g., s1.t1, s1v1.t1, s1.t1v1, s1v1.t1v1...)
2. The variant domains that are already registered to different registrants before the policy effective date of the aforementioned recommendations must be grandfathered
3. Unless and until only one registrant and one sponsoring registrar remains for the grandfathered domain(s) from a variant domain set, activation of any allocatable domains from the variant domain set is not allowed

Domain Name Lifecycle (D4, D6, D7)

D4: Regarding second-level domain names, should a variant set behave as one unit, or should each variant domain name have its own independent domain name life cycle?

D6: To what extent should the Transfer Policy be updated to reflect domain name relationships due to variants and the “same entity” requirement?

D7: If one domain label is suspended, either voluntarily or involuntarily, should all the variant labels related to that domain be suspended?

Preliminary Agreement:

1. The **source domain** must be identified between the registrant and the sponsoring registrar for calculating the variant domain set and determining the variant domains that are allocatable or blocked in accordance with the harmonized IDN Tables for a given gTLD and its variant gTLDs, if applicable
 - a. This requirement does not apply to the grandfathered variant domains
2. The **same entity requirement** must be adhered to in all stages of the domain name lifecycle. This means that each allocatable domain from a variant domain set is allowed to have a domain name lifecycle, which is independent to that of another allocatable domain from that variant domain set, so long as they are registered to the same registrant under the same sponsoring registrar or withheld for possible allocation to that registrant under the same sponsoring registrar
3. In the event an **inter-registrar transfer** process is initiated, either voluntarily or involuntarily, for a domain which belongs to a variant domain set, the process must encompass all of its variant domains, if any, at the same time

Glossary Terms

Potential Terms to Explain

- Canonical
- Code Point
- Harmonization
- IDN Table
- Inter-registrar Transfer
- Same entity
- Source Domain
- Registrant
- Variant Domain Set

Discuss Variant Label Behavior in Domain Name Lifecycle

C4a

Related to SubPro Rec 25.8

C4a) The SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that the set of allocatable or activated second-level variant labels may not be identical across the activated IDN variant TLDs. Meaning, their behavior/disposition can be different. Under the conditions above, may the set of allocatable or activated second-level variant labels not behave identically under an individual TLD, which does not have any variant TLD label?

C4a Context

What does SubPro Rec 25.8 say?

- Second-level labels derived from Rec 25.6 or Rec 25.7 are not required to act, behave, or be perceived as identical.
- Essentially it means the usage of the second-level labels is not required to be the same.

What are the second-level labels derived from Rec 25.6 and Rec 25.7?

- A given second-level label under any allocated variant TLD
 - Example: s1.t1, s1.t1v1, s1.t1v2...
- Second-level variant labels that arise from a registration based on a second-level IDN table under all allocated variant TLD labels
 - Example: s1.t1, s1.t1v1, s1v1.t1, s1v1.t1v1...

What is the rationale for SubPro Rec 25.8?

- Ensuring that second-level domains behave the same has not been found to be technically feasible in the DNS
- Practical reasons for second-level variants to not be the same (e.g., Simplified and Traditional Chinese second-level variants could have the content on the respective web pages available in Simplified or Traditional Chinese, consistent with the DNS label)

What is C4a asking?

Should second-level variant labels under a single TLD that doesn't have top-level variant labels behave the same?

- Example: s1.t1, s1v1.t1, s1v2.t1...

C4a Discussion Questions

Question 1: Does SubPro Rec 25.8 already cover the scenario where a single TLD does not have variant labels, but has second-level variant labels registered under it?

Question 2: If so, does the EPDP Team agree to affirm the SubPro Rec 25.8 that the second-level variant labels under a single TLD are not required to have the same usage?