

Overview Stress test

Version 1, 27 February 2023

Eligibility of Application

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy?
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	Policy is by definition only targeted at ICANN see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws). IDNccTLD requester has to meet conditions of policy. It is up to ICANN to decide whether membership of the ccNSO is relevant in individual cases.	Include in introduction scope of policy and reference to Issue Report

Deselection Criteria/ retirement related scenario's

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
1.	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		
2.	What if an IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD? Is retirement needed?	Section 1.3, section 2 and Section		No
3.	What if IDN ccTLD manager refuses to go through retirement process?	Retirement policy section 4.3, stress test iii Retirement policy, Section 4 Fol	Retirement Process continues when initiated, with or without cooperation of ccTLD Manager. Compliance by ccTLD Manager is not required. IFO may invoke Revocation	NO
4.	What if IDNccTLD Manager is no (longer) member of the ccNSO, do de-selection and retirement policy apply?	Stress testing Retirement policy, Annex C ICANN Bylaws	Policy is by definition only targeted at ICANN see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws). IDNccTLD requester has to meet conditions of policy. It is up to ICANN to decide whether membership of the ccNSO is relevant in individual cases.	No
5.	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.	Whether significant number under management or only a limited set, is not relevant. There is a need to avoid gaming the system. Rationale for Retirement process is to accommodate new ccTLDs per RFC 1591 and this policy.	No

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
			Communication to customers is part of the Retirement plan. In addition, the removal of ccTLD is a predictable and foreseeable process. There should be no surprises. Customers should know where their essential services are hosted.	
6.	What if the Country name as listed on standard is changed (ENG/FR)	Section 1.2.2	If the 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
7.	What if a selected IDN ccTLD string and all its variants are retired and someone else wants to register 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 sting is a meaningful representation of the name of Territory etc., then nothing withstands such a new request	No
8.	What if a ccTLD Manager wishes to retire one of their IDNs (due to natural reasons, such as removal of support of the script on the governmental level), but 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		
9.	What if two countries are merged, like Eastern and Western Germany, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	Principle I		
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		

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
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 Designated and reference to the related script	
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		
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		
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		
16.	'Merger' scenario - Western Germany (BRD, Bundes Republic Deutschland) has .DE. Eastern Germany (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 ?	Principle I	If the name of a Territory is removed from the ISO3166 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 .	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy

Variant and variant management scenarios

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
1.	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	If a selected IDNccTLD is not valid (for whatever reason) variants cannot be calculated anymore.	No
3.	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	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. The national consideration which community is to be served, and hence the registration policy is out of scope of this and other ccNSO PDPs	No
4.	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?	Section 3.2.1& section 3.2.3	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	No

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
			variant of the selected IDNccTLD A if all criteria are met. However, assuming asymmetry, and string B is the selected string and string A a non-allocatable variant of string B then by definition variant IDNccTLD string A is eligible.	
5.	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
6.	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.	
7.	The application of RZ-LGR makes the currently delegated ccTLDs become variant of each other. How will this play out?	Section 3.2.4,	To date (February 2023), IDNccTLD are selected and delegated without applying the RZ-LGR.	
8.	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,	

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
			however one could also argue to make it needs to be made explicit.	
9.	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 V , Section 3.2.3	The general principle is that criteria determine the number of IDNccTLD per territory, including the number of variants. According to section 3.2.3 only the delegatable variant IDNccTLD strings are eligible. Also to be revisited when discussing confusing similarity.	
10.	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?	Section 3.2.3 and Section 5.2	According to section 5.2 the String Validation stage is a set of procedures to ensure all criteria and requirements regarding the selected IDN ccTLD string have been met. Make explicit that validation also applies to request of delegatable variants of the selected IDNccTLD string?	
11.	What if Delegatable variant IDNccTLD string is delegated and Selected IDNccTLD is not delegated?	Section 3.2.3	See Notes and observations. 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.	
12.	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

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
				after the request for the selected IDNccTLD string has been submitted?
	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 when demonstrably threaten the stability and security of the DNS is demonstrably threatened and and deselection the only demonstrably measure to mitigate such a threat, an IDNccTLD should be deselected. However de-selection is the identification of the events that may result in a retirement of the IDNccTLD according to the retirement policy, which takes a least 5 years. 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.	No

Confusing Similarity Tests

Item #	Scenario	Relevant sections in document	Assessment	Adjust proposed policy
1.	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			
2.	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?			
3.	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?			