

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

Phase 1 Initial Report Public Comments Part 2

Satish Babu
Abdulkarim Oloyede

Hadia Elminiawi
Justine Chew

13 September 2023



Agenda

- Among comments received from Public Comment proceedings for EPDP on IDNs' Phase 1 Initial Report on TL Variant Management
 - .quebec & .québec
 - Conservatism Principle – reconsidered and actioned

.quebec & .québec

- ⦿ Subject of 4 public comments filed for Phase 1 Initial Report

- ⦿ The Issue
 - Board-approved SubPro Rec 25.2 says future gTLDs and their variant labels to be generated per RZ-LGR, including disposition values
 - IDNs EPDP PR 1.1 recommends this be extended to existing delegated gTLDs , i.e. RZ-LGR be the sole source to establish variant labels of existing delegated gTLDs
 - Based on integration of the Latin Script RZ-LGR v5 into the RZ-LGR "quebec" and "québec" aren't considered as variant labels
 - Despite "quebec" and "québec" being used interchangeably, internationally
 - **However, this situation is NOT unique to Quebec.**

- ⦿ **Out of scope for this EPDP based on Charter**
 - Because EPDP only deals with management of variant labels
 - Likely confirmed by GNSO Council – possibly the subject of a new PDP after this EPDP concludes – GNSO Council to call for issues paper

Conservatism Principle – reconsidered & actioned (1/4)

- **Conservatism:** Adopt a more cautious approach in gTLD policy development as way to limit any potential security & stability risks associated with the variant label delegation.

- Yet, Rec 8.1 says No ceiling value to allocatable variant gTLDs

- How to balance between promoting variant gTLDs vs Conservatism?
 - In general, application for variant gTLD labels are evaluated 2 ways:
 - 1. Business/language need or usage of variants
 - 2. Technical and operational capability for managing variants

 - The ALAC Team had tried to intervene in both ways during development of Phase 1 Initial Report.

Conservatism Principle – reconsidered & actioned (2/4)

1. Business/language need or usage of variants

Initial Report Preliminary Rec 3.5

A future applicant who wants a primary gTLD string and allocatable variant label(s) ...and ...

An RO who wants allocatable variant label(s) for their existing gTLD...

... must explain why they seek those variant label(s)

VS

Draft Final Report Rec 3.5

In addition to explaining the mission and purpose of its applied-for gTLD string, a future applicant must explain why it wants the allocatable variant label(s) ... and ...

An RO who wants allocatable variant label(s) for their existing gTLD...

... must explain why they seek those variant label(s), including:

3.5.1 The meaning of the variant label(s) and how it is the same as the primary gTLD;

3.5.2 The language communities who will benefit from the introduction of the variant label(s);

3.5.3 The benefits of introducing the primary gTLD and/or the variant label(s) to registrants, Internet users and the online community at-large; and

3.5.4 How the applicant plans to mitigate the potential risk of confusability to end-users.

Conservatism Principle – reconsidered & actioned (2/4)

1. Business/language need or usage of variants

Initial Report IG 3.6

VS

Draft Final Report IG 3.6

Criteria for evaluating explanations (per PR 3.5) should be pre-identified and applied consistently by qualified evaluators

A panel of evaluators with **relevant language expertise** should **review the explanation submitted** by an applicant for its applied-for variant label(s) **using criteria based on a general standard of reasonableness**. In other words, the submitted explanation should be reasonably legitimate and should address or remedy concerns arising from the factors set out in Final Recommendation 3.5.

Additional criteria may be applicable provided they are pre-identified during implementation. Evaluators may also ask clarifying questions of the applicant on the submitted explanation where evaluators think it is necessary but are not obliged to take the clarification into account.

Consistent with SubPro Rec 27.2, this set of criteria shall be scored on a pass/fail scale (0-1 point only). Applicants will have been presumed to have carefully considered whether applied-for variant labels are necessary to achieve the stated mission and purpose of the primary gTLD and as such, applicants achieving a failing score (0 point) should be rare.

Any applied-for variant label which “fails” will not proceed to next stage of application process. Applied-for gTLD string / delegated gTLD is not affected.

Conservatism Principle – reconsidered & actioned (3/4)

2. Technical and operational capability for managing variants

Initial Report Rec 3.7

Both future gTLD applicants and existing ROs who want allocatable variant labels must demonstrate ability to manage primary and variant labels from technical and operational perspective

VS

Draft Final Report Rec 3.7

No substantive change

Initial Report IG 3.8

Evaluation (per PR 3.7) should be closely tied to overall technical capability evaluation with criteria including Critical Functions with respect to SL registrations

VS

Draft Final Report IG 3.8

No substantive change

Conservatism Principle – reconsidered & actioned (4/4)

2. Technical and operational capability for managing variants

Initial Report IG 3.9

ICANN org may do research to help identify additional standards or test for technical and operational capability evaluation (per PR 3.7)

VS

Draft Final Report IG 3.9

Within 15 mths of delegation for the first gTLD variant label and every 24 mths thereafter, ICANN org should conduct research in order to identify whether any additional criteria or tests should be used to evaluate the technical and operational capability of an applicant to manage a variant label set at the registry level.

ICANN org must provide the community an opportunity to provide input on the scope of the research to be undertaken, as well as any proposed outputs on additional criteria or tests

Such **outputs to not be applied retrospectively**.