

# APRALO Statement on EPDP on IDNs Phase 1 Report

Kick-off Meeting

# Overview

1. Background to Phase 1
2. Current status:
3. Report Structure, Recommendations and their End-user Impact
4. Open Issues
5. How to contribute to the Statement
6. How should we submit the APF Statement (to the ICANN Board, CPWG or both)?
7. Q & A

# Background

- EPDP's primary objective is to create policy for activating IDN Variants, which is an important feature for several script communities
- Some communities have been waiting for over 12 years for such policy
- The EPDP was based on a charter which listed a mix of Charter Questions on the top-level variant labels as well as second-level variant domain names
- The EPDP Team first sorted questions into Phase 1 (top-level variant labels) and Phase 2 (second-level domain names)
- This was done in order to finish Phase 1 in view of the new round of gTLDs

# Current Status

- The Phase 1 preliminary report was published for public comments during 24 April to 19 June 2023
- The comments received was discussed and language changes made to arrive at the Phase 1 Final Report
- The EPDP team achieved “full consensus” on all 69 recommendations
  - Which means that the ALAC Team on the EPDP on IDNs also supported them
- Subsequently it was approved by GNSO Council and was sent to the Board
- The Board routinely puts out documents that reach it for public comments before it decided on it
  - It is not very likely that there will be significant comments on the Phase I report at this stage

# Structure of the report

1. Executive Summary
2. EPDP Team Approach
3. Glossary
4. Phase 1 Final Recommendations
5. Differences between EPDP on IDNs and ccPDP4 recommendations
6. Next Steps
7. Annexures

In the final report, the Charter Questions are not in their original order because they have been rearranged more logically by the EPDP Team.

# The Four Principles

- RZ-LGR as the Sole Source: The RZ-LGR will be the sole source to determine valid top-level domain labels, their variant labels, and disposition values of the variant labels
- Same Entity: At the top-level of the DNS, the same registry operator must manage the approved labels from the variant label set of a primary gTLD from the application, legal, and operational standpoints
- Integrity of the Set: The relationship between a primary label and its allocatable and blocked variant labels shall not be infringed upon as long as the primary label exists
- Conservatism: Adopt a more cautious approach in the gTLD policy development as a way to limit any potential security and stability risks associated with the variant label delegation

# Recommendations (and end-user impact)

4.1 RZ-LGR as the sole source (High)

4.2 Same Entity Principle (High)

4.3 Application Submission, Administrative Check, Initial Evaluation (Low)

4.4 String Similarity Review (Low)

4.5 Objection Processes (Low)

4.6 String Contention (Low)

4.7 Contractual Requirements (Medium)

4.8 Delegation And Removal (Medium)

4.9 Variant Label States (Low)

4.10 Charter Questions With No Recommendations (Low)

# Open Issues

- In general, all the recommendations have received full consensus after the public comments were considered
- There was an unresolved issue that was submitted through the public comment process, although only indirectly connected with the EPDP on IDNs: the issue of .quebéc
- There are probably other such cases, which points to a structural flaw in the process of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR)
- One of the most important “principles” that the EPDP team established was that of the the RZ-LGR. However, there appears to be insufficient community review of the output of Generation Panels
- We also received comments from the CCWP-HR pointing to potential insufficiencies from a Human Rights perspective



# Comment from CCWP-Human Rights

We note that there are various Recommendations (Preliminary Recommendation 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.12, and 7.13) which discuss Registry Transition or Change of Control process and therefore bear implications for the right to privacy.

Unfortunately, none of these recommendations are worded in accordance with internationally-recognised data protection principles. For example, Preliminary Recommendation 7.8 states, “If the registry operator of an IDN gTLD changes its back-end registry service provider, that IDN gTLD and any delegated variant label(s) associated with that IDN gTLD must simultaneously transition to the new back-end registry service provider.” This formulation creates the risk that personal data is retained in the old registry following the transition, increasing the exposure of registrants to the potential for breaches or misuse.

We therefore urge ICANN to redraft these recommendations in full accordance with applicable data protection principles, including purpose use limitation, data retention limitation, data destruction, and secure data transfer.

# EPDP's position

- After discussions, the EPDP team took the position that this comment was outside the scope of the EPDP's charter
- While the ALAC members agreed with this position, APF can take a different position if enough of us feel that the basic point is valid and needs to be highlighted from an end-user perspective

# Upper limit for the number of variants?

- On the CQ A5, there was considerable discussion on whether there was a need to fix a ceiling for the number of variants. Two points of view emerged:
  - There is no need for a ceiling. The applicant can take a decision on the number based on the script community requirements, market demand, and the costs
  - There should be a ceiling. Too many variants could not only potentially de-stabilize the DNS, but also cause end-user confusion (the principle of conservatism, which was derived from concerns expressed by SSAC)
- After discussions, it was decided not to impose a ceiling:
  - Any ceiling would be arbitrary
  - All 7 scripts that have allocatable variants, with the exception of Arabic, already had limited the number of possible variants
- Primary + up to 4 variants are to be covered under the base application fee
- ICANN org must, during implementation, create a framework for developing **non-binding** guidelines for the management of gTLDs and their variant labels at the top-level by registries and registrars.

# The next steps (tentative)

- Any APF member or group of members can add comments to the document over the next weeks (until 20 Feb 2024)
- The APF pen holder will close the document after edits (21 Feb 2024)
- We need to decide on how to make the final submission. The options appear to be:
  - Directly submit to ICANN Board in response to the call for comments (12 March 2024)
  - Submit the APRALO statement to CPWG. The CPWG may or may not agree the concerns expressed by the statements are valid (21 Feb 2024)
  - Do both

Thank you!!

Questions?