Recommendation #	Relevant AGB Topic Section	Full Recommendation Text	Incorported into AGB Section?	Notes
1.1	IDNs	The RZ-LGR must be the sole source to calculate the variant labels and disposition values for all existing gTLDs.	Yes	
2.1	IDNs	Any allocatable variant label of an existing gTLD, as calculated by the RZ-LGR, can only be allocated to the same registry operator or withheld for possible allocation only to that registry operator.	Yes	
3.1	IDNs	An application for an allocatable variant label cannot precede an application for that variant label's primary gTLD string.	Yes	
3.10	Application Fees	The fee structure associated with future applications that include variant label(s), and variant label applications from registry operators of existing gTLDs , must be consistent with the principle of cost recovery reflected in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and affirmed by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP.	No	Related to fees (though board adopted)
3.11	Application Fees	A future applicant applying for a primary gTLD string and up to four (4) of that string's allocatable variant labels during an application round must incur the same base application fee as any other gTLD applicant who does not apply for variant labels in that round.	TBD	Board yet to adopt
3.12	Application Fees	Any applicant applying for more than four (4) allocatable variant labels of a primary gTLD string in an application round may incur additional fees that ICANN org considers to be proportionate to any additional costs associa	TBD	Board yet to adopt
3.13	Application Fees	A future registry operator applying only for allocatable variant label(s) of its delegated primary gTLD must incur a discounted base application fee. ICANN org will decide on the discount based on what it considers to be proportionate to any costs associated with evaluating the application and consistent with the cost recovery principle.	TBD	Board yet to adopt
3.14	Application Fees	If a registry operator from the 2012 round applies for up to four (4) allocatable variant labels of its existing IDN gTLD: 3.14.1 in the immediate next application round, the base application fee will be waived for that application as a one-time exception; or 3.14.2 in any application round subsequent to the immediate next application round, that application must incur a discounted base application fee as set out in Final Recommendation 3.13. If a registry operator from the 2012 round applies for more than four (4) allocatable variant labels of its existing IDN gTLD: 3.14.3 in the immediate next application round, that application may incur additional fees as set out in Final Recommendation 3.12; or 3.14.4 in any application round subsequent to the immediate next application round, that application must incur a discounted base application fee as set out in Final Recommendation 3.13 AND may incur additional fees as set out in Final Recommendation 3.12.	TBD	Board yet to adopt

3.15	IDNs Application Queuing / Prioritization	As a one-time exception for the immediate next application round, applications for allocatable variant labels of existing IDN gTLDs from the 2012 round must receive priority in processing order ahead of all other new gTLD applicants, including the IDN applicants that elect to participate in the prioritization draw.	Yes	
3.16	IDNs Different TLD Types Geographic Names Community Priority Evaluation (CPE)	An applied-for allocatable variant label must be subject to the same application requirements and evaluation criteria as the associated primary gTLD string. Specifically, the same documentation requirements apply to both the primary gTLD string and its applied-for allocatable variant label(s). With respect to the three non-standard application types of gTLDs as identified by the SubPro PDP, this means that: 3.16.1 An applicant for a Community-based TLD string and its allocatable variant label(s) is required to submit a written endorsement of its applied-for primary gTLD string and applied-for allocatable variant label(s) from established institution(s) representing the community that the applicant has named.80 3.16.2 An applicant for a Geographic Name TLD string and its allocatable variant label(s) is required to submit documentation of support or non-objection to its applied-for primary gTLD string and applied-for allocatable variant label(s) from relevant governments or public authorities. 3.16.3 An applicant for a .Brand TLD string and its allocatable variant label(s) is required to submit proof that its applied-for primary gTLD string and applied-for allocatable variant label(s) are identical to registered trademarks owned and used by the registry operator or its affiliate.	Only in IDNs section so far	
3.17	IDNs	The EPDP Team affirmed the Recommendation 25.4 in the SubPro PDP Final Report that single-character gTLDs may only be allowed for limited scripts and languages where a character is an ideograph. At the time of the EPDP Team's deliberations, the only script that meets the criteria is the Han script, which is used in the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean languages. Nevertheless, applications for single-character gTLDs that are ideographs must not be accepted until relevant guidelines from the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Generation Panels are developed, finalized after Public Comment, and implemented in the New gTLD Program. In the event that the Generation Panels determine such additional guidelines beyond the analysis already provided in the RZ-LGR unnecessary, applications for single-character gTLDs in the Han script shall be accepted.	Yes	
3.18	IDNs Reserved Names	The New gTLD Program Reserved Names list must not be expanded to include variant labels.	Only in IDNs section so far	
3.19	IDNs Reserved Names	No application for a variant label of a New gTLD Program Reserved Name is allowed.	Only in IDNs section so far	
3.2	IDNs Applications assessed in Rounds	A future registry operator who wishes to apply for an allocatable variant label of its existing gTLD must submit an application during an application round.	Only in IDNs section so far	

3.20	IDNs Reserved Names	The list of Strings Ineligible for Delegation must not be expanded to include variant labels.	Yes		"String Ineligible for Delegation" list does not exist anymore.
3.21	IDNs Reserved Names	Only the protected organizations on the list of Strings Ineligible for Delegation are allowed to apply for the allocatable variant label(s) of their protected string(s) at the top-level. Consistent with Final Recommendation 3.1, an application for an allocatable variant label of a protected string cannot precede an application for the protected string, which serves as the primary label for generating the variant label.	Yes		"String Ineligible for Delegation" list does not exist anymore.
3.22	IDNs Limited Challenge/Appeals	Only an applied-for gTLD string that conforms to the mandatory string requirements, including IDNA 2008 for IDN strings, as well as the RZ-LGR, can be submitted through the new gTLD application submission system. Where the initial algorithmic check deems an applied-for gTLD string as "invalid" or "blocked" (where the applied-for string is a variant label), such application for a non-conforming string may be accepted but the applicant must be warned of its potential disqualification. If the DNS Stability Panel (DSP) subsequently confirms the applied-for string as "invalid" or "blocked" per the RZ-LGR and disqualifies the application for the non-conforming string, the applicant may invoke a limited challenge mechanism for DNS Stability Review to seek a reassessment of the disqualification. However, the applicant's ground to challenge is limited to a belief that its applied-for gTLD string is valid and allocatable as per the RZ-LGR and that the disqualification by the DSP was due to an incorrect assessment of the technical implementation of the RZ-LGR.	Only in IDNs section so far		
3.24	IDNs Limited Challenge/Appeals	An applied-for gTLD string that has been accepted through the new gTLD submission system and correctly assessed by the DNS Stability Panel as "invalid" or "blocked" (where the applied-for string is a variant label) is disqualified unless and until such a string is deemed valid and allocatable in a future version of the RZ-LGR, if any.	Only in IDNs section so far		
3.25	IDNs Application Change Requests	After submission of an application, the applicant is allowed to withdraw an applied-for variant label from that application, but is not allowed to add any other variant label that was not originally applied-for in that application. Only an applicant for a .Brand TLD string whose applied-for primary gTLD string is placed in a contention set is allowed to change its applied-for primary string and allocatable variant label(s) under the condition set out in SubPro PDP Recommendation 20.8.	Only in IDNs section so far		
3.3	Applications assessed in Rounds	Applications for allocatable variant labels of existing gTLDs can be submitted during the immediate next application round of the New gTLD Program and any subsequent rounds.	No		
3.4	IDNs Applications assessed in Rounds	A future applicant applying for a primary gTLD string together with its allocatable variant label(s) in the same round is required to submit one application for the primary gTLD string and the variant label(s).	Only in IDNs section so far		

3.5	IDNs	In addition to explaining the mission and purpose of the applied for primary gTLD string or existing gTLD, the applicant seeking one or more gTLD variant labels will describe the justification of such need. The justification given by the applicant shall at minimum provide the following information: 3.5.1 The meaning or intended meaning (for non-dictionary words) of each of the applied-for variant label(s), including sources; 3.5.2 Explanation of how the primary and variant labels are considered the same; 3.5.3 Explain the benefits and the user communities who will benefit from the introduction of the applied-for variant label(s); and 3.5.4 A description of the steps that the applicant will take to minimize the operational and management complexities of variant gTLDs and variant domain names that impact registrars, resellers and/or registrants.	Yes	
3.7	IDNs Applicant Reviews RSP	A future applicant must be required to demonstrate its ability to manage the applied-for primary gTLD string and applied-for allocatable variant label(s) from both a technical and operational perspective. The same requirement applies to registry operators who wish to apply for allocatable variant label(s) of their existing gTLDs.	Yes	

		String Similarity	The String Similarity Review must be modified to compare an applied-for primary gTLD string (no matter whether it is an ASCII string or an IDN string) and all of its allocatable variant label(s) against the following: 4.1.1 Existing gTLDs and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels; and 4.1.2 Existing ccTLDs and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels; and 4.1.3 Strings requested as IDN ccTLDs and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels; and 4.1.4 Other applied-for gTLD strings and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels; and 4.1.5 All strings on the New gTLD Program Reserved Names list and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels;106 and 4.1.6 Any other two-character ASCII strings and all of their allocatable and blocked variant labels. In addition, the blocked variant label(s) of an applied-for primary gTLD string must also be compared against the following: 4.1.7 Existing gTLDs and all of their allocatable variant labels; and 4.1.8 Existing ccTLDs and all of their allocatable variant labels; and 4.1.9 Strings requested as IDN ccTLDs and all of their allocatable variant labels; and 4.1.10 Other applied-for gTLD strings and all of their allocatable variant labels; and 4.1.11 All strings on the New gTLD Program Reserved Names list and all of their allocatable variant labels; and 4.1.12 Any other two-character ASCII strings and all of their		
4.1			allocatable variant labels.	Yes	
4.2		String Similarity	As an exception to the proposed modification to the String Similarity Review in accordance with Final Recommendation 4.1, the String Similarity Review Panel may decide whether and what blocked variant labels to omit when conducting a comparison. Any such decision by the String Similarity Review Panel must be based on guidelines and/or criteria that justify such an omission on the basis of a manifestly low level of confusability between the scripts of labels being compared.	Yes	
4.3		String Similarity	During implementation, the guidelines and/or criteria must be developed for use by the String Similarity Review Panel to decide on the omission of blocked variant labels when conducting a comparison.	Yes	

| | | String Similarity | All labels from a variant label set, comprising the primary gTLD string and all of its allocatable and blocked variant labels, must share the same outcome out of the String Similarity Review. This means the String Similarity Review, in accordance with Final Recommendations 4.1-4.3, determines that:

4.4.1 If an applied-for primary gTLD string or any of its variant label(s) is confusingly similar to an existing gTLD, an existing ccTLD, a New gTLD Program Reserved Name, a two-character ASCII string, or any of the variant label(s) of the aforementioned categories of strings, the entire variant label set of the applied-for primary gTLD string will be ineligible to proceed in the application process; or
4.4.2 If an applied-for primary gTLD string or any of its variant label(s) is confusingly similar to another applied-for primary gTLD string or any of its variant label(s), the entire variant label sets of the two applied-for primary gTLD strings will be placed in a contention set. Upon the resolution of the contention set, the application that prevails can proceed to the next stage of the application process.
4.4.3 If an applied-for primary gTLD string or any of its variant label(s) is confusingly similar to a requested primary IDN ccTLD string or any of its variant label(s), ICANN org is expected to take the following approach to resolve the conflict:
4.4.3.1 If one of the applied-for primary TLD strings has completed its respective process before the other is lodged, that primary TLD string (and its approved variant label(s), if applicable) will be delegated.
4.4.3.1.1 An applied-for primary gTLD string that has successfully completed all relevant evaluation stages, including dispute resolution and string contention, if applicable, and is eligible for entry into a registry agreement will be considered complete, and therefore that gTLD application (primary gTLD string and applied-for variant label(s), if applicable) would not be disqualified by a newly-filed IDN ccTLD request.
4.4.3.1.2 A requested primary IDN ccTLD that is validated will be considered complete and therefore that IDN ccTLD request (primary IDN ccTLD string and requested variant label(s), if applicable) would not be disqualified by a newly-filed gTLD application.
4.4.3.2 In the case where neither application has completed its respective process, the gTLD application (including the applied-for variant label(s), if applicable) will be put on hold while the IDN ccTLD request (including the requested variant label(s), if applicable) is undergoing evaluation.
4.4.3.2.1 Where the gTLD application (including the applied-for variant label(s), if applicable) does not have the support or non-objection, when required, from the relevant government or public authority, the validated IDN ccTLD request (including the requested variant label(s), if applicable) will prevail and the gTLD application is not eligible to proceed in the application process.
4.4.3.2.2 Where the IDN ccTLD request (including the requested variant label(s), if applicable) is withdrawn or fails evaluation, the gTLD application (including the applied-for variant label(s), if applicable) is eligible to proceed in the application process.
4.4.3.3 In the case where the gTLD application (including the applied-for variant label(s), if applicable) has obtained the support or non-objection of the relevant government or public authority, but is ineligible to proceed due to conflict | | |

5.1	Objections	All applied-for allocatable gTLD variant labels must be subject to the objection processes.	Yes	
5.2	Objections	A String Confusion Objection may be filed based on confusing similarity between combinations of applied-for primary gTLD strings and their variant labels established by Final Recommendations 4.1-4.2. The possible combinations are as follows: 5.2.1 Applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to the primary string of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.2 Applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to an allocatable variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.3 Applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to a blocked variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.4 An allocatable variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to the primary string of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.5 An allocatable variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to an allocatable variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.6 An allocatable variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to a blocked variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.7 A blocked variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to the primary string of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string 5.2.8 A blocked variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string is confusingly similar to an allocatable variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another applied-for primary gTLD string The only combination of strings that cannot form the basis of a String Confusion Objection is that of a blocked variant label of an applied-for primary gTLD string being claimed as confusingly similar to the blocked variant label of an existing gTLD/ccTLD or another appliedfor primary gTLD string. In its objection, the objector must specify the confusing similarity between the combination of strings within the limits of String Similarity Review in accordance with Final Recommendations 4.1-4.2.	Yes	

5.3	Objections	The outcomes of the String Confusion Objection are consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Specifically: 5.3.1 If the objection prevails and where the objector is an existing TLD registry operator, then that entire application is ineligible to proceed to the next stage of the application process; or 5.3.2 If the objection prevails and where the objector is another applicant, then the entire variant label sets in both that application and the objector's application must be placed in a contention set. 5.3.3 If the objection does not prevail, then that entire application may proceed to the next stage of the application process.	Yes	
5.4	Objections	With respect to the Limited Public Interest Objection, Legal Rights Objection, and Community Objection, an objection may be filed against only the applied-for primary gTLD strings and/or the applied-for allocatable variant labels. For avoidance of doubt, the objection cannot be filed against non-applied-for allocatable variant labels or blocked variant labels. Specifically, the objection can be filed against one of the following options: 5.4.1 Only the applied-for primary gTLD string, or 5.4.2 One or more of the applied-for allocatable variant label(s), or 5.4.3 A combination of the applied-for primary gTLD string and one or more applied for allocatable variant label(s)	Yes	
5.5	Objections	With respect to the Limited Public Interest Objection, Legal Rights Objection, and Community Objection, the possible outcomes are as follows: 5.5.1 If an objection against an applied-for primary gTLD string prevails, then that entire application is ineligible to proceed to the next stage of the application process. 5.5.2 If an objection against only one or more applied-for allocatable variant label(s) prevails, then that application for the applied-for primary gTLD string and other unaffected applied-for allocatable variant label(s) may proceed to the next stage of the application process without the applied-for allocatable variant label(s) which are rendered ineligible by the objection. 5.5.3 If the objection does not prevail, then that entire application may proceed to the next stage of the application process.	Yes	
6.1	String Similarity	An applied-for primary gTLD string that is also a variant label of another applied-for primary gTLD string, as calculated by the RZ-LGR, must be placed in a contention set.	Yes	
6.2	String Similarity	If an applied-for primary gTLD string or its variant label is found to be confusingly similar to another applied-for primary gTLD string or its variant label, the entire variant label sets in the affected applications shall be placed in a contention set together. This applies no matter whether the primary gTLD string is an ASCII string or an IDN string.	Yes	

7.1	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	Any future gTLD along with its variant labels (if any) must be subject to one Registry Agreement with each variant label having the same service level agreements (SLAs) and other operational requirements.	Yes	
7.10	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	Emergency transition of a gTLD to an EBERO provider must include the allocated and delegated variant label(s) of that gTLD, if any. All these labels must be transitioned to the same EBERO provider at the same time.	Yes	
7.11	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	In the event a gTLD is reassigned as a result of a TM-PDDRP determination, that reassignment must include all allocated and delegated variant label(s) of the gTLD, if any, at the same time.	Yes	
7.12	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	The same data escrow provider must be contracted for the gTLD and its allocated and delegated variant label(s).	Yes	
7.14	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	The applied-for primary gTLD string and any allocatable variant label sought by the applicant must be bound by the same restrictions, which will become contractual requirements upon execution of the Registry Agreement. Similarly, any allocatable variant label sought by an existing registry operator will be bound by the same restrictions as the existing gTLD upon execution of the new Specification to its existing Registry Agreement for the newly approved variant label(s). The restrictions in this recommendation refer to the differential treatment and requirements applied to non-standard types of gTLDs, which are Community-based TLDs, Brand TLDs, Geographic Name TLDs, as well as TLDs subject to Category 1 Safeguards.	Yes	
7.3	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	Any existing registry operator that is successful in its future application for its variant label(s) must be required to adopt contractual terms to accommodate the newly approved variant label(s) by way of a new Specification to its existing Registry Agreement.	No	Currently analyzing
7.4	Application Fees	The registry fixed fee for a gTLD registry operator that operates the delegated gTLD label(s) from a variant label set must be the same as a gTLD registry operator of a single gTLD.	TBD	Board yet to adopt
7.5	Application Fees	The calculation of the registry-level transaction fee must be based on the cumulative number of domain name registrations of the combined delegated gTLD label(s) from a variant label set.	TBD	Board yet to adopt
7.6	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	The registry service provider for each one of the Critical Functions as defined in the Base Registry Agreement for an existing gTLD must be the same as for its delegated variant labels. The Critical Functions are: DNS Service, DNSSEC proper resolution, EPP, RDDS, and Data Escrow.	Yes	
7.7	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts	If the registry operator changes its gTLD's registry service provider for any one of the Critical Functions, the variant label(s) of that gTLD must simultaneously transition to the same registry service provider for that Critical Function.	Yes	
7.8	Base Registry Agreement/Contracts Contractual Compliance	In the event a Registry Transition or Change of Control process is initiated for a gTLD, the process must encompass the gTLD and all its allocated and delegated variant label(s), if any, at the same time.	Yes	

7.9		Base Registry Agreement/Contracts Contractual Compliance	After the Registry Transition Process or Change of Control process is completed for a gTLD and its allocated and delegated variant label(s), the successor registry operator can apply for the other non-delegated, allocatable variant label(s) of that gTLD in accordance with the "same entity" principle pursuant to Final Recommendation 2.1.	No	Currently analyzing
8.1		Base Registry Agreement/Contracts Contractual Compliance	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 toplevel variant labels conservative.	No	Currently analyzing
8.10		Contractual Compliance Delegation Process	A primary gTLD that is removed from the root zone, either voluntarily or involuntarily, must also require the removal of its delegated variant label(s) from the root zone.	Yes	
8.11		Contractual Compliance Delegation Process	A delegated variant label that is voluntarily removed from the root zone will not require the removal of the associated primary gTLD or its other delegated variant label(s).	Yes	
8.13		Contractual Compliance Delegation Process	In the event that a gTLD is removed from the root zone as a consequence of its registry operator's breach of the Registry Agreement, the rest of its variant label set, if any, must also be removed from the root zone.	Yes	
8.2		N/A	In order to encourage a positive and predictable registrant experience, ICANN org must, during implementation, create a framework for developing nonbinding guidelines for the management of gTLDs and their variant labels at the top-level by registries and registrars.	NA	Not related to AGB Topics
8.4		Terms & Conditions Delegation Process	Applicants for a primary gTLD string and its applied-for allocatable variant label(s) that pass evaluation must be subject to the terms and conditions, as recommended by the SubPro PDP, in respect of the timeframe for delegation, including the ability to apply for an extension of time for delegation.	Yes	Only in Base RA currently
8.5		Delegation Process	The sequence for delegating the applied-for primary gTLD string and the applied-for allocatable variant label(s) that pass evaluation should be determined by the registry operator.	No	Currently analyzing
8.6		Delegation Process	Any delegated gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels (if any) not validated by a proposed RZ-LGR update must be grandfathered. In other words, the proposed update will apply to future new gTLDs and their variant labels and will not be retroactive; there will be no change to the contractual and delegation state of the delegated gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels (if any), which predate the proposed RZ-LGR update and are subject to the version of RZ-LGR when those gTLDs and variant labels were initially applied for upon the finalization of the application process.	No	Currently analyzing

8.7	Delegation Process	For all future versions of the RZ-LGR, Generation Panels (GPs) and the Integration Panel (IP) should follow the stability principle in the LGR Procedure and make best efforts to retain full backward compatibility with delegated gTLDs and their delegated and allocated variant labels (if any).The LGR Procedure must be updated to specify the exceptional circumstances, to the extent known to the GPs and IP, that could result in a proposed update to the RZ-LGR not being able to retain full backward compatibility.	No	Currently analyzing
8.8	Delegation Process	In the unexpected event where a proposed update to the RZ-LGR is unable to retain full backward compatibility for validating any delegated gTLDs as well as their delegated and allocated variant labels (if any), the relevant GP must call out the exception during a Public Comment period and explain the reasons for such exception. The Public Comment period should also include the elements in the following Implementation Guidance.	No	Currently analyzing
9.1	IDNs	A given variant label must have one of the following label states at any one time: delegated, allocated, withheld-same-entity, blocked, or rejected.If the same terminology is used for certain label states and new gTLD application states, their respective definitions must be consistent.	NA	Not related to AGB Topics
9.3	IDNs	A variant label may go through the following transitions: 1. from "blocked" to "withheld-same-entity"; 2. from "withheld-same-entity" to "blocked"; 3. from "rejected" to "withheld-same-entity". 4. from "withheld-same-entity" to "allocated"; 5. from "allocated" to "withheld-same-entity"; 6. from "allocated" to "delegated"; and 7. from "delegated" to "allocated" See below (tab "Notes")a visualization of the label state transitions.	NA	Not related to AGB Topics