EPDP on IDNs: Phase 2

ALAC inputs and responses from the EPDP CPWG, 31 July 2024

ALAC inputs on Recommendations

- ALAC had supported all recommendations of the Phase 2 Preliminary Report
- We had flagged three minor language inconsistencies pertaining to Recommendation 6 and Implementation Guidance 7
  - These two have been merged as Rec 6 and the language made more consistent
- Expansion of ROID in the Glossary: Accepted

CQs with no recommendations: C3 and C3a

- Although the report mandates the "same-entity" principle at the second level, it doesn't mandate any method to uniquely identify the entity (ie., the registrant).
- ALAC recommended that there eventually should be a mechanism–ideally a universal mechanism–to uniquely identify a registrant, and to enhance interoperability
- Registries have agreed to discuss this and to implement a mechanism in future

C6

- C6 is about the format in which IDN tables are to be represented. There are three standards available presently:
    - Two legacy RFCs that cannot be machine-parsed
    - RFC 7940, which is the new, machine-processable standard
- ICANN Org supports all three, but the Staff Paper recommends RFC 7940
- The EPDP has not made any recommendations
- ALAC asked for a commitment to move to RFC 7940 at a future date
- The EPDP has agreed to include this point in the Rationale section of C6

D8

- CQ D8 asks if "...or reporting and fee purposes, whether the variant domain set should be treated as a single registration"
- GAC, BC and ALAC had all asked that the variant set should be treated as a single registration. GAC's emphasis was on the reduction of fees, whereas ALAC's comment related fees as well as the ease of operations such as registration, renewal and transfer
- However, there was significant pushback from Registries and Registrars, as the question of single or multiple (EPP-Create or EPP-Update) was best left to individual Ry/Rr based on their existing practices

PR14-IG15

- These refer to a new service that would help to discover the activated variant domain names (and source domain name) for a given variant. No such service exists now.
- There was also a discussion if RDDS should be expanded to include the variant domain name set
- ALAC's position was that there has to be an "official" way for an end-user to cross check if a particular domain name was a variant, and if so, of which source
- An ICANN Board member in the call supported this position, speaking from a Global Public Interest perspective

PR14-IG15

- NCSG expressed concerns from a privacy and Human Rights perspective if such a discovery service would link all the sites with a single registrant, and possibly provide clues to the Government
- ALAC pointed out that activating a particular variant domain is a matter of choice for the registrant, and that registrants should exercise caution while doing so. Besides, there was no need to publish any personal information
- Although Registries initially were reluctant for a public service, ultimately there was support for such a service. However, Registries did not want to create the service themselves
- ICANN Org was tasked with examining how this service could be created in the most efficient manner

Next steps

- By the end of this month, almost all the public comments received would be processed
- The Phase 2 final report is expected to be presented to the GNSO Council by Oct 2024, and to the Board if the Council approves it
- Meanwhile, the SubPro IRT Sub-Track IDN has commenced work, with the first meeting scheduled for 8 Aug 2024

Thank you