SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #14 1500 UTC 20 July 2017

Agenda

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks
2. SOI updates
3. WT4 CC2 comments
4. Road ahead for WT4
5. AOB

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks
2. SOI updates

3. WT4 CC2 comments

CC2 comments summary (4.1)

IDNs: Security and stability review (further revised after ICANN 59)

- Security and stability review role was not clearly defined in AGB; most of it was testing of IDN rendering. It didn't include name collisions.
- No Root Zone LGRs available at 2012-round
- IDN compliance can be only partially verified by algorithms in the submission system
- Possible language:

  "Compliance with IDNA 2008 (RFCs 5890-5895) or its successor and applicable Root Zone LGRs (Label Generation Rules) (RZ-LGR-n) should be verified algorithmically as valid or invalid by the submission system to the maximum extent feasible, leaving manual invalidation as a last resort mechanism."

IDNs: 1-char IDN TLDs (revised after WT4 , SSAC, ICANN Org and CC2 comments)

- Possible Language:

  “1-Unicode char gTLDs will be allowed for script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram), provided they are not country and/or territory names and do not introduce confusion risks that rise above commonplace similarities, consistent with SSAC and JIG* reports.”

  *Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Workgroup

  (https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/jig-final-report-30mar11-en.pdf)

  (https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf)

- Coordination with ccNSO and GAC consultations were found appropriate, with harmonization a worthy goal (although not a requirement)

IDN Variant TLDs (further revised after ICANN 59)

- Previously seen as conflicting with Rec. 2:

  "Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain."

- 3 possible implementation solutions identified; WT4 converged on not prescribing a specific one at this point. Leaving it to the implementation or to applicant also not yet defined. What's the WT sentiment on this ?
- Possible Language:

  "IDN gTLDs deemed to be variants of already existing or applied for TLDs will be allowed provided: (1) they have the same registry operator implementing, by force of agreement, a policy of cross-Variant TLD bundling and (2) Root Zone LGRs already included that script/language at evaluation time."

CC2 comments summary (4.2)

Universal Acceptance

- Assumed policy scope to mean to encourage adoption by removing barriers to usage, not in a marketing sense
- Principle B: “Some new generic top-level domains should be internationalised domain names (IDNs) subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root.”
- WT4 and CC2 comments usually satisfied with UASG efforts, some suggestions to raise awareness of their efforts
- Different from 2007, IDN TLDs (ccTLDs and gTLDS) are already in the root
- Possible language: “Some new generic top-level domains should be internationalised domain names (IDNs), although applicants should be made aware of universal acceptance challenges in ASCII and IDN TLDs. (https://uasg.tech)”
-

4. Road ahead for WT4

Where we are: tentative consensus reached

- Need to further refine and confirm language
- Two of them discussed in this call:
  - IDNs
  - UA
- Other items include
  - Timing of technical capability being required
  - Technical evaluation to be performed in aggregation
  - Financial evaluation to be performed in aggregation
  - Name collisions
    - Subject to possible new feedback from technical community outreach

Where we want to be: still to be discussed

- New or further discussion required
  - Name collisions in legacy gTLDs
  - Name collisions 2-year readiness for both 2012-round gTLDs and SubPro
    - Depends on ICANN Org response on the 2012-round collisions
  - Root zone scaling
    - Outreach to SSAC, RSSAC and OCTO upcoming

Still ahead for WT4

- Technical evaluation questions
  - Waiting for ICANN Org response on content of CQs, but usually deemed OK (except for Q30 - Security Policy - and Q32 - Scalable and HA Architecture)
  - Waiting for ICANN Org response on SLA Failures (asked for suggestions that would later reduce them)
- Financial evaluation questions
  - Although also waiting for ICANN Org response on CQs, generally already deemed as requiring strong improvements or full rewrite
  - Current idea is to have a straw-person to jumpstart WT4 discussion
- Discussing of CQ report, ICANN Org's own summary, public comments and CC2 on evaluation questions


5. AOB