

2022-05-12 IDNs EPDP

The call for the IDNs EPDP team will take place on **Thursday, 12 May 2022 at 13:30 UTC for 90 minutes**.

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/37z7vymj>



PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Roll Call & SOI (2 minutes)
2. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 mins)
3. Continue discussion of charter question E2 (40 mins)
4. Introduction to charter question D2 (40 mins)
5. AOB (3 mins)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS



PARTICIPATION

Attendance

Apologies: Michael Bauland, Emily Barabas (staff), Donna Austin, Nigel Hickson



RECORDINGS

[Audio Recording](#)

[Zoom Recording](#)

[Chat Transcript](#)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)



Notes/ Action Items

Notes – IDNs EPDP Call – 12 May 2022

Welcome & Chair Updates

- For the String Similarity small group, reminder to complete Doodle poll so we can schedule the meeting soon.
- A7 Part 1, A9, A10 – please review. Deadline for input is 20 May.
- For outreach to CJK GPs for single character TLDs in Han, the Chinese and Japanese GPs have replied. Waiting on Korean GP so that replies can be consolidated and reviewed at once.
- Note that E2 will also necessarily include discussion of E1, part 2.

Continue discussion of charter question E2

- Slide 6 - Reminder of background/context on objections
- Slide 7 - Reminder of staff paper recommendations and discussion points
- Questions – Must all requested allocatable variant TLD labels be subject to the objection processes?
 - Note: preliminary conclusion for this EPDP Team is that there is a single application, with requested variants included.
- Should the allocatable variant labels NOT requested by applicants be subject to the objection process?
- Confirmed – the basis, ground, of objections are not to be touched. Only considering impact of variant labels (requested allocatable and not requested allocatable). This question seems similar to what is being discussed for String Sim (e.g., 3 levels). For the second question, it would seem to be the same answer as for String Sim, whatever that ends up being? Perhaps this should be added to the small team's remit.
- For question 1 – once a variant is delegated, it is treated as any other domain name in the DNS, from a technical perspective. As such, it seems that requested variants should be subject to the same rigor.
- Reminder – objections take place after Initial Eval (including String Sim).
- Some agreement at a principle level. A blocked variant could be identical to a string that a potential future applicant may be interested. This is an argument for allowing blocked variants to be included in objections.
- Depending upon which gTLD is applied for as the primary, it may impact whether the variants are allocatable or blocked. The following example was shared:

-- special HSBC

-- Traditional Chinese

-- Simplified Chinese

If an applicant applies for TC or SC, the special HSBC one would be blocked and not allocatable.

- As an example, if an applicant applied for the traditional Chinese version, if the blocked label is not also included for objection, HSBC may not be able to object to the special HSBC?
- Question about whether legal rights objection allows for non-exact match, to see if the blocked label could still be objected against, even if it is not an exact match.
- Suggestion to write up the example for consideration representative groups.

Action Item: Write up the example in a clear manner (Note: Edmon provided an example in the chat).

If Applied for: HSBC

IDN Variants: TC(allocatable) + SC(allocatable)

If Applied for: TC

IDN Variants: HSBC(blocked) + SC(allocatable)

If Applied for: SC

IDN Variants: HSBC(blocked) + (allocatable)

- Response to question about objections: when based on TM rights or for IGOs, identical or similar, to phonetic, appearance, sound, meaning, etc. See section 3.5.2 of the AGB. This is important to take into consideration in understanding implications.
- Will consider again whether the String Sim small team should further consider.
- Preliminary conclusion: question 1 is yes and question 2 requires more analysis, and possible inclusion with the small team's work.

Introduction to charter question D2

- Slide 9 – Overview of charter question. Note - Question has an implicit dependency on with D1a – preliminary conclusion for that question was that a primary label and variants should be subject to a single Registry Agreement.
- Slide 10 – Overview of Registry Transition Process, the various types, and how they can be triggered.
- Slide 11 – Overview of expectations for Type 1 & Type 2 Registry Transition Process.
- Question about whether D2 should also be applicable to allocatable (i.e., not assigned/delegated). If not delegated, there would be no contractual obligations and nothing to transition.
- Assumption is that after a change of control, the new RO would be the only party able to apply for non-delegated, allocatable variants. The same-entity principle would seem to apply. There may be some operational consideration whether a list is actually maintained.
- Question about EBERO – can the original operator maintain control? Answer provided in slides later – if the problems are resolved, then there is no change of control.
- EBERO process can be used for cases where a gTLD is purposefully removed from the root. A RO may only want to remove a single variant and that should not necessarily impact the other variants in the set.
- Slide 12, 13 – Overview of EBERO
- Question – what happens if variants are applied for outside of rounds? Staff paper recommends against this.
- For EBERO, the TLD moves to the EBERO provider (e.g., CIRA, CNNIC, etc.), if only a part of the set is moved, then the variants could be operated by a different entity.
- To this point, need to consider what happens when a variant is intentionally removed. It should not force actions to be taken against the strings that are intended to be maintained.
- The treatment of the variant set could be different based on what triggers EBERO (e.g., failure versus intentional retirement).

Action Item – examine what happens for intentional and planned retirement under EBERO, as opposed to emergency action.

- Slide 14 – Overview of TM-PDDRP. Important aspect is one specific remedy: termination of RA.
- Slide 15 – Overview of SubPro context, Staff Paper context, and questions for discussion.
- Suggestion – 3 considerations, understand process for addition, removal, transition of variants. And for clarity, the triggering event will be important.
- ccTLD situation is different. If a government no longer supports a language, there are different implications. gTLDs would not be subject to such limitations.

AOB

- Reminder: review A7 Part 1, A9, A10 – please review. Deadline for input is 20 May.