SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #9 2000 UTC 20 April 2017

Agenda

1-2
Welcome and Opening Remarks SOI updates

3
Full WG Update

4
Name Collisions in legacy gTLDs

5
Name collisions in 2012-round gTLDs

6
Currently ongoing consensus calls and discussion themes

7
AOB

1. **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
2. **SOI updates**

3. Full WG Update

4. Name Collisions in legacy gTLDs

Name collisions: new name, old phenomena (1 / 2)

- **Situation 1: use of a previously unregistered domain**
  - **Example: acme-internal-network.com**
- **Situation 2: use of DNS suffix list**
  - **Example: acme.corp generating requests for acme.corp.com**
- **Work-Track discussion:**
  - **Contracted Parties should be forced or could be allowed to take collision domains away from users (policy change)**
  - **✔ Possible threats does not warrant policy changes; no new policy required.**

Name collisions: new name, old phenomena (2 / 2)

- **Situation 3: previously registered domain**
  - **Example: owner of acme.com let the domain expire, new user registers it**
- **Work-Track discussion:**
  - 🞏 **Expired Domain Deletion and Expired Registration Recovery policies should be revisited and changed**
  - ✔ **Possible threats does not warrant policy changes**

5. Name Collisions in 2012-round gTLDs

Name collisions Framework in 2012-round

- **All 2012-round required to pass a controlled interruption period and be able to respond within two hours for life-threatening collision reports, for the first two years of delegation**
- **Current number of collision reports is 37 occurrances reported to ICANN, of which 0 were life-threatening**
- **Work-Track discussion:**
  - ◻ **2012-round registries should extend such support beyond the 2-year period (implementation change)**
  - ✔ **Occurrence experience does not warrant creation of policy to override what is in the agreements (keep as it is)**

6. Currently ongoing consensus calls and discussion themes

Consensus Call WT4-1: Demonstrating technical capability only after evaluation

Recommendation 7:

"**Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out.** "

Possible Language: "Applicants must be able demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out, but will only be required to do so at contract-signing time, after passing other criteria and/or approvals and prevailing in contention set(s)."

Technical Evaluation to be performed as aggregated / consolidated as feasible

- No clear indication of why Staff decided against consolidating technical evaluation in 2012-round
   a. Any ideas ?
- Consolidation is not fully tied with back-end certification, could apply to applications from the same applicant, but can be an enabler
- Possible Language:

"Technical Evaluation may be aggregated and/or consolidated to the maximum extent possible that generate process efficiencies, including both different applications from the same applicant and different applications sharing a common technical infrastructure"

"Financial Evaluation must be performed in aggregation of a registry family"

- AGB clearly overlooked different business models in 2012-round
  a. Revenue-generating or self-sustainable registry (profit or non-profit)
  b. Cost-center registry (typical of brands, possibly causes)
- Besides different financial goals, single-application evaluation overlooked the possibility of an applicant winning so many TLDs to the point of not being able to run them (gaming the system)
- Rec. 8: "Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organisational operational capability."
- Possible Language: "Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organisational operational capability in tandem for all currently-owned and applied-for TLDs that would be part of a single registry family."
- Financial Evaluation would still be gating and be done prior to contention set resolution

IDNs: Discussion Outcome on 1-char IDN TLDs

- Discussed in WT4 since Hyderabad

- Proper definitions provided by ICANN staff on different type of characters:

  a. Letter (examples: Latin and Cyrillic)

  b. Syllable (examples: Japanese Katakana and Hiragana, Mayan)

  c. Ideograph (or ideogram) (examples: Japanese Kanji, Traditional Chinese)

- Possible Language:

"IDN 1-char gTLDs won't be disallowed for script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram), provided they are not country and/or territory names."

  Operational hazard: language is not defined in a char, only the script.

- Coordination with ccNSO and GAC consultations were found appropriate.

IDNs: Discussion Outcome on Variant TLDs

- Also discussed in WT4 since Hyderabad

- Previously seen as conflicting with Rec. 2:

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

- 3 possible solutions identified

- Possible Language:

  "IDN gTLDs deemed to be variants of already existing or applied for TLDs won't be disallowed provided: (1) they have the same registry operator implementing, by force of agreement, a policy of (....) (2) top-level LGRs and second-level LGRs already established for the script/language at evaluation time."

IDNs: Connection with security and stability review

- Security and stability review role was not clearly defined in AGB

- Later in the process, there were mentions that they only applied to IDN rendering

- SSR hasn't evaluated risks such as name collisions, which was addressed much later

- No IDN LGRs available at that time

- Can the IDN part of SSR be done completely by algorithms in the submission system ?

- What other security and stability considerations were evaluated ? Perhaps asking ICANN for the SOW ?

7. AOB