SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #13 0300 UTC 20 June 2017

F2F Meeting @JNB 0830 SAST 27 June 2017

ICANN

Agenda

1-2 Welcome and Opening Remarks SOI updates

3 Full WG Update

4 More mature discussions (tentative consensus)

5 Items still requiring more discussion

6 AOB

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

3. Full WG Update

4. More mature discussions (tentative consensus)

Demonstrating technical capability only after evaluation (revised after CC2)

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, either by submitting it to evaluation at application time or agreeing to use a previously approved* infrastructure"

★ Could mean in the same procedure or previous procedures if an RSP program exists

Technical Evaluation to be performed as aggregated / consolidated as feasible

- Consolidation is connected but not fully tied with a registry service provider program, could apply to applications within the same procedure or window

- 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 to be performed in aggregation of a registry family

- 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 become part of a single registry family."

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)"

-

IDNs: Security and stability review (revised after ICANN Org comments)

- 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 IDN 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 Top-Level LGRs (Label Generation Rules) 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."

This language automatically blocks emoji TLDs. 😭

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 (revised after ICANN Org and SSAC comments)

- 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 defined.

- 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) top-level LGRs and second-level LGRs are already established for the script/language at evaluation time."

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (1/2)

- **Data-driven decision making using trusted research-accessible data (like DITL and ORDINAL)**
- **Before the procedure, ICANN Org would provide a "do not apply" list and a list of "exercise care" strings where they already expect a more detailed study to be required**
- **Every application, whether or not to those already identified as "exercise care" strings, would be allowed to file a collision mitigation framework**
- **All applied-for strings would be evaluated as to their risk of collisions: low risk, aggravated risk, high risk**
- **A high risk finding terminates the application(s)**
- **An aggravated risk determination requires a non-standard mitigation framework to move forward**

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (2/2)

- **All low risk strings would share a common framework, using controlled interruption and would start controlled interruption right after their findings are published**
- **Minimum 90-day interruption period**
- **Mitigation frameworks would be evaluated by RSTEP**
- **No APD or other per-label lists, unless required by an specific collision mitigation (ex: [appname].TLD)**
- **Possible label-specific non-wildcard NXDOMAIN responses, based on affected party and registry request, with ICANN Org approval**
- **2-year readiness issue discussed later**
- **Outreach to IETF DNSOp, RIPE DNS-WG and DNS-OARC**

5. Items still requiring more discussion

Name collisions in legacy and current gTLDs (revised after JAS advice)

- **Situation: previously registered domain**
  - **Example: owner of acme.com let the domain expire, new user registers it**
- **Possible additions to "Expired Domain Deletion and Expired Registration Recovery" policy:**
  - **Notification of previous domain owner**
    - **By whom ?**
  - **Disallowing contracted parties to disclose information that would stimulate collisions, like DNS query volumes in dropcatch lists**

Name Collisions Framework: two year readiness

- **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 occurrences reported to ICANN, of which 0 were life-threatening**
- **WT4 seems to lean towards " Occurrence experience does not warrant creation of policy to override what is in the 2012 agreements (keep as it is)", but requested details on the 37 occurrences are yet to be provided**
- **Same lack of details also preventing decision on whether to keep this mechanism for subsequent procedures**

Road 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 strawperson to jumpstart WT4 discussion**
- **Discussing of CQ report, ICANN Org's own summary, public comments and CC2**
- **Hope to get RSSAC response on root zone scaling**

6. AOB