



# 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