# Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process

**Glossary, E5 (Part 2)**

**IDN-EPDP Team Meeting #45 | 4 August 2022**

ICANN

# Agenda

1. Roll Call & SOI Updates (2 min)

2. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 min)

3. Glossary Items (40 min)

4. Strings Ineligible for Delegation (40 min)

5. AOB (3 mins)

# Glossary List

# Purpose of Glossary List

To provide clear, precise, and consistent definition of specific terminology,

which may be unfamiliar to casual readers and are repeatedly used during

charter question deliberation and drafting of Initial and Final Reports

# Existing Sources for Glossary List

1. Integrated Issues Report (20 Feb 2012)

2. IDN Implementation Guidelines Version 4.0 (19 May 2018)

3. IDN Variant Management Staff Paper (25 July 2018)

4. ccPDP4 Policy Proposal (Development Ongoing)

# Relevant Glossary from Integrated Issues Report

**Annex 2 of the IDN Variant Integrated Issues Report:**
**https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-vip-integrated-issues-final-clean-20feb12-en.pdf#page=89**

Relevant Terms defined:

- Activation
- Allocation
- Blocking
- Code point
- Delegation
- Domain
- Internationalized Domain Name Label (IDL)
- IDL set
- Internationalized Domain Name (IDN)
- Label Generation Rules
- Valid Code Point
- Variant
- Variant Label
- Withheld
- Zone

# Relevant Glossary from IDN Implementation Guidelines v4.0

**Annex B of IDN Implementation Guidelines:**
**https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf#page=7**

Relevant Terms defined (in the context of second-level registrations):

- Activated
- Allocatable
- Allocated
- Allocation of label
- Blocked
- Blocking of a label
- Code point
- Delegation of a label
- IDN variant label
- Internationalized Domain Name Label
- Internationalized Domain Name table
- Internationalized Domain Names
- Label
- Label Generation Ruleset, or Label Generation Rules
- Primary IDN label
- Variant

# Relevant Glossary from Staff Paper

**Annex A of Staff Paper:**
**https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-appendices-25jul18-en.pdf#page=3**

Relevant Terms defined:

- Activated/Active
- Allocated
- Blocked
- Delegated
- IDL set
- Labels
- Registry Operator
- ROID
- Withheld
- Withheld-same-entity

# Relevant Glossary in ccPDP4

**Section 9, Annex A of Basic Policy Proposals for IDN ccTLD String Selection Process**

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Activated/Active | A status of some label with respect to a zone, indicating that there are DNS resource records at that node name; or else that there are subordinate names to that name, even though there are no resource records at that node name. In the case where there are resource records at the node name, any resource record will do. In the case where there are subordinate names but no resource records (except those to support DNSSEC), the label names an empty non-terminal. A registry (zone operator) setting the active status activates the name, or performs activation. |
| Allocatable or Allocated Variant | A status of some label (string) with respect to a zone, whereby the label is associated administratively to some entity that has requested the label. This term (and its cognates "allocation" and "to allocate") represents the first step on the way to delegation in the DNS. When the registry (zone operator) allocates the label, it is effectively making a label a candidate for activation. Allocation does not, however, affect the DNS at all. |
| Blocked Variant | A status of some label (string) with respect to a zone, according to which the label is unavailable for allocation to anyone. The term "to block" denotes the registry (the zone operator) taking this action. |

# Relevant Glossary in ccPDP4 (Cont.)

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| Delegation | Process to assign a ccTLD |
| Delegated (technical definition) | A status of some label with respect to a zone, indicating that in that zone there are NS resource records at the label. The NS resource records create a zone cut, and require an SOA record for the same owner name and corresponding NS resource records in the subordinate zone. The act of entering the NS records in the zone at the parent side of the zone cut is delegation, and to do that is to delegate. This definition is largely based on RFC 1034; the reader should consult RFC 1034 for detailed discussion of how the DNS is broken into zones. |
| Rejected or non-Valid string | A Rejected string is set aside on administrative grounds outside the ordinary LGR procedures. Other terms used "Not Approved" and "Will Not Proceed". Strings that cannot be allocated on visual confusability grounds, based on the string similarity review step in the TLD application process, are also Rejected. |
| Withheld-same-entity | A Withheld label is set aside for possible allocation to only the same entity of the labels in the variant set |
| Withheld-same-entity Variant | A Withheld label or string is set aside for possible allocation only to the same entity of the other labels in the variant set. |

# Overlapping Terms

| Integrated Issues Report | IDN Implementation Guidelines v4.0 | Staff Paper | ccPDP4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Activation | Activated | Activated<br>Active | Activated<br>Active |
| Allocation | Allocatable<br>Allocated<br>Allocation of label | Allocated | Allocatable<br>Allocated Variant |
| Blocking | Blocked<br>Blocking of a label | Blocked | Blocked Variant |
| Code point | Code point | | |
| Delegation | Delegation of a label | Delegated | Delegation<br>Delegated (technical definition) |
| Internationalized Domain Name Label (IDL) | Internationalized Domain Name Label | | |
| IDL set | | IDL set | |
| | Label | Labels | |
| Internationalized Domain Name | Internationalized Domain Names | | |
| Label Generation Rules | Label Generation Ruleset<br>Label Generation Rules | | |
| Variant<br>Variant Label | IDN variant label<br>Variant | | |
| Withheld | | Withheld<br>Withheld-same-entity | Withheld-same-entity<br>Withheld-same-entity Variant |

# Non-Overlapping Terms

| Integrated Issues Report | IDN Implementation Guidelines v4.0 | Staff Paper | ccPDP4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Domain | Primary IDN label | Registry Operator | Rejected or non-Valid string |
| Valid Code Point | Internationalized Domain Name table | ROID | |
| Zone | | | |

# Issue for discussion

1. During our discussions, we have adopted language/terminology that may not be technically correct, but appears to be commonly understood by members of the Team.

2. However, the language contained in our draft recommendations should be more precise to mitigate any misunderstanding or ambiguity.

3. Therefore it would be beneficial to have a discussion about what we mean by the terms:

    a. Primary or Primary IDN gTLD; and

    b. Set, variant set or variant label set

4. And whether the context in which we use those terms can change their meaning.

## a.  Primary, Primary IDN gTLD

**Existing definition in IDN Implementation Guidelines**

**Primary IDN label (Second-Level)**
An IDN label applied-for or submitted by a registrant

## b. Set, Variant Set, Variant Label Set

**Existing definition in Integrated Issues Report**

**IDN Label**
This term is used in RFC 3743 to talk about individual labels that make up IDNs. It identifies the label that is under consideration under the Language Table

**IDL Set**
A label whose code points are all included in the zone repertoire, along with all of the labels arising from the application of the code point variant rules on that first label

# E5 (Part 2) – Continued Discussion of Strings Ineligible for Delegation

# Charter Question E5 (Part 2)

E5 (Part 2): Should the strings ineligible for delegation for existing and future gTLDs be updated to include any possible variant labels?

# Context for Discussion

**Outcome of IGO PDP:**

- IGO PDP, which concluded in November 2013, recommends including a number of identifiers in the future version of AGB as Ineligible for Delegation

- A specific list of identifiers is to be granted protections on the basis of international treaties

- Identifiers on this list are unavailable to be applied for as gTLDs, with an exception procedure for the relevant protected organization to apply for their respective strings

- These identifiers are NOT included in the string similarity process

**Implementation by ICANN org:**

- ICANN org has NOT yet implemented this policy at the top-level, as there has been no New gTLD round

  - The top-level recommendations will be integrated into the Applicant Guidebook for the immediate next round of the program

- ICANN org HAS implemented the recommendations for the second-level

- We already more or less know what top-level identifiers will need to be included in the AGB

  - International Olympic Committee, Red Cross & Red Crescent: Specific Designations protected under the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, Intergovernmental Organizations (IGO), and International Non Governmental Organizations (INGOs)

- The second-level policy has a change process for adding or deleting names from the Red Cross, IOC and IGO Identifier List

# Possible Approach 1

**Possible Approach 1:**

1. Keep the list of strings ineligible for delegation intact and not to update it to include variants

**Rationale:**

1. IGO PDP (and second-level policy) already have both 1) a specific set of identifiers and 2) a change procedure to add or delete names

    a. Preventive protections are provided to a finite/specific list of strings limited to <u>exact match</u> based on internationally recognized treaties

    b. Careful deliberations of IGO PDP that took years to complete should not be modified

2. There are other measures in place (e.g., GAC Early Warning, GAC Advice, Objection process) to deter unrelated applicants from applying for the variant of a protected string

3. The number of variants for some strings will be extraordinarily large, adding unnecessary burden to the evaluation process

# Possible Approach 2

**Possible Approach 2:**

1. Keep the list of strings ineligible for delegation intact and not to update it to include variants

2. Prevent applications for all variants of the protected strings, and link to a resource for calculating the variants

3. Variants can only be applied for by the relevant organizations AND as part of a 'set' that includes the primary string on the list

4. Make it clear that preventing application for variants is expressly NOT an expansion of rights for the protected strings

**Rationale:**

1. This is similar to the approach dealing with the variants of Reserved Names – nothing is added to the list but applications for variants are forbidden

2. While the risk of an ineligible entity attempting to apply for a variant of a protected string may be low, this approach should help prevent such a situation and ensure that only the relevant organization (e.g., IGO, INGO, etc.) can get the variant of their protected string

3. As the list is kept intact, this approach should not provide additional protections to the identifiers that may not otherwise be available via international law/treaties