GNSO IDN Working Group
gnso-idn-wg@icann.org

Teleconference 23 January 2007

Contacts:
rmohan@afilias.info (Ram Mohan - Chair)
olof.nordling@icann.org (Olof Nordling - ICANN Staff)
gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org (Glen de Saint Géry – GNSO Secretariat)

Agenda

1. GNSO IDN WG plan of operation - Ram
2. Becoming a member of IDN WG – Glen, Ram
3. IDN WG member expectations - Ram, Olof
4. Discussion of Items 1-3 - WG
5. Coordination with ccNSO & GAC - Ram
6. Discussion of Issues List
7. Plan for prioritization of major areas (which help us define our work)
8. Preparation for Jan 30 meeting

GNSO IDN WG Purpose

- To identify and specify
  - any policy issues that should be considered by the GNSO via a policy development process (PDP) that have not already been considered within PDP-Dec05

- Our Job
  - Review
    - New gTLD draft recommendations
    - Laboratory test outcomes
    - ICANN Staff Issues report
    - RFC 4690 (IAB document)
  - Research
    - Policy implications for IDN gTLDs
  - Report (due March 21, 2007)
    - Policy matters shared/conflicted with ccNSO
    - Policy issues that merit a new PDP

Plan of Operation

- 18 meetings (9 pairs, every Tuesday)
- Each pair of meetings focused on specific agenda topics
- Calendar:
  - Complete review process by Feb 6
  - Create draft review outcome by Feb 13
  - Research policy implications & arrive at draft conclusions by Mar 6
  - Review draft Lisbon report Mar 13
  - Finalize Lisbon report Mar 20
  - Issue Lisbon report Mar 21

Other Details

- Who may join the GNSO IDN WG
  - Constituency members or GNSO Council members
  - ICANN Advisory group liaisons

- WG member expectations
  - Read summary documents
  - Decide which issues you/your constituency care about the most
  - Inform & consult with your constituency
  - Come prepared to meetings (do your homework)

Important Definitions We Need To Understand

- What is
  - "gTLD"?
  - "existing gTLD"?
  - "new gTLD"?
  - "IDN gTLD"?
  - "IDN ccTLD"?
- What is
  - a variant?
  - a language?
  - a script?
- What is/are
  - an alias
  - normal delegation records
  - DNAME records
- What is <u>not</u> in scope of discussions of the GNSO IDN WG?

7 Major Topics To Discuss

- Introduction of New gTLDs
- Techno-Policy Details
- Existing Domain Name Holders
- Existing gTLD strings
- Geo-Political Details
- Privacy & Whois Details
- Legal Details

Topics …

- ## New gTLDs
  - What is the policy impact on new gTLD introduction by IDN gTLDs?
    - Should new gTLDs wait for completion of IDN gTLD issues?
  - What reserved-names policies should be adopted in new gTLDs with respect to. IDN TLDs?

- ## Techno-Policy Details
  - Should single script adherence at all TLD levels be a requirement?
  - Should there be limitations in which scripts are made available for IDNs? If yes, what are they?
  - What are the policy issues for IDN variants?

Topics …

- **Existing Domain Name Holders**
  - Do priority rights exist for registrant, registrar and registry?
  - Does aliasing provide sufficient protection and reduce confusion for existing domain name holders?

- **Existing gTLD strings**
  - Allocation
  - Representation of strings
  - Should there be a policy recommendation regarding backwards compatibility of existing IDNs when IDN protocols change?

Topics …

- **Geo-Political Details**
  - What are countries' role in IDN gTLDs?
  - What is the WG opinion on countries asserting "sovereign right" over scripts/languages?
  - What are ccTLD's role in IDN gTLDs?
  - What about geopolitical names in IDN gTLDs?

- **Privacy & Whois Details**
  - Do existing Whois policies for gTLDs adequately cover IDNs? If not, what is lacking?
  - Should there be a requirement that Whois information be available in a "link language" (such as English) in addition to the local script representation?

Topics …

- Legal Details
  - What is the impact on UDRP when IDNs and IDN TLDs become common-place?

Plan for Jan 30 meeting

- Prioritization of major topics (1 through 7)
  - Via consensus and/or simple majority
- Review new gTLD Recommendations
- Review ICANN Staff Issues Report

- We'll review IAB Document & Lab tests in Feb 6 meeting

End of Jan 23 discussion

Appendix

- Background material follows

Issues from Sao Paulo I

1. Should transliterations of existing gTLD strings be addressed?
- Translations of gTLDs already covered in the New gTLD work,
- Transliterations relate to "confusingly similar" concept in New gTLDs
- Complex, as transliterations cannot be defined for some scripts/languages

2. Should the next round for new gTLDs wait for the inclusion of IDN gTLDs?
- Community expectations that IDN gTLD be launched soon, preferably within a year
- Support in the New gTLD work to at least enable reservation of IDN strings
- Risks for ASCII cybersquatting identified (e.g .espana vs .españa)
- New gTLDs should not be delayed by waiting for a decision on IDN gTLDs.
- IDN gTLD timing depends on outcome of both technical and policy work

3. Would aliasing be a preferred option, an open option or an option to discourage?
- Aliasing maps the whole sub-domain tree to an additional TLD string
- To be discussed without specific reference to any technical solution
- Not an IDN issue per se, although prompting much interest in relation to IDNs
- In the New gTLD recommendations, each application for a string is regarded as applying for a separate TLD.
- There is no need for defensive registrations in an "alias" string
- Aliasing could improve or deteriorate user experience, depending on the case
- Aliasing of existing TLDs may invoke competition concerns

Issues from Sao Paulo II

4. Should an existing domain name holder have a priority right for a corresponding domain in another script?
- Issue not discussed at any depth in Sao Paulo
- A domain name as such does not confer any intellectual property rights to the domain name holder
- There could be particular issues to explore in connection to "aliasing", see issue 3 above

5. Given a particular script on the top-level, should that script be compulsory on lower levels also?
- Not a requirement for current gTLDs – otherwise there would have been no IDN SLDs
- The IDN Guidelines state that characters within a string should be from a single script
- Should that restriction extend across levels for an IDN gTLD?
- Could be limited to the first and second levels only, in order to have an enforceable policy

6. How should countries' claims to "rights" to scripts be regarded?
- Political requirements to prove community support to accept TLDs in a particular script
- Korean is a case in point – are there others?

7. How should initial limitations in available IDN scripts for DNS be made?
- At first, only a subset of all Unicode scripts will be available for IDN TLDs
- Exclusions of scripts/languages may raise political issues
- Possible objections from countries/communities for being unfairly treated or left behind

8. Should a country opting for a gTLD be free to set policies for the second level?
- ccTLDs have no obligations to follow any external policy-setting mechanisms
- In analogy, should a country opting for a gTLD have similar freedom?

Issues from Sao Paulo III

9. How could "grandfathering" of existing SLDs be achieved when the IDN protocols change?
- The IDN protocol revision reduces the number of allowed code points
- May affect 2 million IDN second level domains and require "grandfathering" options
- Effects of protocol changes on application software may also raise "grandfathering" issues
- Design criteria in the protocol revision are said to foresee grandfathering

10. What requirements for change of Whois should be considered?
- Multiple solutions already in use today for Whois regarding IDNs
- Few complaints on Whois for IDNs yet, may change with increased use, improved browser support etc
- Experience that registrants in general wish to supply their names in their own script
- Domain names could be output in, for example, UTF-8 or as "xn--"
- Not a constraining factor for launch of IDN gTLDs, but standardization would be useful

11. How to handle IDN cases of variants?
- This issue was only mentioned, not discussed in Sao Paulo
- Variant issues are important for scripts with many symbols, where some can be interchanged
- Related to the notion of "confusingly similar"

12. Is there a need to modify the UDRP in view of increased use of IDNs?
- Staff has reported on experience of using the UDRP for IDNs.
- UDRP applied by WIPO to IDN SLD disputes since 2000
- Limited number of cases but UDRP said to work well also for IDNs, without obvious modification needs

Issues from Sao Paulo IV

13. How to handle geopolitical names?
- Is there a need for specific rules for gTLD strings with geopolitical names?
- The same geopolitical name can relate to more than one location
- New gTLD recommendation foresees objection opportunities to strings and a dispute resolution process
- Possible additional New gTLD string test, not IDN-specific
- Issue to be addressed by GAC and ccNSO as well

14. How could an IDN - ccTLD be defined and deployed?
- Main topic for ccNSO IDN WG discussions in Sao Paulo
- GAC input important on this matter, also for decisions regarding registry operators and TLD strings
- Parallel list to ISO-3166 would be needed, but ISO has expressed reluctance to this approach
- Proposal to start with one IDN-ccTLD per country, dedicated to (one of) its official language(s)
- The notion of "official language" varies and calls for flexibility in the approach
- Official name(s) of each country as TLD strings may be very long, requiring flexibility
- Possible UNESCO role in relation to language communities and vetting of language tables

For the full text of the Draft Issue List, see
http://gnso.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/draft-idn-issue-list-22dec06.htm