1. Issues of relevance for selection criteria

1.1 Does the operation of an IDN TLD registry require particular additional competences that should be reflected in selection criteria?

1.2 How far is it essential to safeguard against business failure of new IDN TLDs? Do such risks for a new IDN TLD differ from those involved in a new TLD in general?

1.3 How should the choice of the IDN string or strings be governed? How would the approaches for gTLDs and for ccTLDs differ?

1.4 Is it from a policy standpoint advisable to create internationalized equivalents of existing TLDs? How could an introduction of internationalized equivalents of existing TLDs best promote competition and choice for end-users?

1.5 What selection and approval processes should apply for translation and/or transliteration of an existing <.tld> to its script equivalent(s) <.idn-tld>? Should any transliteration be phonetic (= transcription) or definitional/literal? Should a registry be able to determine its own equivalent(s), subject to an approval process involving input from the community, including governments? How should public policy aspects be reflected in such an approval process? How can the identified need for consistency between different national character tables for the same language best be achieved?

1.6 How should the number of IDN top-level labels per existing TLD be determined? If limits should apply, how many IDN strings should be allowed per existing TLD, and based upon what criteria? Are there reasons to have conservative limits initially, with a view to easing them as experience is gained?
1. Issues of relevance for selection criteria, cont’d

1.7 Should entities other than the existing TLD registry be entitled to run an IDN equivalent or equivalents of this TLD? If so, under what policies should the ‘new’ registry manage the <.idn-tld>? Conversely, should an existing registry be prevented from operating a related IDN TLD on the grounds of promoting competition? Are there special considerations required in these regards concerning TLDs with eligibility requirements? Reference: GNSO mailing list for the questions in this paragraph and similar questions.

1.8 Should the IDN based string relate to an official language within the country of the ccTLD? In cases when a language can be represented in multiple scripts, should each script be entitled to a separate IDN based string?

1.9 What is the accepted representation of a country name in non-ASCII scripts?

1.10 What considerations need to be made for languages and scripts used across multiple countries?

1.11 What are the advantages and drawbacks of having <.idn-tld> map into <.tld>? (This, for example, means that www.example.tld and www.example.idn-tld will resolve to the same website.)

1.12 Given that the ultimate user experience has been identified as an overall priority, how can any risks for end user confusion best be counteracted? Various risks, issues and aspects of user experience must be a priority. Acceptable user experience levels must be discussed and targeted.
2. Issues of relevance for allocation methods

2.1 If more than one party apply for the same IDN top-level label, on what grounds should a single applicant be selected? This is similar to having two applications for the same ascii-tld. There are additional complexities such as if an applicant wishes to introduce and <idn-tld> that is a translation or transliteration of an existing gTLD.

2.2 Similarly, what measures should ICANN take into consideration when selecting between more than one application for different IDN top-level labels that have a similar or identical purposes? What importance should be given to the sequential order in which such applications are received in relation to other possible aspects?

2.3 How should conflicts between a proposed IDN top-level label and a trademark be resolved? Does a specific dispute resolution mechanism need to be put in place to resolve such conflicts? In this scenario ICANN is effectively the registrar for the root zone. The policy should address the issue of determining which, if either, of two countries requesting the same name is designated as the TLD.

2.4 In what order should applications for IDN top-level labels be handled in case that: (i) countries or ccTLDs are determined to be entitled to one or more IDN-based TLDs and (ii) more applications appear at the same time than can effectively be processed?
3. Issues of relevance for contractual conditions

3.1 What particular contractual provisions are required for an <.idn-tld> in addition to those normally required for any <.tld>? How could IETF IDN standards and ICANN’s IDN Guidelines best be incorporated in the contractual conditions?

3.2 To what extent are current established policies adequate for IDN? Are modifications of the existing UDRP required to address disputes concerning IDN labels? Are modifications needed to facilitate usability of WHOIS information for end-users with different scripts?

3.3 Provided that an internationalized equivalent of a TLD exists as <idn-tld> in some script, should there be a policy for what script(s) may be used at the second level, such as <idn-domain>.<idn-tld>? In other words, should the script used on the second level match the script used in the top-level? Given that, with specific exceptions, mixing of scripts is prohibited on the second level, should the same rule apply to the top-level?

3.4 Should a registrant in <.tld> have a prior right to register in the IDN version <.idn-tld>? Would current domain name holders feel that they are forced to register in the IDN equivalent for brand protection? Does an intellectual property rights holder in one or more jurisdictions have a prior right to register in an IDN version?

3.5 What rules should govern timing and sequencing of the launch of IDN top-level domains? Is there a need for sunrise periods? Is there a need for concurrent launch of multiple IDN top-level domains for fair competition reasons?

4. Other aspects

   Other IDN issues, like email interoperability and browser appearance of various identifiers, may affect policy preferences and may be of major importance from the user perspective. Such issues fall outside the remit of GNSO, but deserve to be kept in mind for a full perspective of the ultimate user experience.