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 not 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?
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