

# GNSO IDN Working Group

[gnso-idn-wg@icann.org](mailto:gnso-idn-wg@icann.org)

Meetings 3-4  
Teleconference 30 January 2007

Contacts:

[rmohan@afilias.info](mailto:rmohan@afilias.info) (Ram Mohan - Chair)

[olof.nordling@icann.org](mailto:olof.nordling@icann.org) (Olof Nordling - ICANN Staff)

[gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org](mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org) (Glen de Saint Géry – GNSO Secretariat)

# Agenda

1. Launch of IDN Wiki – procedures to access
2. Recap of major discussion points from January 23, 2007 call
3. Major topics on issues list
4. Prioritize all major headings
5. IDN impact on New gTLD recommendations
6. Review of ICANN Staff Issues report
7. Preparation for Feb 06 meeting

# Topics Left To Discuss

- Geo-Political Details
- Privacy & Whois Details
- Legal Details

# 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?

# Prioritization

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

# New gTLD Recommendations – applicability of IDNs

- Selection Criteria
  - String
  - Applicant
  - Process conditions (ICANN)
- Allocation Methods
- Policies for Contractual Conditions

# ICANN Staff Issues Report

- Review document sent separately

# Plan for Feb 06 meeting

- Review WG thinking on
  - new gTLD Recommendations &
  - ICANN Staff Issues Report
- Review IAB Document
- Review Lab Test
- Begin crafting basic WG statements on the top priority topics

**End of Jan 30 discussion**

# Appendix

- Background material follows

# 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

# 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://gns0.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/draft-idn-issue-list-22dec06.htm>**