

# GNSO IDN Working Group

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

Meetings 5-6  
Teleconference 06 February 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. Recap of major discussion points from January 30, 2007 calls (see document)
2. Report from Joint GNSO-ccNSO-GAC Chairs Consultation, Jan 31, 2007
3. Results of prioritization of issues for WG
  - Ratification of results
4. Draft Conclusions from Jan 23 & Jan 30 calls
5. Review Lab Test Results
6. Review IAB Document
7. Preparation for Feb 13 meeting

# Joint GNSO-ccNSO-GAC Chairs Consultation - Summary

- Met Jan 31, 2007; will meet every 3-4 weeks
- ccNSO WG getting started
  - 2LD IDN experience statements
  - IDN TLD plan
  - gTLD/ccTLD interactions
- ccNSO-GAC jt WG likely to review policy/legal issues
- GAC Chair suggests not reacting to various IDN statements from different nations until all views are received and analyzed
- Some interest in reviewing and contributing on evaluation criteria for new IDN gTLDs
- Geographic names – ccNSO/GAC Chair personal views are that it is likely to differ by country
- Creation of “IDN 3166” list most likely to be useful

# WG Prioritization Results

## Priority 1:

Introduction of New gTLDs – 42.08

## Priority 2:

Geo-Political Details – 27.00

Existing gTLD strings – 25.88

## Priority 3:

Existing Domain Name Holders – 22.58

Techno-Policy Details – 20.50

## Priority 4:

Privacy & Whois Details – 11.00

## Priority 5:

Legal Details – 8.00

## Priority 6:

Other/Stealth Issues – 1.50

# Ratification of Priorities

# Draft Conclusions

## Jan 23 & Jan 30 calls

### Agreement on:

1. Neither new gTLDs nor IDN gTLDs should be delayed due to the other
2. New gTLDs should not preempt IDN gTLDs
3. Single script adherence at all levels not enforceable
4. Limit IDN gTLD string confusion and collision due to variants
5. Priority rights for new strings do not derive from existing strings, but could derive from IPR rights
6. UDRP does not need revision w.r.t. IDN gTLD rollout

**Agreement** = We can include this statement as the consensus view of the WG in our report

### Support for:

1. IDN gTLD application review priority based on “distance from ASCII”
2. Aliasing provides protection of and reduce confusion for existing domain name holders
3. All new IDN gTLD rollouts to include sunrise periods
4. Compliance with ICANN IDN Guidelines
5. Consider local/regional preexisting developments re IDN gTLDs
6. Recognize current practice to display the registrant in local script and at least one of the contacts in ASCII

**Support** = There is some gathering of positive opinion for the position, but competing positions may exist and a consensus view has not (yet) been reached

# IDN Lab Test Results – Tina Dam

- IDN Lab Test Objectives
- Presentation of results
- Test Results Report publication
- Next steps & Timetable

# IAB Document

## 3 Issues:

- If IDNs are to be entered in the root zone, decisions must first be made about how these TLDs are to be named and delegated.
- Decisions presumably must be made as to which, if any, root IDN labels should be associated with DNAME records and which ones should be handled by normal delegation records or other mechanisms
- If IDN labels are to be placed in the root zone, there are issues associated with how they are to be encoded and deployed

Reference:

<http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4690.txt>

## 7 Recommendations:

- Reduction of Permitted Character List
  - specify such internationalized hostnames
- Elimination of All Non-Language Characters
  - Unicode characters that are not needed to write words or numbers in any of the world's languages should be eliminated from the list of characters that are appropriate in DNS labels
- Elimination of Word-Separation Punctuation
- Updating to New Versions of Unicode
  - Anything that can be done to lower complexity and simplify forward transitions should be seriously considered
- Role and Uses of the DNS
- Databases of Registered Names
- Security Considerations

# Plan for Feb 13 meeting

- Issue Draft Outcomes Report to WG
- Discuss Draft Outcomes Report to WG
- Focus on Priority 1 (New gTLD Strings)

**End of Feb 06 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>**