

# EPDP-IDNs Phase 2 Project Plan & Estimated Timeline



GNSO Council Meeting | 25 May 2023

# Board Resolution on 16 March 2023

Whereas, the Board understands that the delivery of the Implementation Plan no later than 1 August 2023 requires the satisfactory completion of the following four deliverables (the Deliverables) **by the last day of the ICANN77 Public Meeting (15 June 2023)**:

4. **A project plan** from the GNSO Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) Working Group (WG) **identifying all charter questions that will impact the next Applicant Guidebook**, along with considerations to ensure a consistent solution on IDN Variant TLDs with the ccPDP4 on IDN ccTLDs (in accordance with prior Board [Resolution 2019.03.14.09](#)), and **a timeline by when the IDNs EPDP WG will deliver relevant recommendations to the GNSO Council**.

# Phase 1: Impact Analysis & Timeline

EPDP Team identified 29 questions under the following topics to be addressed in Phase 1:

- Topic A: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR – **Charter Questions A1-A10**
- Topic B: “Same entity” at the top-level – **Charter Question B1-B5**
- Topic D: Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle – **Charter Questions D1-D3, D8**
- Topic E: Adjustments to objection process, string similarity review, string contention resolution, reserved strings, and other policies and procedures – **Charter Questions E1-E7**

All of the 68 Phase 1 preliminary recommendations will have impact on the next Applicant Guidebook

- 60 out of 68 preliminary recommendations concern future gTLDs
- 8 preliminary recommendations concern existing IDN gTLD registry operators applying for their variant labels

Estimated 10 November 2023 to deliver **Phase 1 Final Report** based on the following assumptions:

- Phase 1 Initial Report Public Comment closes on 5 June 2023
- 18 weeks to review public comments and complete deliberation toward Phase 1 Final Report
- 5 weeks to build Final Report, conduct consensus call, and adopt final recommendations

# Phase 2: Impact Analysis Introduction

EPDP Team identified 19 questions under the following topics to be addressed in Phase 2:

- Topic C: “Same entity” at the second-level – **Charter Questions C1-C6**
- Topic D: Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle – **Charter Questions D4-D8**
- Topic F: Adjustments in registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms – **Charter Questions F1-F2**
- Topic G: Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines – **Charter Questions G1-G1a**

Phase 2 impact analysis is conducted based on the following key assumptions:

- EPDP Team will develop corresponding recommendation(s) for each question that will result in a **change to the status quo**
- **2012 AGB will serve as the basis** of the next AGB
- **Impact on the Registry Agreement will have an impact on the next AGB**, as they will be published together for Public Comment (input from ICANN org GDS department)

# Phase 2: Impact Analysis Overview

Impact?	C1	C2	C3	C3a	C4	C4a	C5	C6	D4	D5	D6	D6a	D7	D7a	D8	F1	F2	G1	G2
Next AGB	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	May	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	May	May
Application Question	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	May	Yes	Yes	No	May	May	May	May	Yes	May	May	May	May
Contractual Obligation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	May	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Summary:

- **7 out of 19 questions will have an impact** on the next AGB
- **3 out of 19 questions may have an impact** on the next AGB
- **9 out of 19 questions** may NOT have an impact on the next AGB
- **As noted, the Registry Agreement will have an impact on the next AGB: potential impact on application questions and contractual obligation also reviewed and nearly every question may have an impact.**
  - Contractual obligation generally refers to contracted parties' obligations as reflected in Registry Agreement, Registrar Accreditation Agreement, Consensus Policies, temporary policies, and other policies/procedures that have legal effect
- **Foundational questions**, which may set the underlying principles of Phase 2 deliberation and affect the deliberation of related charter questions, are highlighted in **Yellow**

# Phase 2: Project Plan (Expanded View)

Group 1 - foundational questions, questions that will / may have an impact on AGB and their related questions		
Question	Topic	Meeting #
C4	IDN Table Harmonization	4
C5	IDN Table Harmonization Mechanism	2
C6	IDN Table LGR Format	2
C1 & C2 (Part 1)	Same Entity	4
C3	ROID	4
C3a	ROID Mechanism	2
C2 (Part 2)	Activate Variant Domains	4
D4	Variant Domain Behavior	4
C4a	Behavior Under Single gTLD	1
D8	WHOIS	3
D5	Fees	2
G1	IDN Implementation Guidelines	4
G1a	Separate Legal Mechanism	2
<b>Total:</b>		<b>38</b>
<b>Contingency Buffer:</b>		<b>9</b>

Group 2 - remaining questions		
Question	Topic	Meeting #
D6	Transfer	2
D7	Suspension	2
F1	TMCH	2
D6a	UDRP	2
D7a	URS	2
F2	RPM Catch All	1
<b>Total:</b>		<b>11</b>
<b>Contingency Buffer:</b>		<b>2</b>

# Phase 2: Estimated Timeline

- **Tackle Phase 2 in one-go:**
  - Only a limited number of questions may not have a direct impact on the next AGB or RA (indirect impact may exist)
  - Further triage will likely extend the total timeline for completion by another 8 months
- **Essentially no change to the milestone date estimation:**
  - Phase 2 Initial Report: **18 April 2025** (1 week earlier than current project plan); **deliberations to start in Dec 2023.**
  - Phase 2 Final Report: **24 October 2025** (2 weeks earlier than current project plan)
- **Estimated timeline is conservative and based on the following assumptions:**
  - Current method of operating is unchanged (e.g., weekly 2-hour online meetings, 2 working sessions / ICANN meeting)
  - Phase 1 must be completed first (e.g., when Phase 1 Initial Report Public Comment closes, pause Phase 2 work)
  - Estimated timeline for various steps besides charter question deliberation is unchanged, examples include:
    - ICANN org Early Input Review: 10 weeks
    - Build Phase 2 Initial Report + ICANN org Processing: 6 weeks
    - Phase 2 Initial Report Public Comment: 6 weeks
    - Review Public Comments + Complete Deliberation: 17 weeks
    - Build Phase 2 Final Report + Consensus Call: 4 weeks

# Phase 2: F2F Workshop Request

**EPDP Team would like to request a face-to-face workshop to speed up Phase 2 deliberation**

## Summary:

- Given the EPDP Team composition and geographical spread, more frequent weekly meetings may be challenging to organize and may result in a significant drop in membership or burnout
- Based on the assumption that one F2F workshop will allow 3 days of meetings with 4 meetings per day, one workshop may facilitate 12 meetings. As a result, two F2F workshops may shorten the overall deliberation timeline by up to 40%
- EPDP Team will aim for more working sessions during ICANN meetings, subject to slot availability and suitability
- Explore other mechanisms to increase efficiency in deliberations, e.g. by starting with agreed principles, not from scratch

**Time Frame for F2F Workshop:** during the deliberation stage of Phase 2 charter questions: Nov 2023 - Dec 2023

\*Consideration: 6 month lead time required for ICANN org approval process

Note, depending upon the overall progress of the group and potentially based on the success of the F2F meeting (noting limitations from lead time), the EPDP Team may request an additional F2F Workshop.



# Appendix: Full Impact Analysis of Phase 2 Charter Questions



# Phase 2: Project Plan

	Group 1 47 meetings													Group 2 13 meetings					
Impact?	C4	C5	C6	C1	C2	C3	C3a	D4	C4a	D8	D5	G1	G2	D6	D7	F1	D6a	D7a	F2
Next AGB	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	May	May	May	No	No	No	No	No	No
Application Question	Yes	May	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	May	May	May	May	May	May	May	May
Contractual Obligation	Yes	May	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Summary:

- Based on the impact analysis, divide Phase 2 work into two groups
  - **Group 1 (13 questions):** foundational questions, questions that will / may have an impact on AGB and their related questions
  - **Group 2 (6 questions):** remaining questions
- EPDP Team estimated that **60 meetings** are potentially needed to complete initial deliberation for Phase 2 questions:
  - Group 1 questions may require **47 meetings** to complete initial deliberation
  - Group 2 questions may require **13 meetings** to complete initial deliberation

# Explanatory Notes

- Each slide includes:
  - a summary version of the Phase 2 charter question
  - potential data needed to facilitate deliberation
  - potential outcomes as a result of the deliberation
  - estimated number of meetings to finish initial deliberation (based on difficulty of charter question and experience in Phase 1)
  - analysis of impact on the next Applicant Guidebook (AGB), application question, and contractual obligation
- Impact analysis is conducted based on the following assumptions:
  - EPDP Team will develop corresponding recommendation(s) for each question that will result in a change to the status quo
  - The 2012 AGB will serve as the basis of the next AGB (relevant AGB section numbers and 2012 round application question numbers are noted in the rationale)
  - Impact on the Registry Agreement will have an impact on the next AGB, as they will be published together for Public Comment (input received from ICANN org GDS department)
- Contractual obligation generally refers to contracted parties' obligations as reflected in Registry Agreement, Registrar Accreditation Agreement, Consensus Policies, temporary policies, and other policies/procedures that have legal effects (relevant documents and section numbers are noted in the rationale)
- Foundational questions refer to questions that may set the underlying principles of Phase 2 deliberation and affect the deliberation of related charter questions

# C1 & C2 (Part 1)

**c1) Should the “same entity” requirement be extended to existing variant domains?**

**c2) Part 1: Should the “same registrant” requirement be extended to existing variant domains?**

<b>Data</b>	Data from registrars regarding how variant domains are managed
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes, “same entity” / “same registrant” required retrospectively</li><li>- No, grandfather existing registrations</li></ul>
<b>Length</b>	4 Meetings <b>Foundational Question</b>

**If EPDP Team recommends “same entity” / “same registrant” requirement applied retrospectively to existing variant domains**

<b>Next AGB</b>	No, only impacts existing variant domains
<b>Application Question</b>	No, only impacts existing variant domains
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	Yes, potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- IDN Implementation Guidelines</li></ul>

## C2 (Part 2)

### c2) Part 2: Whether the current rules for activating variant domains should be updated?

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Data from registrars regarding registrant situation of variant domains</li><li>- Data from registries regarding their current practice activating variant domains</li></ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Follow the current rules for activating variant labels</li><li>- Develop different rules for activating variant labels</li></ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>4 Meetings</b> <b>Foundational Question</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends changes to how ROs activate second-level variant labels*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Section 2.2.3 Registry Services Review</li><li>- Section 2.2.3.2 Customary Services</li></ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Yes</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Question 23 Registry Services</li><li>- Question 44 (optional)</li></ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Exhibit A of Registry Agreement</li><li>- IDN Implementation Guidelines</li></ul>

**c3) Should ROID be used to identify the same registrant for both existing and future variant domains? If not, what other mechanisms, if any, exist to identify the same registrant?**

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basics of ROID; data from ICANN Compliance (e.g., any issue with the use of ROIDs)</li> <li>- Data from registrars regarding the mechanism(s) of identifying the same registrant</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>For future registrations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, use ROID to identify the same registrant</li> <li>- No, use a different mechanism to identify same registrant</li> <li>- No specific recommendation, let registrars determine the appropriate mechanism</li> </ul> <p>For existing registrations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, use ROID retrospectively</li> <li>- No, grandfather existing practices</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>4 Meetings</b> <span style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"><i>Foundational Question</i></span>

***If EPDP Team recommends ROID or a specific mechanism to identify the same registrant***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Yes</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 25 Extensible Provisioning Protocol</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 4 for Registration Data Publication Services</li> </ul>

## c3a) Should additional requirements be developed if ROID is determined as the mechanism to identify the same registrant?

<b>Data</b>	Data from registrars regarding the mechanism(s) of identifying the same registrant
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	Depends on the answer to C3... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, develop additional requirements</li> <li>- No additional requirements from EPDP, let registrars determine additional requirements if needed</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends ROID and additional requirements to identify the same registrant*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Yes</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 25 Extensible Provisioning Protocol</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 4 for Registration Data Publication Services</li> </ul>

## c4) Should IDN tables under a gTLD be mutually coherent for an existing gTLD or a future gTLD?

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explanation of “mutually coherent”</li> <li>- Data from registries and back end registry service providers regarding current practice of making IDN tables mutually coherent</li> <li>- Data from ICANN org’s IDN table update project</li> <li>- Impact on existing registrations if harmonization is required</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>For future IDN tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, IDN tables must be required to be mutually coherent</li> <li>- No, IDN tables do not need to be mutually coherent</li> </ul> <p>For existing IDN tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, existing IDN tables must be required to be “mutually coherent” retrospectively and enforce compliance with existing registrations</li> <li>- No, grandfather existing IDN tables and existing registrations</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>4 Meetings</b> <span style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"><b>Foundational Question</b></span>

### ***If EPDP Team recommends IDN tables be mutually coherent***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 1.3 Information for Internationalized Domain Name Applicants</li> <li>- Section 1.3.2 IDN Tables</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Yes</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 15(a) If an IDN, attach IDN table for the proposed registry</li> <li>- Question 15(b) Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and source used</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IDN Implementation Guidelines</li> </ul>



## c4) Should variant domains under a single gTLD behave the same?

<b>Data</b>	SubPro PDP Recommendation 25.8: <i>Second-level labels derived from Recommendation 25.6 or Recommendation 25.7 are not required to act, behave, or be perceived as identical.</i>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	Affirm SubPro PDP Recommendation 25.8, which has already addressed this question
<b>Length</b>	<b>1 Meeting</b>

### ***If EPDP Team affirms SubPro PDP Recommendation 25.8***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>No</b> , no additional requirement as variant domains do not need to behave the same
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>No</b> , no additional requirement as variant domains do not need to behave the same
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>No</b> , no additional requirement as variant domains do not need to behave the same

## c5) How to harmonize IDN tables to ensure the ones under a gTLD are mutually coherent?

<b>Data</b>	Data from registries and back end registry service providers regarding their current practice of IDN table harmonization
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopt staff paper suggested method(s) of IDN table harmonization</li> <li>- Recommend a different method of IDN table harmonization</li> <li>- No specific recommendation, let registries determine their methods of IDN table harmonization</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends specific method(s) of IDN table harmonization*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>No</b> , implementation detail does not seem necessary for inclusion in AGB
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 15(b) Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and source used</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IDN Implementation Guidelines</li> </ul>

## c6) Should IDN tables use the LGR format, as specified in RFC 7940, for both existing gTLDs and future gTLDs?

### Data

- Data from registries regarding IDN table format
- Data from ICANN regarding IDN table format

### Potential Outcome

- For future IDN tables:
- Require LGR format as specified in RFC 7940
  - Recommend a different IDN table format
  - No specific recommendation, let registries determine IDN table format
- For existing IDN tables:
- Require LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 retroactively
  - Grandfather existing IDN Tables in their current formats

### Length

**2 Meetings**

## *If EPDP Team recommends the LGR format or a specific format for IDN tables*

### Next AGB

- Yes**, potential update to:
- Section 1.3 Information for Internationalized Domain Name Applicants
  - Section 1.3.2 IDN Tables

### Application Question

- Yes**, may impact how an applicant answers:
- Question 15(a) If an IDN, attach IDN table for the proposed registry
  - Question 15(b) Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and source used
  - Question 44 (optional)

### Contractual Obligation

- Yes**, potential update to:
- IDN Implementation Guidelines

**d4) Should the variant domains from a variant label set have the same behavior throughout the domain name lifecycle?**

**Data**

- Basics of domain name lifecycle stages
- SubPro PDP Recommendation 25.7

**Potential Outcome**

- Take into account the underlying principles of variant management mechanism...
- Yes, a variant label set must behave as one unit at all stages of the domain name lifecycle
  - No, a variant label set do not need to behave as one unit at any stage of the domain name lifecycle
  - Some stage(s) of the domain name lifecycle will require that a variant set behaves as one unit

**Length**

**4 Meetings** **Foundational Question**

***If EPDP Team recommends variant domains have the same behavior for one, some, or all stages in domain name lifecycle***

**Next AGB**

- Yes**, potential update to:
- Section 2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review

**Application Question**

- Yes**, may impact how an applicant answers:
- Question 27 Registration Life Cycle
  - Question 44 (optional)

**Contractual Obligation**

- Yes**, potential update to:
- Registrar Accreditation Agreement

## d5) Should each variant domain transaction incur fees paid to ICANN by its registry and registrar?

<b>Data</b>	Fees paid to ICANN by contracted parties
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	Take into consideration <a href="#">Preliminary Recommendation 7.6</a> regarding the calculation of the registry-level transaction fee... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each domain name registration will be considered an independent registration and require fee paid to ICANN by registry and registrar</li> <li>- A variant label set will be considered as one unit for fee purposes</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends how variant domain incur fees paid to ICANN by its registry and registrar*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>Maybe</b> , it is referenced in Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., pay recurring fees to ICANN) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- However, if the EPDP Team recommends any substantive update to RA Section 6.1, it will impact AGB</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>No</b> , does not seem necessary for inclusion as an application question; cannot find such a question in 2012 round
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Section 6.1 Registry-Level Fees</li> <li>- Registrar Accreditation Agreement?</li> </ul>

## d6) Whether and how should the Transfer Policy be updated for variant domains?

<b>Data</b>	Basics of Transfer Policy
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Depends on answer to D4...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transfer of one domain will affect the other domains from the variant label set</li> <li>- Transfer of one domain does not affect the other domains from the variant label set</li> <li>- Transfer of one domain may affect the other domains from the variant label set, depending on specific circumstances</li> <li>- Recommend other specific changes to transfer policy to preserve the underlying principles of variant management mechanism</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the Transfer Policy*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>No</b>, changes will be applied to the Transfer Policy directly, and AGB may only reference it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., comply with consensus policies and temporary policies)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 27 Registration Life Cycle</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transfer Policy</li> </ul>

## **d6a) Should the variant domains from a variant label set be transferred to the same entity as a remedy of UDRP?**

<b>Data</b>	Basics of UDRP and its remedy
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Depends on answer to D4 and D6...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transfer of the entire variant label set is required as a remedy of UDRP</li> <li>- Transfer of one domain name as a remedy of UDRP does not necessarily impact the other domains from the variant label set</li> <li>- Recommend specific changes to other dispute resolution mechanisms to preserve the underlying principles of variant management mechanism</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### ***If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the UDRP***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>No</b>, changes will be applied to the UDRP directly, and AGB may only reference it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., comply with consensus policies and temporary policies)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 29 Rights Protection Mechanism</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UDRP</li> </ul>

### d7) Whether and how should suspension related procedures be updated for variant domains?

<b>Data</b>	Basics of domain name suspension (voluntary and involuntary)
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Depends on answer to D4...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suspension of one domain will affect the other domains from the variant label set</li> <li>- Suspension of one domain does not affect the other domains from the variant label set</li> <li>- Suspension of one domain may affect the other domains from the variant label set, depending on specific circumstances</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends any changes to suspension related policies and procedures*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>No</b> , changes will be applied to suspension related policies and procedures directly (e.g., Section 3.7.7.2 in Registrar Accreditation Agreement), and AGB may only reference them.
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Maybe</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 28 Abuse Prevention and Mitigation</li> <li>- Question 29 Rights Protection Mechanism</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registrar Accreditation Agreement</li> </ul>



## d7a) Should all of the variant domains from a variant label set be suspended as a remedy of URS?

<b>Data</b>	Basics of URS and its remedy
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Depends on answer to D4 and D7...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suspension of the entire variant label set is required as a remedy of URS</li> <li>- Suspension of one domain name as a remedy of URS does not necessarily impact the other domains from the variant label set</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the URS*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>No</b>, changes will be applied to the URS directly, and AGB may only reference it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., implement post-launch rights protection measures)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 29 Rights Protection Mechanism</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- URS</li> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 7 for Minimum Requirements for Rights Protection Mechanisms (references URS)</li> </ul>

## d8) Should data with regard to variant domains be available in IANA WHOIS and Registry WHOIS?

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basics of WHOIS/RDAP</li> <li>- GDPR outcomes</li> <li>- Information from the Internationalization of Registration Data Group</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Take into account <a href="#">Implementation Guidance 9.2</a> regarding variant label state tracking...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend specific changes to IANA WHOIS and Registry WHOIS to record the registration data of a domain and its associated variant label set</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>3 Meetings</b>

### *If EPDP Team recommends any changes to WHOIS*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review</li> <li>- Section 5.2.3 Test Elements: Registry Systems (Whois support)</li> <li>- Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., provide whois service)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 26 Whois</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 4 for Registration Data Publication Services</li> </ul>

**f1) Should variant labels of a registered mark also be recorded in the TMCH? Are variant labels of a registered mark eligible to receive Sunrise and Trademark Claims services?**

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basics of TMCH and its Sunrise and Trademark Claims services</li> <li>- ICANN org collected data on TMCH</li> <li>- SAC060</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<p>Take into account <u>Preliminary Recommendation 3.16</u> regarding variant label application for .Brand TLDs...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change to TMCH and its services due to the exact match rule based on trademark law</li> <li>- Recommend specific changes to TMCH and its services by considering SAC060</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>2 Meetings</b>

***If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the TMCH***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>No</b>, changes will be applied to the TMCH directly, and AGB may only reference it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., implement start-up rights protection measures)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 29 Rights Protection Mechanism</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TMCH</li> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 7 for Minimum Requirements for Rights Protection Mechanisms (references TMCH)</li> </ul>

## f2) RPM catch all question

<b>Data</b>	Basics of rights protection mechanisms and dispute resolution procedures
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	Take into account <u>Preliminary Recommendation 7.12</u> regarding the remedy of TM-PDDRP and depends on answers to D6a, D7a, F1... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend other specific changes to RPMs to preserve the underlying principles of variant management mechanism</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>1 Meeting</b>

## *If EPDP Team recommends any changes to RPMs*

<b>Next AGB</b>	<b>No</b> , changes will be applied to RPMs directly, and AGB may only reference them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., implement post-launch rights protection measures)</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<b>Maybe</b> , may impact how an applicant answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 29 Rights Protection Mechanism</li> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<b>Yes</b> , potential update to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 7 for Minimum Requirements for Rights Protection Mechanisms (references RPMs)</li> </ul>

**g1) Since IDN Implementation Guidelines have contractual implications for registries and registrars, what is the proper mechanism for updating them in the future?**

<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- History of IDN Implementation Guidelines and current process for updating</li> <li>- Background of IDN Implementation Guidelines version 4.1 and related challenges</li> <li>- IDN ccTLDs' experience with IDN Implementation Guidelines</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend specific changes to how IDN Implementation Guidelines should be updated</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<b>4 Meetings</b> <span style="background-color: yellow; padding: 2px;"><b>Foundational Question</b></span>

***If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the update process of IDN Implementation Guidelines***

<b>Next AGB</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, changes will be applied to IDN Implementation Guidelines directly, and AGB may only reference it. See Section 1.3.2 IDN Tables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- However, if the EPDP Team recommends any fundamental change to the IDN Implementation Guidelines that will result in any substantive update to RA Specification 6, it will impact AGB</li> </ul>
<b>Application Question</b>	<p><b>Maybe</b>, may impact how an applicant answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 44 (optional)</li> </ul>
<b>Contractual Obligation</b>	<p><b>Yes</b>, potential update to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registry Agreement Specification 6 for Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications (references IDN Implementation Guidelines)</li> </ul>

**g1a) Should a separate legal mechanism, other than the IDN Implementation Guidelines, be created to enforce IDN related contractual obligations for registries and registrars?**

**Data**

- History of IDN Implementation Guidelines and current process for updating
- Background of IDN Implementation Guidelines version 4.1 and related challenges
- IDN ccTLDs' experience with IDN Implementation Guidelines

**Potential Outcome**

- Depends on answer to G1..
- No, there is no need for separate legal mechanism as the IDN Implementation Guidelines already suffice
  - Yes, there is a need for separate legal mechanism (develop a recommendation)
  - ccTLDs related consideration seem to be out of scope

**Length**

**2 Meetings**

***If EPDP Team recommends any changes to the update process of IDN Implementation Guidelines***

**Next AGB**

**Maybe**, changes will be applied to such a separate legal mechanism directly, and AGB may only reference it. See Section 5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator (e.g., comply with consensus policies and temporary policies)

- However, if the EPDP Team recommends any fundamental change to the IDN Implementation Guidelines that will result in any substantive update to RA Specification 6, it will impact AGB

**Application Question**

**Maybe**, may impact how an applicant answers:

- Question 44 (optional)

**Contractual Obligation**

**Yes**, potential update to:

- Registry Agreement Specification 6 for Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications (references IDN Implementation Guidelines)