

| Request for Issue Report   |   |
|--|---|
| Name of Requestor:   | Greg DiBiase  |
| Name of Stakeholder Group/Constituency/Advisory Committee (if applicable) in support of request: | Registrars Stakeholder Group  |
| Please provide rationale for policy development:   | <p>In some instances, a registry operator may wish to operate both the ASCII gTLD and the Latin diacritic version of the gTLD. In the vast majority of cases, the Latin script rules incorporated into the RZ-LGR have determined that the ASCII and Latin diacritic versions of a label will not be calculated as variant labels of each other.</p> <p>If an existing registry operator or a new applicant wishes to operate both the ASCII and Latin diacritic version of a label, they may be found visually confusingly similar. In respect of an existing gTLD, the applied-for label would be ineligible to proceed. For two new applied-for labels, they would be placed in a string contention set.</p> <p>If an ASCII and Latin diacritic pair are found to be visually confusingly similar, there is currently no mechanism to allow them to proceed forward.</p> |
| Brief explanation of how issue affects your SG/Constituency/Advisory Committee:                  | <p>Existing registry operators of an ASCII or Latin IDN may wish to operate the ASCII or Latin diacritic pair.</p> <p>New applicants may wish to apply for and operate both the ASCII and Latin diacritic labels.</p>   |
| Suggestions on specific items to be addressed in the Issue Report (if any):                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Analysis into the practice of omitting diacritics outside of the DNS, why it is done, and why/how it may be applicable to the DNS.</li> <li>● Analysis as to why the Latin Generation Panel determined that most diacritic letters are generally not defined as variants.</li> <li>● Development of a problem statement and consideration of the problem space: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ E.g., only limit to Latin script; applicable to existing and new applications; potential limits to application type.</li> <li>○ E.g., only limit to equivalent labels and how to define “equivalence”</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Consideration of which elements for the</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>EPDP-IDNs, both Phases 1 &amp; 2, may be applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of whether the ccTLD solution may be transferable to the gTLD space.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Please provide a concise definition of the issue presented and the problems raised by the issue, including quantification to the extent feasible:</p> | <p>An IDN gTLD with diacritics may be unlikely to co-exist with its base ASCII gTLD.</p> <p>The issue is theoretically possible for any existing ASCII or Latin IDN gTLD and is essentially infinite for future applied-for ASCII or Latin IDN gTLDs.</p>  |
| <p>What is the economic impact or effect on competition, consumer trust, privacy and other rights:</p>   | <p>In only being able to operate the ASCII or Latin IDN gTLD, a registry operator must make a choice between the two and in doing so, may potentially under-serve their local audience or their international audience. This may have an economic impact on the registry operator.</p> <p>If a solution to this issue is developed, it has the opportunity to enhance competition and choice.</p>  |
| <p>Please provide supporting evidence (if any):</p>  | <p>N/A</p>   |
| <p>How does this issue relate to the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws, the Affirmation of Commitments and/or ICANN's Articles of Incorporation:</p>        | <p>This issue is related to certain provisions contained in Annex G-2 of the ICANN Bylaws, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS;</li> <li>• functional and performance specifications for the provision of registry services; and,</li> <li>• security and stability of the registry database for a TLD.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Date Submitted:</p>   | <p>06 May 2024</p>   |
| <p>Expected Completion Date:</p>   | <p>Initiation request date + at least 45 calendar days</p>   |