



# **Item #5: Latin Script Diacritics PDP**

## **GNSO Council Meeting**

10 Sep. 2026

# Latin Script Diacritics PDP

## AGENDA

---

### 01 Background and Overview

- LD PDP Overview
- Progress Update

### 02 LD PDP Final Outputs

- Output Overview
- Priority Outputs

### 03 Community Input

- PC Overview
- Changes since PC

### 04 Impact Assessment

- GPI, HRIA,  
Existing CPs

### 05 Next Steps

- Upcoming Process

### 06 Q&A

- Discussions



# **Background and Overview**

# Overview

## Latin Script Diacritics (LD) PDP



Examples of ASCII and LD gTLD Strings: **.cafe** and **.café**  
**.facade** and **.façade**

Visually similar • Not variants

### Issue

Current rules present a risk that **ASCII gTLD and its LD version(s) cannot be both delegated due to visual similarity**. Per RZ-LGR, vast majority of LDs are determined not to be considered variants.

### Policy Goal

To assess the circumstances under which an **ASCII gTLD and its LD version(s) could be simultaneously delegated**. Current RZ-LGR does not deal with this situation.

### Approach

Considering the **exceptional nature** of the process, the WG leveraged **existing IDN policy**, where applicable, to determine **character eligibility and the LD Set requirements, identify measures, risks, and safeguards**.

### Considerations

**Impact Assessments on Global Public Interest, Human Rights, and existing Consensus Policies**

### Outcome

**57 final outputs:**  
- **45 final recommendations**  
- 12 implementation guidance  
  
All received **Full Consensus**.

# Progress Update

## LD PDP PROGRESS

- ❖ LD PDP WG published its **Initial Report in January 2026**.
- ❖ LD PDP WG went through a thorough **Public Comment Review** process.





# **LD PDP Final Outputs**

# Output Overview (1/2)

## LD PDP FINAL OUTPUTS

57

45 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS  
12 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE

100%

FULL CONSENSUS

### Topic 1: Requirements for the Set at the Top-level

Final Recommendation 1

### Topic 2: “Same Entity” Principle at the Top-level

Final Recommendation 2

### Topic 3: Application Submission, Administrative Check, Initial Evaluation

Final Outputs 3-17

### Topic 4: Contractual Requirements

Final Outputs 18-29

### Topic 5: Delegation and Removal

Final Outputs 30-40

### Topic 6: Requirements for the Set at the Second-level

Final Recommendations 41-42

### Topic 7: “Same Entity” Principle at the Second-level and IDN Table Harmonization

Final Outputs 43-47

### Topic 8: Adjustments in Registration Processes Pertinent to the Domain Name Lifecycle

Final Outputs 48-57

# Output Overview (2/2)

## KEY TAKEAWAYS

---

Outputs Leveraged Existing IDNs Policy; Mirrored EPDP-IDNs

Same Entity Principle; Key safeguard per the WG Charter

Conservatism Principle; Narrow Scope for Exception Process

Engagement from ICANN org and Board Liaisons

# Final Outputs (1/2)

## TOP-LEVEL: PRIORITY OUTPUTS

### REC 1 | Define the ASCII/LD gTLD Set

Eligibility of characters, ASCII gTLD base requirement, no overlap with Variant TLD Set.

### REC 5 | Single application

Apply for the ASCII gTLD string and corresponding LD gTLD string(s) together as one set.

### REC 6 | Only one exception path

ASCII gTLD and its corresponding LD gTLD strings cannot proceed independently through separate applications.

### REC 7 | Resolve exemptions

Defines when pre-existing stand-alone gTLD exemptions can end / convert. The ultimate goal is to end all exemptions.

### REC 15 | Future Set application fee

Future set applications follow the New gTLD Program cost recovery principle.

### REC 16 | Corresponding string application fee

Corresponding gTLD string applications also follow the Program's cost recovery principle; ICANN org determines proportional discount, if any.

### REC 37 | ASCII gTLD removal

Removing ASCII gTLD is possible but dissolves the set; 10-year cool-off until possible for reassignment to another entity (i.e., outside of the set).

### REC 38 | LD gTLD removal

Removing LD string(s) is possible without removing the rest and/or dissolving the set; 10-year cool-off until possible for reassignment to another entity (i.e., outside of the set).

#### Key points for Top-level:

Set requirements • same entity • single exceptional path for application • single contract for the Set • conservative delegation and removal rules

# Final Outputs (2/2)

## SECOND-LEVEL: PRIORITY OUTPUTS

### REC 41 | Define the ASCII/LD Domain Set

Extends the set concept across valid second-level labels and their variants under each TLD.

### REC 42 | Second-level LGR baseline

ICANN org should create template/minimum LGRs for gTLD registry operators managing ASCII/LD gTLD Sets; diacritized ASCII letters from the eligible character list become blocked variants at baseline; any optional changes are to be reviewed by ICANN org.

### REC 43 | Same entity

The same entity principle applies to the second-level, including those labels that are diacritic versions within an LD gTLD Set; thus, allocatable names in the ASCII/LD Domain Set go only to the same registrant and same sponsoring registrar.

### REC 45 | Exemption; protect existing registrations

Non-conforming existing domain names are exempted; no retroactive change to allocation or contracts.

### REC 53 | Outreach

ICANN org MUST provide necessary information to relevant stakeholders to enhance their understanding of LD Sets and their requirements, in particular, their potential impact on dispute resolution proceedings.

#### Key points for Second-level:

Set requirements • consistent LGR • same entity •  
Exemption rules and protection for existing registrations • predictable lifecycle management • effective outreach



# Community Input

# Public Comment Overview

## Public Comment for Initial Report – SNAPSHOT

### KEY FACTS

#### 40 DAYS

Initial Report published on 12 January 2026 for a 40-day Public Comment.

#### 54 → 57

The Initial Report had 54 preliminary outputs; Final Report now contains 57 outputs after review and refinement.

#### COMMENT COUNT

The Initial Report received input from 16 commenters, including substantive comments for 29 outputs among 54 outputs.

#### KEY INPUT

All community submissions and ICANN org input were reviewed thoroughly through the [Public Comment Review Tool](#) and incorporated, as appropriate.

#### Character eligibility

Concerns that the eligible characters were too limited, focusing on decomposability that was too restrictive.

#### Conservatism

Key concerns from ICANN org, requesting the WG to strengthen the outputs respecting the exception framework.

#### Second-level consistency

Concerns on consistency for top- and second-level rules, while also requesting stronger same-entity rules for the second-level.

#### Fee policy for operations

Registry-level fee policy was asked to be within ICANN org discretion and not guided by the policy development process.

### KEY CONCERNS

#### Impact Assessment

3 commenters expressly supported the GPI analysis and HRIA; NCSG offered suggestions for HRIA improvement.

# Changes Since Public Comment

## What materially changed after Public Comment?

---

### ● EXPANDED

#### Character Eligibility and Rules

Rec. 1 expanded beyond decomposable characters to be defined as “LATIN SMALL LETTER ... WITH ...” characters; Rec. 41 extended the same entity rules to cover diacritic second-level labels.

### ● STRENGTHENED

#### Exception Process

Rec. 6 was newly created to establish that corresponding ASCII and LD gTLD strings may only proceed together, not separately, through the LD PDP exception process.

### ● ADDED

#### Exemption for Top-level, Application Scenarios, and Second-level Safeguards

Recs. 6 and 7 were newly created to establish rules for exemption at the top-level; IG 9 added to illustrate different scenarios when gTLDs are withdrawn during application; Rec. 42 added a minimum LGR baseline.

### ● CLARIFIED/ REMOVED

#### Fees & Operations

Application fees remain tied to cost recovery; registry-level fee recommendations were removed as these tie to ICANN org’s operational/financial discretion.



# Impact Assessment

# Impact Assessment

## GLOBAL PUBLIC INTEREST (GPI)

**Overall assessment:** generally positive

**Why:** enables a more diverse and multilingual Internet while retaining security, stability, and predictability safeguards.

## HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT ASSESSMENT (HRIA)

**Overall assessment:** positive rather than negative

**Why:** enables a more diverse and multilingual Internet that ensures safe participation through a transparent and accountable process.

**Risks noted:** fees, process complexity, awareness gaps, and impacts on underserved communities.

## EXISTING CONSENSUS POLICIES

**Overall assessment:** low impact

Most policies have minimal to no impact; however, **UDRP and Transfer Policy/TDRP were identified as potentially low-impact** where they may need to evolve/adapt in the future; but the current recs (Recs. 50-51) align with existing policy and do not pose any conflicts.

## Why overall low impact

The framework largely mirrors established IDN policy (*in particular, EPDP-IDNs Phases 1 & 2 that are already adopted*), adding necessary safeguards to mitigate risks and provide opportunities, rather than negatively impacting the public interest or changing the substantive standards of existing Consensus Policies.



# Next Steps

# Next Steps

## TENTATIVE TIMELINE

---





# Q&A