



Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) Request

July 12, 2021

Registry Operator

Public Interest Registry

Request Details

Case Number: 00964415

This Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) request form should be submitted for review by ICANN org when a registry operator is adding, modifying, or removing a Registry Service for a TLD or group of TLDs.

The RSEP Process webpage provides additional information about the process and lists RSEP requests that have been reviewed and/or approved by ICANN org. If you are proposing a service that was previously approved, we encourage you to respond similarly to the most recently approved request(s) to facilitate ICANN org's review.

Certain known Registry Services are identified in the Naming Services portal (NSp) case type list under "RSEP Fast Track" (example: "RSEP Fast Track – BTAPPA"). If you would like to submit a request for one of these services, please exit this case and select the specific Fast Track case type. Unless the service is identified under RSEP Fast Track, all other RSEP requests should be submitted through this form.

Helpful Tips

- Click the "Save" button to save your work. This will allow you to return to the request at a later time and will not submit the request.
- You may print or save your request as a PDF by clicking the printer icon in the upper right corner. You must click "Save" at least once in order to print the request.
- Click the "Submit" button to submit your completed request to ICANN org.
- Complete the information requested below. All fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required. If not applicable, respond with "N/A."

1. PROPOSED SERVICE DESCRIPTION

1.1. Name of proposed service.

Addition of IDN languages to .ORG.

1.2. Provide a general description of the proposed service including the impact to external users and how it will be offered.

Additional language scripts will be offered in .ORG allowing users to register domains using those languages.

1.3. Provide a technical description of the proposed service.

PIR will provide registration of internationalized domain names (IDNs) in .ORG. To accomplish this, we seek approval to add the following IDNs:

Croatian HR
Finnish FI
Hindi HIN-DEVA
Italian IT
Montenegrin ME
Portuguese PT
Japanese

1.4. If this proposed service has already been approved by ICANN org, identify and provide a link to the RSEP request for the same service that was most recently approved.

No, the request to add these languages has not already been approved by ICANN.

1.5. Describe the benefits of the proposed service and who would benefit from the proposed service.

Providing registrants around the world with the ability to register more meaningful and regionally specific domain names will broaden consumer choices in the marketplaces where they work and live. An important part of this is enabling registrants to register domain names in different languages. PIR wants to provide more of this capability for .ORG.

1.6. Describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed service.

We will implement a 90-day notification with registrars and technical teams once this RSEP is approved by ICANN.

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

turkish-trtxt

1.8. If the proposed service adds or modifies Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) languages or scripts that have already been approved in another RSEP request or are considered pre-approved by ICANN org, provide (a) a reference to the RSEP request, TLD(s), and IDN table(s) that were already approved or (b) a link to the pre-approved Reference Label Generation Rules (LGR). Otherwise, indicate “not applicable.”

Yes, language tables such as these have been added in numerous TLDs in the gTLD space.

The most current IDN requirements will be used to evaluate a submitted table.

2. SECURITY AND STABILITY

2.1. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the life cycle of domain names?

This change will not impact the domain lifecycle.

2.2. Does the proposed service alter the storage and input of Registry Data?

No.

2.3. Explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems.

Not applicable.

2.4. Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service? If so, identify the concerns and describe how you intend to address those concerns.

None.

2.5. Describe the quality assurance plan and/or testing of the proposed service prior to deployment.

The following information describes the development and quality assurance process used to create and evaluate all IDN tables. Afilias, as our backend services provider, evaluates IDN tables on the following categories:

1. Conformance to IDNA: Afilias was actively involved in efforts to evolve the IDNA standards to ensure they are more responsive to technical and social needs, as reflected in RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 and 6452. Each Unicode character, including variants, that are captured within the IDN table are analyzed against the IDNA protocol to ensure full compliance; examples

of incompatibility includes characters that are prohibited in IDNA. Incompatible characters are excluded from the tables.

2. Completeness of the Table: Afilias determines whether the IDN table is technically complete, ensuring that there are no corner cases that may lead to confusion to end-users. In this process, specifically if variants exist, Afilias analyzes each character and its associated variants to ensure that each character produces the same set of variants. If all variant mappings and reverse mappings correlate, the IDN table is considered complete. Any exceptions are raised to subject matter experts for further evaluation and recommendations.

3. Registration and administration policies: In the analysis of supporting IDNs, certain languages include specific linguistic policies, which Afilias adheres to. Examples include policies derived from the ASIWG for Arabic Scripts and for Cyrillic IDNs, Afilias references RFC 5992.

4. Registry policies: Upon successful evaluation of the IDN tables and its registration policies, Afilias considered additional policies to ensure consistency of implementation, as well as to prevent potential abusive behavior to ensure a high quality of service.

2.6. Identify and list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.

In the implementation of the IDN registration and resolution services, PIR and Afilias will adhere to the relevant IETF standards, including RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, and 5893, and their updates, as well as the ICANN IDN Implementation Guidelines (including the 3.0 version announced for implementation on 22 November 2011:

<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-22nov11-en.htm>).

3. COMPETITION

3.1. Do you believe the proposed service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.

Offering these IDN languages gives registrants more choice in the marketplace.

3.2. How would you define the markets in which the proposed service would compete?

The IDN languages would complete in the existing global marketplace.

3.3. What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to the proposed service?

Existing registrars provide other TLDs for registrants to choose.

3.4. In view of your status as a Registry Operator, would the introduction of the proposed service potentially affect the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?

No.

3.5. Do you propose to work with a vendor or contractor to provide the proposed service? If so, what is the name of the vendor/contractor and describe the nature of the services the vendor/contractor would provide.

Afilias is PIR's backend services provider and will provide the technical capability and service as per the PIR and Afilias agreement.

3.6. Have you communicated with any of the entities whose products or services might be affected by the introduction of your proposed service? If so, please describe the communications.

No, PIR has not communicated the IDN languages listed in this RSEP. As noted earlier, PIR will send communication 90 days prior to launch to registrars.

3.7. If you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of the proposed service, attach them below. ICANN will keep the documents confidential.

4. CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS

4.1. List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the proposed service. This includes, but is not limited to, Consensus Policies, previously approved amendments or services, Reserved Names, and Rights Protection Mechanisms.

Public Interest Registry's .ORG Registry Agreement Exhibit A, Section 4, Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs).

4.2. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the reporting of data to ICANN?

There will be no effect on the reporting of data to ICANN if this proposed service is approved.

4.3. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS)?*

None.

4.4. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the price of a domain name registration?

None at this time.

4.5. Will the proposed service result in a change to a Material Subcontracting Arrangement (MSA) as defined by the Registry Agreement? If so, identify and describe the change. Please

note that a change to an MSA requires consent from ICANN org through the MSA change request process. The RSEP request must be approved prior to submitting the MSA change request.

No.

5. AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE

5.1. A Registry Agreement (RA) amendment is required when the proposed service: (i) contradicts existing provisions in the RA or (ii) is not contemplated in the RA and, therefore, needs to be added to Exhibit A of the RA and/or as an appropriate addendum/appendix. If applicable, provide draft language (or a link to previously approved RA amendment language) describing the service to be used in an RA amendment if the proposed service is approved. If an RA amendment is not applicable, respond with “N/A” and provide a complete response to question 5.2.*

For examples or for IDN services, you may refer to the webpage for standard RA template amendments for commonly requested Registry Services.

PIR believes the previously approved RA amendment language for "Adding IDN Languages/Scripts" is appropriate here. The link to that language may be found here: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ra-amend-template-idn-add-language-script-29jan18-en.pdf>

5.2. If the proposed service is permissible under an existing provision in the Registry Agreement, identify the provision and provide rationale. If not applicable, respond with “N/A” and provide a complete response to question 5.1.

Not applicable. (We can check with Brian to make sure I am reading this correctly).

6. CONSULTATION

6.1. ICANN org encourages you to set up a consultation call through your Engagement Manager prior to submitting this RSEP request. This is to help ensure that necessary information is assembled ahead of time.

Identify if and when you had a consultation call with ICANN org. If you did not request a consultation call, provide rationale.

Yes, PIR had a consultation with ICANN on October 6, 2020. Lisa Carter facilitated the call. We appreciate ICANN's consultation and thank the ICANN staff for their time.

6.2. Describe your consultations with the community, experts, and/or others. This can include, but is not limited to, the relevant community for a sponsored or community TLD, registrars or the registrar constituency, end users and/or registrants, or other constituency groups. What were the quantity, nature, and results of the consultations? How will the proposed service impact these groups? Which groups support or oppose this proposed service?

Registrars have shared positive feedback with PIR regarding the addition of the requested IDN languages. Also, PIR has received inquiries from registrants requesting additional languages.

7. OTHER

7.1. Would there be any intellectual property impact or considerations raised by the proposed service?

No.

7.2. Does the proposed service contain intellectual property exclusive to your gTLD registry?

No.

7.3. Provide any other relevant information to include with the request. If none, respond with "N/A."

Not applicable.

7.4. If additional information should be considered, attach one or more file(s) below.

Affected TLDs

Current Registry Operator	Top Level Domain	Registry Agreement Date
Public Interest Registry	org	2019-06-30