

**GNSO Preliminary Issues
Report Policy Issues relating
to IDN at the top-level
*28 May 2006***

**Introduction to ccNSO
26 June, 2006
by Hiro Hotta**

Summary, Objective

- **this document**
 - sets out policy issues involved with the potential introduction of IDNs into the root zone of the DNS
 - provides relevant references, and
 - suggests how to proceed
- **this report is designed**
 - to give the GNSO Council the information necessary to make a decision about whether to proceed with a policy development process on policy aspects related to the introduction of IDNs at the root
- **the intention is**
 - to establish a full picture of issues that need to be dealt with before deployment of IDN TLDs can take place

Background

- **Technical tests of two approaches are under investigation**
 - **DNAME records** imply a situation where the operator of an existing TLD would map it into some other script equivalent, either synonymous to or a transliteration of the original TLD
 - **NS records** allow the creation of a new TLD that can be proposed by any entity regardless of whether it is currently operating a top-level domain or not

Policy Issues

- **possible scenarios**
 - a) A gTLD registry operator wishes to introduce an IDN based string that relates to the existing gTLD.
 - b) **A ccTLD registry operator wishes to introduce an IDN based string that relates to the existing ccTLD.**
 - c) A party may wish to introduce an IDN based string that relates to a gTLD, in competition with the gTLD registry operator.
 - d) **A party may wish to introduce an IDN based string that relates to a ccTLD in competition with the ccTLD.**
 - e) A party wishes to introduce a new IDN string with no relationship to an existing TLD.

Issues of relevance for selection criteria -1

- The operation of an IDN TLD registry require particular additional competences?
- In how far is it essential to safeguard against business failure of new IDN TLDs? Different from in new TLD cases in general?
- **How should the choice of the IDN string(s) be governed? Approaches for gTLDs and for ccTLDs differ?**
- To create internationalized equivalents of existing TLDs? How to promote competition and choice for end-users?
- **What selection and approval processes should apply to <.idn-tld> equivalent to <.tld>? phonetic transliteration definitional/literal transliteration? How should public policy aspects be reflected in such an approval process?**
- **A limit on the number of IDN top-level labels per existing TLD?**
- **Any entity be entitled to run an IDN equivalent or equivalents of this TLD? With what eligibility requirements?**
- **Relate to an official language within the country of the ccTLD? In what script when multiple scripts exist in the country?**

Issues of relevance for selection criteria -2

- **What is the accepted representation of a country name in non-Latin scripts? Manager of IDN ccTLD must be located within the geographic territory associated with the ccTLD?**
- **What considerations need to be made for languages and scripts used across multiple countries?**
- **What are the advantages and drawbacks of having a <.tld> and its equivalent <.idn-tld> in the same TLD or in different TLDs?**
 - **is there a policy preference to have domain names under <.tld> and <.idn-tld> resolve to the same website or to different sites?**
 - **<idn-domain>.<idn-tld> should be the same as <idn-domain>.<tld>? <domain>.<tld> and <domain>.<idn-tld> belong to one registrant? how about <idn-domain>.<tld> and <idn-domain>.<idn-tld>?**
- **Both DNAME record and NS record method lead to overall satisfactory results from a policy perspective?**
- **How can any risks for end user confusion best be counteracted?**

Issues of relevance for allocation methods

- **How to select a successful applicant**
 - **When more than one party apply for the same IDN top-level label**
 - **When more than one party apply for different IDN top-level labels but with identical purposes?**
- **How should conflicts between a proposed IDN top-level label and a trademark be resolved?**
- **In what order should applications for IDN top-level labels be handled in case of limited resources?**

Issues of relevance for contractual conditions

- **What particular contractual provisions required? How IETF IDN standards and ICANN's IDN Guidelines be incorporated?**
- **Current established policies adequate for IDNs? UDRP modification required? WHOIS information in different scripts?**
- **Should the script used on the second level match the script used in top-level? Mixing of scripts prohibited in <.idn-tld>?**
- **A registrant in <.tld> have a prior right to register in the IDN version <.idn-tld>? Would current domain name holders feel that they are forced to register in the IDN equivalent for brand protection? Does an IPR holder have a prior right to register in an IDN version?**
- **What rules should govern timing and sequencing of the launch of IDN top-level domains? Is there a need for sunrise periods? Is there a need for concurrent launch of multiple IDN top-level domains for fair competition reasons?**

Other Aspects

- **Email interoperability**
- **Browser appearance of various identifiers**
- **etc.**

Recommendations

- GNSO launch a PDP, **in cooperation with the ccNSO (on the ccTLD aspects)** and the GAC (on the public policy aspects), as well as in close consultation with the broader ICANN community

Proposed approach and next steps

1. GNSO and **ccNSO** jointly complete the policy issues inventory, requesting advice from the GAC, IDN-PAC as appropriate.
2. GNSO and **ccNSO** jointly prioritize the issues, selecting those essential for a launch, resolve how to address them and by whom.
3. GNSO and **ccNSO**, individually and/or jointly, examine the issues and propose solutions, in particular relating to the issue areas identified in the PDP for new gTLDs.
4. Consultation of the **ccNSO** during a GNSO PDP, two options:
 - (a) Regular, informal consultations between **ccNSO** and GNSO during the GNSO PDP, without a formal **ccNSO** PDP, or
 - (b) **ccNSO** also launches and goes with a formal PDP with mutual consultation by way of mutual liaisons

Joint ccNSO/GNSO WG on IDN be tasked with prioritizing the issues, proposing a selection of issues to address and how to address them.

5. ICANN staff also recommends that the GNSO Council take as its starting point the **joint ccNSO/GNSO WG**

Discussions among ccTLDs

Discussions among ccTLDs - 1

- **Issues that should collect focus seems to be**
 - (1) selection of IDN ccTLD string(s)**
 - who selects
 - what the approval criteria are
 - how many
 - how collisions are resolved

==> solved through cooperation among local & global efforts
 - (2) selection of IDN ccTLD manager**
 - automatic assignment to the existing ASCII ccTLD manager?
 - new selection?

==> mainly solved at the local level
 - (3) harmonious user experience at the global level**
 - no need?
 - to some extent?

==> solved through best practice or guidelines elaborated globally, if such harmony is considered necessary

Discussions among ccTLDs - 2

- **Cooperation between gNSO and ccNSO**
 - Necessary ?
- **Necessity of ccNSO PDP**
 - Yes / No ?
 - Each ccTLD has its own situation in cultures and languages, and it seems impossible or even inappropriate to force all the ccTLDs to follow such a global policy
 - Or, such policy may be empty
- **Selection of IDN TLD strings**
 - cannot be solved by each country or region alone
 - must follow the global rules (at ICANN level) once we decide to stick to a single authoritative root. So, ccTLDs have to give voices to the policy of new TLD
- **Selection of new TLDs (incl. IDN-TLD) and managers**

GIVE COMMENTS INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY

Discussions among ccTLDs - 3

- To make one step further in selecting IDN ccTLD string
- one idea is to come up with a parallel table

ASCII TLD

(ISO 3166)

:

.JP

:

IDN TLD

(string related to the name of the country)

:

.日本

:

- lots of hurdles expected even in this step
 - decision on who should propose the IDN string
 - situation where 2 or more official languages exist in one cc
 - decision on whether the string is related to the cc's name
 - collision resolution (although bare possibility)
- However
 - seems necessary anyway on the way to full deployment of IDN TLDs