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The Goal of Sub-group 3

To identify cross-over issues arising from the introduction of IDNs at the top level including new gTLDs (cc NSO IDN WG Charter)
Cross-over Issues on IDNs at the Top Level

- Application (String, Registry selection) criteria of IDN TLDs in new gTLD process
  - Should the same selection criteria be applied to ascii and IDN TLDs in the new gTLD rounds?

< New gTLD evaluation process >
- Preliminary evaluation stage the application will be approved if:
  - Application meets objective technical, business criteria
  - Technical stability is assured
  - String is not a reserved name
  - String is not confusingly similar to existing or proposed string
  - There's no string contention
  - No formal objection is raised
- If not, what should be an additional set of application criteria (requirements) for IDN TLDs in the new gTLD rounds?

  • Should the applicant be required to demonstrate broad-based support from the local language community? (GNSO IDN WG’s Final Report)

  • If yes, how to determine the local language community?
    - In some cases it would be relatively easy to define the corresponding local language community (i.e. one language: one country (or territory), whereas it may not be so easy for others (i.e. multiple language: multiple country (or territories))

  • Should there be a consultation process with ccNSO and possibly the GAC?

  • How do we incorporate the consultation process within the new gTLDs process?
Cross-over Issues on IDN at the Top Level

- **Reserved geographical & geopolitical names**
  - all geographic & geopolitical names in the ISO 3166-1 list (e.g. Portugal, India, Canada) & names of territories, distinct geographic and geopolitical names as ICANN may direct from time to time

- GNSO IDN WG Final Report (’07.3) : 4.1.2. GAC Consultation on Geo-political Impact:
  - Agreement that, within the process for new gTLD consideration, the process for determining whether a string has a geo-political impact is a challenge, and that GAC consultation may be necessary but may not provide comprehensive responses.

- Should the ccNSO be included within the consultation process on reserved geographical and geopolitical names?
  - If so, what would be the suitable consultation process? Jointly working with the GAC and relevant language community?
  - Should the consultation process be made prior to application? Or during application process?
4.1.2. GAC Consultation on Geo-political Impact:

Agreement that, within the process for new gTLD consideration, the process for determining whether a string has a geo-political impact is a challenge, and that GAC consultation may be necessary but may not provide comprehensive responses.

4.1.3. Language Community Input for Evaluation of new IDN gTLD Strings:

Agreement that a suitable process for consultation, including with relevant language communities, is needed when considering new IDN gTLD strings. 4.2.10

- In reference to the development of a suitable process for consultation (See previous section on “Agreement that a suitable process for consultation, including with relevant language communities, is needed when considering new IDN gTLD strings”); Support for a suitably convened language committee, fairly representing the geographic distribution of the respective language community worldwide, to review the selection/adoption of an IDN gTLD string in that particular language.
New gTLD evaluation process

- Preliminary evaluation stage the application will be approved if:
  - Application meets objective technical, business criteria
  - Technical stability is assured
  - String is not a reserved name
  - String is not confusingly similar to existing or proposed string
  - There’s no string contention
  - No formal objection is raised

- Issues raised in the preliminary evaluation may be resolved in an extended evaluation procedure characterised by a set of dispute resolution process