

# GNSO -GAC JOINT MEETING

LOS ANGELES  
28 OCTOBER 2007



# Issues for today's meeting

- ☼ Update on activities in:
  - ☼ Inter Governmental Organisation (IGO) Domain Name Dispute Resolution Procedure (DRP)
  - ☼ Domain Tasting
  - ☼ Whois
- ☼ Open Discussion on IDN ccTLDs

# IGO DRP

- ✿ Staff produced issues report 15 June 2007
- ✿ GNSO asked staff to produce a draft IGO Domain Name DRP primarily intended for new gTLDs
- ✿ Staff produced this report on 28 Sep 2007
- ✿ Council scheduled to vote on whether to initiate PDP on 31 Oct 2007. If approved, would study and decide on the policy implications of the current staff proposal
  - ✿ PDP would need to determine whether it applied to 2nd level domain names for both existing and new gTLDs

# IGO DRP II

- ✻ In terms of new gTLDs at the top level, they will be subject to objection process
- ✻ Some open issues relating to policy at the 2nd level include:
  - ✻ Previous inability to reach consensus on WIPO-2 and UDRP issues in 2003
  - ✻ Question relating to degree of actual abuse in existing TLDs
  - ✻ Utility of .int in establishing bona fide IGO registrations
  - ✻ Some IGO designators correspond to regular words or names (WHO, Who and who)
  - ✻ Need to deal with both current TLDs and new gTLDs
- ✻ No recent substantive discussion in council on these issues yet.

# Domain Tasting

- ✿ Following ALAC's request, GNSO requested an Issues report on Domain Tasting
- ✿ After receiving the report GNSO decided to create an ad-hoc group for further fact finding on Domain Tasting
- ✿ This ad-hoc group has submitted an Outcomes Report
- ✿ Council will hold an open discussion and then vote on initiating a PDP on 31 Oct.
- ✿ Terms of reference were recommended in the ad-hoc group's report

# Domain Tasting II

✻ Proposed Terms of reference for PDP include:

1. Review and assess all the effects of domain tasting activities that have been identified.
2. Judge whether the overall effects justify measures to be taken to impede domain tasting.
3. If the answer to 2 is affirmative, then consider the potential impacts of various measures on the Constituencies, and recommend measures designed to impede domain tasting.

# Whois

- ✱ Studies currently being investigated by staff based on GNSO resolution to ask for studies. This corresponds to point 4.2 in the *GAC Principles regarding gTLD Whois services*
- ✱ Many open questions about
  - ✱ Need for study
  - ✱ Scope of study
  - ✱ Methodology for study
  - ✱ Status of ongoing study if PDP is concluded

# Whois I

- ✻ Whois WG on OPoC implementation completed its work with strong support on many compromise issues but absence of strong support on some important issues, including:
  - ✻ OPoC responsibility for Reveal function
  - ✻ Authorisation policy for access to concealed information



# Whois III

- ✻ The Whois WG used the *GAC Principles regarding gTLD Whois services* as a reference throughout the process.
- ✻ In addition to council and constituency members WG Participants included:
  - ✻ Some GAC members in their individual capacity
  - ✻ Individuals representing several governmental agencies
  - ✻ Individuals representing several industry groups
  - ✻ Individual registrants and users

# Whois II

- ✻ Open discussion and vote scheduled for 31 Oct
- ✻ 3 Motions on the table - still in discussion
  1. Asks staff to propose an implementation of OPoC that takes into account the work done in the TF, the WG and the comments received in response to that work
  2. Postpones further decisions on OPoC until after the studies being investigated by staff are completed
  3. Recommends that Board consider “sunsetting” the Whois requirements in the Registrar contract due to the lack of consensus if motion #1 does not pass.

# Whois IV

- ✻ GNSO interest in GAC's current position regarding:
  - ✻ Board's unanimous approval on 10 May 2006 of GNSO council Resolution 20051128-05 regarding conflicts between local/nation mandatory privacy laws or regulations and applicable provisions of the ICANN contract regarding the collection, display and distribution of personal data via the gTLD WHOIS service.

# IDN ccTLD

- ✻ GNSO has developed a draft set of comments responding to Board resolution 07.56 requesting responses to the issues and questions regarding IDN ccTLDs

# Summary of responses I

1. IDN-labelled TLDs (both cc and g) should be introduced as soon as practicable after technical requirements and tests are successfully completed.
2. The introduction of IDN-labelled gTLDs or ccTLDs should not be delayed because of lack of readiness of one category, but if they are not introduced at the same time, steps should be taken to ensure neither category is disadvantaged because of a delayed implementation.
3. Conflict avoidance procedures should be developed if IDN-labelled gTLDs are ready for introduction before IDN-labelled ccTLDs

# Summary of responses II

4. We support an interim solution whereby each territory designated in the ISO 3166-1 list would be granted one IDN label in the near term if doing so more quickly satisfies user needs.
5. The user experience is one of the fundamental motivations for deployment of IDNs and should therefore be a guiding principle in implementation decisions.
6. Any added IDN label for a territory designated in the ISO 3166-1 list should be for the sole purpose of benefiting the language community (or communities) designated by the new label.

# Summary of responses III

7. IDN ccTLD strings should be meaningful to the local community and should represent, in scripts of the corresponding government's choice, a meaningful representation of the territory's name in the selected script.
8. If multiple scripts are in official use in a territory, the best user experience would be to provide, where feasible, IDN labels in all of those scripts.
9. Confusingly similar strings should be avoided.

# Summary of responses IV

10. Measures must be taken to limit confusion and collisions due to variants.
11. Consideration should be given to the risks for homoglyphic spoofing.
12. Variable string length is the appropriate approach for IDN labels for territories designated in the ISO 3166-1 list.



# Summary of responses V

13. A suitable process for consultation, including with relevant language communities, is needed when considering new IDN labels for the top-level.
14. Where script mixing occurs or is necessary across multiple levels, registries must implement clear procedures to prevent spoofing and visual confusion for users.
15. Operators of top-level domain registries with IDN labels for territories designated by the ISO 3166-1 list should be required to follow the ICANN IDN Guidelines just like gTLD registries that offer IDNs

THANK YOU

