IDN Scoping Team

Edmon Chung

GNSO Council Meeting
24 October 2019

Background

- The IDN Scoping Team was tasked by the GNSO Council to:
  - **Consider** the topic of IDNs holistically and accordingly, consider the likely issues that may require some form of resolution
  - **Consider** if the issues identified are well understood, researched, and analyzed, especially in existing in staff reports
  - **Make a recommendation** to the GNSO Council on the proper mechanisms(s) to address the issues
  - **Make a recommendation** to the GNSO Council on the preferred method for coordination with the ccNSO

- The IDN Scoping Team has been meeting on a bi-weekly basis since August 2019 and has concentrated on reviewing two key documents:
  - **IDN Implementation Guidelines**
  - **IDN Variant TLD Recommendations**

Initial Findings: Two Groups of Issues

1

Operational Issues

- Potential differences between IDN Guidelines and RA
- Updating and evolving IDN tables

2

Policy Issues

- Process to update IDN Implementation Guidelines
- Second-level variant requirements, especially same-entity, and all of the accompanying impacts to other processes and policies (**string requirements, string similarity, transfers, RPMs, RA, EBERO, etc.**)

Some concerns expressed that there is insufficient expertise on the small team to properly understand the impacts to other processes and policies (e.g., RPMs).

Are other Councilors/GNSO community interested in joining? Is there need for SMEs during this scoping stage?

Preliminary Thinking

About the Staff Papers in General

The small team is largely in agreement with the findings and recommendations in the staff papers

However…

Policy development is needed, even if to codify staff recommendations;

Any subsequent PDP is not required to adopt staff recommendations

Mechanisms to Complete Work

The small team believes that two streams of work may be needed:

1) Direct interaction between ICANN org & affected parties for operational issues;
2) A policy development track

Coordination with the ccNSO

- Because there is policy development for both the GNSO and ccNSO, **CCWG does not make sense.**
- The GNSO/ccNSO scoping teams each already had **liaisons** and the small team believes **this practice should be maintained** if/when policy development is initiated.
- While no agreement on coordination mechanism, at a minimum, **PDP leadership and/or liaisons could meet on a regular basis** (e.g., every two weeks) to coordinate.

Engage with ICANN

Thank You and Questions

Visit us at **icann.org**
Email: email

@icann

linkedin/company/icann

facebook.com/icannorg

slideshare/icannpresentations

youtube.com/icannnews

soundcloud/icann

flickr.com/icann

instagram.com/icannorg