Public Comment Summary Report

Phase 2 Initial Report of the EPDP on Internationalized Domain Names

Open for Submissions Date:
Thursday, 11 April 2024

Closed for Submissions Date:
Tuesday, 21 May 2024

Summary Report Due Date:
Thursday, 20 June 2024 (extended from Tuesday, 04 June 2024)

Category: Policy

Requester: Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

ICANN org Contact(s): saewon.lee@icann.org

Open Proceeding Link: https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/phase-2-initial-report-of-the-epdp-on-internationalized-domain-names-11-04-2024

Outcome:
The Public Comment proceeding was open during 11 April 2024 through 21 May 2024. The period was not extended but the EPDP-IDNs leadership team accepted one (1) late submission, at their discretion.

The EPDP-IDNs Team received a total of eight (8) submissions from groups, organizations, and individuals. The comments received will greatly support the Team to continue with deliberations for the final output, including the development of final recommendations and implementation guidance, where they will conduct a thorough review of all the comments received and consider whether any changes need to be made to the Preliminary Output.

Section 1: What We Received Input On

The EPDP Team sought input on its twenty (20) Preliminary Outputs (14 Preliminary Recommendations and 6 Implementation Guidance) included in the Phase 2 Initial Report, covering issues pertaining to second-level variant management. Specifically, the Phase 2 Initial Report focused on Phase 2 questions included in the EPDP Team's charter on the following topics:

- "Same entity" at the second-level and IDN Table harmonization
- Operational and legal impact of the "same entity" principle to a domain name cycle
    - Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle
    - Adjustments in registration dispute-resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms

- Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines

The Public Comment proceeding was presented as a series of structured questions while also providing an opportunity for respondents to provide general submissions. When submitting the responses, the respondents were also requested to include detailed rationale to support further analyses of the relevant issues.

Section 2: Submissions

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
ICANN org	Michael Karakash	
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	Mesumbe Tomslin Samme-Nlar	
Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG)	Sarah Wyld	
Business Constituency (BC)	BC	
Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)	RySG	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ALAC	

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Michael Bauland	N/A	

Section 2a: Late Submissions

At their discretion, the EPDP-IDNs leadership team accepted one (1) late submission from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), which has been linked here.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)	Nigel Hickson	

Section 3: Summary of Submissions

To facilitate EPDP-IDNs Team's review of the Public Comment submissions, the ICANN support staff developed a Public Comment review tool, which provides a high-level assessment of the views expressed on the preliminary output as well as the detailed submissions provided by each contributor. All contributions received and the Public Comment review tool can be reviewed here.

Section 4: Analysis of Submissions

The EPDP-IDNs Team is responsible for the review and analysis of submissions, and they will be reviewing all submissions via the Public Comment review tool during the Team meetings through deliberations. Please note that at the time of publication of this report, the EPDP-IDNs Team will not have initiated their review and deliberations on the Public Comment submissions.

In organizing the Public Comment submissions, the support staff team took note of those topic areas where there was a relatively high concentration of submissions expressing concerns or proposing alternative language, which may provide an initial indication that a greater share of the EPDP-IDNs Team's attention should be devoted to the corresponding Preliminary Outputs. Examples of such topics relate to the automatic allocation and activation process *(see Implementation Guidance 2)*, source domain name *(see Preliminary Recommendations 8-9)*, Transfer Policy *(Preliminary Recommendations 10-11, Implementation Guidance 12),* mechanism and service for the realization of the "same entity" rule, including the use of Registration Data Directory Services (RDDS) *(Preliminary Recommendations 14 and Implementation Guidance 15)*, and defining the proper vehicle for the update of the IDN Implementation Guidelines *(Preliminary Recommendation 20)*. Another topic that was brought to attention was related to the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) and transaction fees *(not tied to a specific output but to charter question D5)*.

Following the guided submission form structure, substantive (those responses that required significant change to the outputs OR did not support the outputs) and non-substantive (those responses that supported the outputs as written OR supported with wording change) comments were categorized by each contributor per each Preliminary Output. General comments, glossary (Section 3) feedback, and comments for those charter questions with no preliminary outputs were sorted separately.

For the avoidance of doubt, the EPDP-IDNs Team will carefully consider all submissions on all outputs, including all general comments, during the course of its Public Comment review. As such, contents in the Public Comment review tool can be expected to be updated over time.

Section 5: Next Steps

The EPDP-IDNs Team will commence their review of the Public Comments at ICANN80 Policy Forum in Kigali, Rwanda (June 2024). Following the review and analysis of the Public Comments received for the Initial Report, the EPDP Team will consider whether any changes need to be made to the Phase 2 Preliminary Outputs. The Phase 2 Final Report will be published for GNSO Council's consideration after a formal consensus call on all of the proposed Phase 2 Final Outputs.

Subject: FW: [Gac-leadership] Fwd: [Gnso-epdp-idn-team] Re: Phase 2 Initial Report Public Comment Review Tool

Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 at 06:12:07 Central Daylight Time

From: Andrea Glandon

From: Donna austin <DonnaAustin605@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 9, 2024 4:35 AM
To: Hickson, Nigel (DSIT) <nigel.hickson@dsit.gov.uk>
Cc: Saewon Lee <saewon.lee@icann.org>; gnso-epdp-idn-team@icann.org <gnso-epdp-idn-team@icann.org>; GNSO Secs <gnso-secs@icann.org>
Subject: Re: [Gnso-epdp-idn-team] Re: Phase 2 Initial Report Public Comment Review Tool

Thanks very much Nigel.

We will endeavour to incorporate the GAC comments into our work.

Donna
Sent from my iPhone

On 9 Jun 2024, at 1:24 AM, Hickson, Nigel (DSIT) via Gnso-epdp-idn-team <gnso-epdp-idn-team@icann.org> wrote:

Steve, Dan, Saewon and colleagues

Good afternoon. I do sincerely apologise for the lack of GAC input during the public comment period on the Phase 2 Initial Report.

We did solicit views but received no substantive feedback; apart from Australia, the comments of whom I have outlined below.

Essentially, in discussion with GAC members, the overriding sentiment is one of support for the work of EPDP group in furthering opportunities for the promulgation of IDNs and thus enhancing of multilinguism on the Internet. Furthermore, there is also a sense of the requirement for a predictable and understood framework in which applicant for TLDs and 2nd level names can take part. There were also entreaties that the cost of applications be kept as low as possible (though recognise the costs are largely beyond prevue of our work.

Finally, it was hoped that a comprehensive "guide" could be produced (which assume it would through IRT process) that explains the new rules.

<u>Australia comments</u>

These were submitted by the Australian GAC representative.

On cost (D5), given the cost of IDNs are likely to mainly affect under-represented regions and groups, we feel that the costs for variants should be kept as low as possible. EPP Update should be used as the preferred means to activate variant domains to minimise costs.

On the items regarding trademarks (D6a, D7a, F2, F1) we are comfortable with the recommendations in the report and support increased efforts to provide outreach to rights holders.

Not sure if there's space for it in this document but it might be worth encouraging alterations to services such as the RDRS and WHOIS to proactively provide variant domain names when one name is queried noting they should all be controlled by the same owner and registry.

We would, of course, be happy to expand on any of these points.

Look forward to continuing this important work and look forward to seeing colleagues in Kigali.

Best

Nigel

From: Saewon Lee via Gnso-epdp-idn-team <gnso-epdp-idn-team@icann.org>
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 11:50 AM
To: gnso-epdp-idn-team@icann.org
Cc: GNSO Secs <gnso-secs@icann.org>
Subject: [Gnso-epdp-idn-team] Phase 2 Initial Report Public Comment Review Tool

Dear EPDP-IDNs Team,

We hope this email finds you safely.

Following the closure of Public Comment for Phase 2 Initial Report on 21 May, the staff has prepared a Public Comment Review Tool [docs.google.com], where the submissions have been organized in the order of recommendations, to help the Team with comment review and deliberations in the following weeks.

For our **Working Session in Kigali on Monday, 10 June, at 13:45 CAT**, a high-level overview of the Public Comment submissions will be provided, whereafter the Team will start reviewing the comments in sequence.

We look forward to seeing you all soon, either in person or online, and to those travelling to Kigali, we wish you a smooth and safe journey!

Best regards,
Steve, Dan, and Saewon.