

GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: Draft Final Report on Policy Aspects Regarding Introduction of Single Character IDN TLDs

Date: January 5, 2011

Issue Document URL: <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#jig-draft-final-report>

This statement on the issue noted above is submitted on behalf of the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG). It is a consensus position arrived at through RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings.

The RySG appreciates the opportunity to comment on the "JIG Draft Final Report on Single Character IDN TLDs". This statement is consistent with our previous one on the Initial report submitted on 9 September 2010 (http://www.gtldregistries.org/system/files/IDN_1_character_statement_FINAL_090910.doc), where the RySG continued to support the supermajority recommendation from the GNSO Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs:

"[For Single and Two Character IDN strings at all levels,] Single and two-character U-labels on the top level and second level of a domain name should not be restricted in general. At the top level, requested strings should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis in the new gTLD process depending on the script and language used in order to determine whether the string should be granted for allocation in the DNS."

The RySG believes that the draft final report thoroughly addresses the possible issues identified in the group and raised in the public comments. In particular, we support the following JIG recommendations for IDN gTLDs and believe that they mitigate possible problems:

- Single and two-character U-labels on the top and second level of a domain name should not be generally restricted.
- Requested top-level gTLD labels should, however, be restricted as follows:
 - Single letters in the ASCII character set should be reserved at the top level; if subsequent research demonstrates that the technical issues and concerns can be favorably addressed, the reservation status may be reconsidered.
 - A top-level label must not be a plausible segment of an IPv4 or IPv6 address.
- The current restriction of two letter top level labels to ccTLDs should be continued. Detrimental user confusion not addressed by the above restrictions can be dealt with using the dispute resolution process for confusingly similar names.

To implement these recommendations, the RySG also supports the proposed

“Suggested Edits to New gTLD Applicant Guidebook” (Section 6 of the report).

The RySG believes the JIG has developed a set of recommendations that address the technical and policy issues that could result in stability and security problems while at the same time meeting the needs of users of scripts in which single U-labels are widely used.

RySG Level of Support

1. Level of Support of Active Members:

- 1.1. # of Members in Favor: 9
- 1.2. # of Members Opposed: 0
- 1.3. # of Members that Abstained: 0
- 1.4. # of Members that did not vote: 4

2. Minority Position(s): N/A

General RySG Information

- Total # of eligible RySG Members¹: 14
- Total # of RySG Members: 13
- Total # of Active RySG Members²: 13
- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 9
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 7
- # of Members that participated in this process: 13
- Names of Members that participated in this process: 13
 - 1. Afilias (.info & .mobi)
 - 2. DotAsia Organisation (.asia)
 - 3. DotCooperation (.coop)
 - 4. Employ Media (.jobs)
 - 5. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
 - 6. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma

¹ All top-level domain sponsors or registry operators that have agreements with ICANN to provide Registry Services in support of one or more gTLDs are eligible for membership upon the “effective date” set forth in the operator’s or sponsor’s agreement (RySG Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 1). The RySG Articles of Operation can be found at <<http://gns0.icann.org/files/gns0/en/improvements/registries-sg-proposed-charter-30jul09-en.pdf>>. The Universal Postal Union recently concluded the .POST agreement with ICANN, but as of this writing the UPU has not applied for RySG membership.

² Per the RySG Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 6: Members shall be classified as “Active” or “Inactive”. A member shall be classified as “Active” unless it is classified as “Inactive” pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in a RySG meeting or voting process for a total of three consecutive meetings or voting processes or both. An Inactive member shall have all rights and duties of membership other than being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member may resume Active status at any time by participating in a RySG meeting or by voting.

- (.museum)
 - 7. NeuStar (.biz)
 - 8. Public Interest Registry - PIR (.org)
 - 9. RegistryPro (.pro)
 - 10. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
 - 11. Telnic (.tel)
 - 12. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
 - 13. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)
- Names & email addresses for points of contact
 - Chair: David Maher, dmaher@pir.org
 - Vice Chair: Keith Drazek, kdrazek@verisign.com
 - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
 - RySG representative for this statement: Ching Chiao, chiao@registry.asia