

Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

#### **Proposed Service**

Name of Proposed Service:

Second Level IDN Support for the Cyrillic <.o??> TLD (xn--c1avg)

Technical description of Proposed Service:

Public Interest Registry intends to offer support for second level domain name registrations for the following languages based on the Cyrillic script (ISO-15924), in addition to the Russian Language that is currently supported: Belarusian Language \\r\\nBosnian Language \\r\\nBosnian Language \\r\\nBosnian Language \\r\\nBosnian Language \\r\\nDivinumer \\r\\nPlease see the attached IDN tables for the languages listed above in a machine-readable format. The format of these tables complies with RFC 3743. \\r\\nUtilization of the IDN table and Language Policies \r\nPermitted Characters for Registration: \\r\\nOnly characters found in the second column of the IDN tables are permitted by the registry for registration. Mixed Cyrillic and ASCII characters are not permitted. \\r\\nIn the IDN tables, the first column represents the complete Unicode list of the Cyrillic based characters; the second column represents the preferred character(s) associated with the character in the first column. \\r\\nCharacters not included in the second column of the tables will be blocked from registration for the associated Cyrillic based language. \\r\\nVariant Management: \\r\\nCyrillic characters have ASCII character variants. \\r\\nDuring the registration process for a Cyrillic based IDN, the character(s) in the third column will be reserved, thus blocking future registrations of the ASCII variant. \\r\\\n\r\\nr\r\n

Appendix A (Language Tables (Attachment to W3G9I-4C0I1).pdf)

#### Consultation

Please describe with specificity your consultations with the community, experts and or others. What were the quantity, nature and content of the consultations?:

VINPIR's Application to serve as the registry operator for the <.o??> TLD was the culmination of a sustained and focused effort to better understand and serve the Cyrillic community. In 2008, PIR conducted focus group meetings in Moscow, Russia to understand their needs and the receptiveness to Internationalized Domain Names ("IDNs").

a. If the registry is a sponsored TLD, what were the nature and content of these consultations with the sponsored TLD community?:

\r\nN/A



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

b. Were consultations with gTLD registrars or the registrar constituency appropriate? Which registrars were consulted? What were the nature and content of the consultation?:

\r\nNo. None

c. Were consultations with other constituency groups appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

\r\nAs noted above, PIR conducted focus group meetings with end users prior to submitting its Application to serve as the Registry for the <.o??> TLD.

d. Were consultations with end users appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

\text{VnAs noted above, PIR conducted focus group meetings with end users prior to submitting its Application to serve as the Registry for the <.o??> TLD.

e. Who would endorse the introduction of this service? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

VnBelarusian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Serbian, and Ukrainian language users who want a fully IDN.IDN version of .ORG. Currently, only Russian language users enjoy a fully IDN.IDN version of .ORG.

f. Who would object the introduction of this service? What were(or would be) the nature and content of these consultations?:

VnWhen PIR initially filed to serve as the registry for the <.o??> TLD, two related Russian companies, Regtime, Ltd. and Legato, Ltd. (collectively, the "Objectors") jointly filed an Existing Legal Rights Objection with the World Intellectual Property Organization ("WIPO") Arbitration and Mediation Center. WIPO issued an Expert Determination rejecting the Objectors' claims and refusing all of their requested relief.

#### **Timeline**

Please describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed new registry service:



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

VInIf and once approved by ICANN, PIR will work with Afilias to implement the service as soon as possible.

#### **Business Description**

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

VInThe registrations of IDNs are stored in the registry as the A-label. As such, all interactions between the registry and registrars concerning an IDN are done using the A-label representation of the domain name. \r\nWhen a user makes an IDN registration through a registrar under this TLD the following steps will occur:\r\no At the registrar site the user is requested to specify which script/language their desired IDN domain name is intended to be represented in. The user then enters the IDN they wish to register, as a U-label.\r\no The registrar passes the request for the IDN on to the Afilias registry system, after first converting any U-labels into their appropriate A-label forms. In The Afilias system verifies that all characters requested in the IDN is included in the associated IDN Table as described above. Irlno IDNA is applied verifying that the IDN requested is a valid IDN per the protocol requirements and that any contextual rules required are fulfilled. Ir\no A check is performed to ensure that the requested IDN is available under this TLD, and the availability response is returned to the registrar. \( \text{V} \) \( \text{In O The} \) registrar presents the user whether the IDN they searched for is available for registration. The registrar takes the user through their standard registration and payment processes. Ir/no The registrar sends the Afilias registry system a Domain Create request in the A-label (xn-- representation) form for the requested IDN domain name, including the appropriate language tag.\r\no The Afilias registry re-checks the above listed verification steps. \r\no If all IDN registration policies and technical requirements are met, the IDN is created in the registry. If the applied for IDN has variants, these variants will be reserved in order to block other users from registering them, and any other IDN specific registry variant policies will be applied.\r\n

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:

Afilias evaluates IDN tables on 3 categories: \r\n1. Conformance to IDNA: Afilias was actively involved in efforts to evolve the IDNA standards to ensure they are more responsive to technical and social needs, as reflected in RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, and 5893. Each Unicode character, including variants, that are captured within the IDN table are analyzed against the IDNA protocol to ensure full compliance; examples of incompatibility includes characters that are prohibited in IDNA. Incompatible characters are excluded from the tables.\r\n2. Completeness of the Table: Afilias determines whether the IDN table is complete, ensuring that there are no corner cases that may lead to confusion to end-users. In this process, specifically if variants exist, Afilias analyzes each character and its associated variants to ensure that each character produces the same set of variants. If all variant mappings and reverse mappings correlate, the IDN table is considered complete. \r\n3. Registration and administration policies: In the analysis of supporting Cyrillic IDNs, Afilias references RFC 5992. \r\nVnVn completion of the analysis, Afilias determined that there were no outstanding issues regarding the Cyrillic IDN tables. \r\n\r\n\r\n



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

Please list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.:

VININ the implementation of the IDN registration and resolution services, Afilias will adhere to the relevant IETF standards, including RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, and 5893, as well as the ICANN IDN Implementation Guidelines (including the 3.0 version announced for implementation on 22 November 2011: http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-22nov11-en.htm).

#### **Contractual Provisions**

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

\text{\contractual provision is Exhibit A to the November 14, 2013 Registry Agreement between Public Interest Registry and ICANN (the "Cyrillic Registry Agreement").

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the reporting of data to ICANN:

\r\nNone.

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the Whois?:

\r\nNone.

#### **Contract Amendments**

Please describe or provide the necessary contractual amendments for the proposed service:

Section 3 of Exhibit A to the Cyrillic Registry Agreement, should be amended as provided for in the attached document.

Appendix B (Contractual Amendment (Attachment to W3G9I-4C0I1).pdf)

#### **Benefits of Service**

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

VnThe most important reason for IDNs is the growing number of Internet users around the world for whom it is difficult to use ASCII characters. The fact is, the Internet is accessed by more people who do not use Latin languages and scripts than those who do. This means that it is difficult for them to recognize ASCII characters and reproduce them on keyboards or use software to enter website addresses in browsers. IDN.IDN domain names will offer many new opportunities and benefits for Internet users around the world by allowing them to establish and use domains in their native languages and scripts. PIR filed its Application for <.???>, with the express intent to extend its stewardship of .ORG to the Cyrillic language community name and promote adoption of mainstream adoption of IDNs. \r\n\r\n\r\nThe proposed service will offer the Eastern European language community an in-language and localized IDN.IDN translation of domains residing in .ORG, and to promote the mainstream adoption of IDNs. Currently, only Russian language users enjoy a fully IDN.IDN version of .ORG. The proposed service would allow for Belarusian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Serbian and Ukrainian language users to enjoy fully IDN.IDN version of .ORG as well. \r\n

#### Competition

Do you believe your proposed new Registry Service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.:

\r\nNo.

How would you define the markets in which your proposed Registry Service would compete?:

\r\nBelarusian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Serbian, and Ukrainian language Internet users, present and future.

What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to your proposed Registry Service?:

\r\nA limited number of ccTLDs and gTLDs may offer or plan to offer this service.

In view of your status as a registry operator, would the introduction of your proposed Registry Service potentially impair the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?:

\r\nNo other company would be affected.

Do you propose to work with a vendor or contractor to provide the proposed Registry Service? If so, what is the



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

name of the vendor/contractor, and describe the nature of the services the vendor/contractor would provide.:

\r\nPIR will work with its backend technical services provider, Afilias Limited.

Have you communicated with any of the entities whose products or services might be affected by the introduction of your proposed Registry Service? If so, please describe the communications.:

\r\nNo/None.

Do you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of your proposed Registry Service? If so, please submit them with your application. (ICANN will keep the documents confidential).:

\r\nNo.

### **Security and Stability**

Does the proposed service alter the storage and input of Registry Data?:

\r\nNo.

Please explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of reponses to Internet servers or end systems:

\text{V\nBased on our quality assurance process, there is no evidence that the proposed service will impact throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses.

Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service, and if so, how do you intend to address those concerns?:

No.\r\n

#### Other Issues

Are there any Intellectual Property considerations raised by the Proposed Service:



Ticket ID: W3G9I-4C0I1

**Registry Name: Public Interest Registry** 

gTLD: .org .xn--i1b6b1a6a2e

**Status: ICANN Review** 

Status Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:24 Print Date: 2014-07-11 21:45:32

IrlnNo.
Does the proposed service contain intellectual property exclusive to your gTLD registry?:
IrInNo.
List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:
IrlnN/A.
Any other relevant information to include with this request:
\r\nNone.