BACKGROUND

The [Preliminary Issue Report](#) was focused on the circumstance when an ASCII gTLD and the Latin script diacritic version of the gTLD are not variants of each other AND may be found to be visually similar to each other. The issue is theoretically possible for any existing ASCII or Latin script IDN gTLD and is essentially infinite for future applied-for ASCII or Latin script IDN gTLDs, where diacritics are involved. On 16 May 2024, the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on this topic which once received, aided in determining next steps (e.g., initiating a PDP).

Preceding the GNSO Council's request for an Issue Report, the Council was briefed on the topic of Latin script diacritics. The Council welcomed analysis from ICANN org and the identification of potential mechanisms, that may be more efficient than requesting an Issue Report and completing a PDP, in order to allow for the potential simultaneous allocation of both the ASCII and Latin script diacritic versions of gTLDs. ICANN org proposed a solution that would leverage non-adopted recommendations related to string similarity since in essence, a solution for this issue is likely an exception process for visually similar strings. However, the Council was not comfortable with this solution and instead requested an Issue Report, which must include details on why code points with and without diacritics are distinct letters, and therefore not the "same" letter (i.e., are not variants); the Council was particularly interested in the outcome regarding variants, as the variant management rules coming from Phase 1 of the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names provide an avenue for "similar" strings to be simultaneously delegated.

On 17 October 2024, the [Final Issue Report](#) was [presented](#) to the GNSO Council which resulted in the Council [initiating a PDP](#) for Latin Script Diacritics during the GNSO Council meeting at ICANN81 on 13 November 2024. On 19 December 2024, the [PDP WG Charter](#) for Latin Script Diacritics was [adopted](#).

The Latin Script Diacritics PDP WG has only recently initiated its work, meeting for the first time on 08 March, 2025, during ICANN82.

GNSO Latin Script Diacritics Policy Development Process
Questions for Community Input

The scope of work, charter questions, and key issues to consider presented below are contained in the Latin Script Diacritics PDP WG Charter.

<u>**Work Scope and Charter Questions**</u>

Scope of work: In circumstances where a base ASCII gTLD and the Latin script diacritic version of the gTLD are NOT variants of each other, what mechanism is needed in order to allow a single registry operator to simultaneously operate both gTLDs? A presumption for this issue is that the ASCII and Latin script diacritic have a non-negligible chance to be determined to be visually confusingly similar.

NOT in Scope: This PDP will use the Latin RZ-LGR as one of the relevant baseline foundational documents when delineating scope. This PDP must understand the work that was completed by the Latin Generation Panel, including the rationale and impact of the various exclusions of Section 3: Variant Sets.

Charter Questions:
1. Under what circumstances should a base ASCII gTLD and the Latin script diacritic version of the gTLD be simultaneously delegated, if any?
   a. If such circumstances exist, what measures should be put into place in order to mitigate the potential for end-user confusion?

2. If a solution is needed to this issue, are any of the elements of the ccTLD Fast Track process transferable?

3. If a solution is needed to this issue, are any of the elements from either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the EPDP on IDNs, or Topic 25 on IDNs from the SubPro Final Report, relevant, or warrant discussion specific to Latin script diacritics?

4. If a solution is needed to this issue, will it have any impact on existing Consensus Policies?

<u>**Impact on Human Rights**</u>

The WG is expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on human rights. In order to facilitate this analysis, the WG may wish to consult the Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) tool for ICANN PDPs. The WG is expected to consider and address questions such as:
1. whether there is a likely human rights impact;
2. If so, who are the groups expected to be impacted and the expected severity of the impact (high / medium / low).
3. And if so, when developing the policy recommendations:

a. is the proposed action necessary to achieve the desired outcome;
b. is the proposed action proportionate;
c. is the proposed action legitimate.

Impact on the Global Public Interest

The WG is also expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on the Global Public Interest (GPI). In order to facilitate this analysis, the WG may wish to consult the checklist which considers the overall impact by way of the following three (3) categories:
1. Overall ICANN Category: Impact on ICANN and how its mission is served
2. Public Interest Categories: Impact on global public interest
3. Relevant Bylaws: Impact on and consideration of the Bylaws