

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Security & Stability

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 11 February 2020, 19:00 UTC



APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	[27] SECURITY AND STABILITY [2.7.6]		Priority:	HIGH	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegation Rates • Emojis • DNS Abuse mitigation • Systems [2.4.3] – algorithmic checking of TLDs against RZ-LGRs and ASCII string requirements 					
Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is a safe rate of delegation of new gTLDs into the root zone? • Banning of emojis as TLDs 					
Policy Goals:	<p>In respect of Delegation Rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New gTLD Program should be introduced in an ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable manner • Primary purpose of new gTLDs are to foster diversity, encourage competition and enhance utility of DNS • New gTLDs should be delegated into the root zone in a manner that minimises risk of harming operational stability, security and global interoperability of the Internet <p>Implementation Guidance: The application submission system should do all feasible algorithmic checking of TLDs, including against RZ-LGRs and ASCII string requirements to better ensure only valid ASCII and IDN TLDs can be submitted. A proposed TLD might be algorithmically found to be valid or invalid, or verifying its validity may not be possible using algorithmic checking. Only in the latter case, when a proposed TLD doesn't fit all the conditions for automatic checking, a manual review should occur to validate or invalidate the TLD.</p>					
Assigned CCT-RT Rec's:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Rec. 14: Pro-active anti-abuse measures (high priority for SubPro) ? Rec. 16: Support ongoing data collection efforts (eg DAAR) (high priority for SubPro) 					
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 					
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?			
1. Be conservative in adding new gTLDs to RZ	In delegating new gTLDs, WG agrees with RSSAC that trouble-free access	Yes				

	to RZ is absolutely critical for all Internet users and therefore ICANN should honor the principle of conservatism when adding new gTLDs to the RZ		
2. Focus on rate of change in RZ	<p>As recommended by both SSAC and RSSAC, ICANN should focus on rate of change in RZ, rather than total number of delegated strings for a given calendar year. Better to think in terms of changes over smaller time periods (eg monthly)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From SAC100 <p>ICANN should focus on the rate of change for the RZ, rather than total number of delegated strings for a given calendar year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From RSSAC031 <p>Rate of change more important than absolute magnitude, based on historical trends and operational experience, number of TLDs delegated in the RZ should not increase by more than circa 5% per month, minor variations from time to time allowed</p>	Yes	
3. Early warning systems to monitor delegation rates desirable	<p>From SAC100</p> <p>ICANN should continue developing the monitoring and early warning capability with respect to RZ scaling.</p>	Yes	

	This investigation should be completed prior to increasing number of delegations in the RZ		
4. Support RSSAC recommendations	<p>From RSSAC031</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate of change more important than absolute magnitude, based on historical trends and operational experience, number of TLDs delegated in the RZ should not increase by more than circa 5% per month, minor variations from time to time allowed • The RZ is uniquely a shared resource upon which all Internet users rely, so it continues to be important to limit rate of adding new gTLDs 	Yes	
5. Support for SSAC recommendations	<p>From SAC100</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registries so that it can delay addition to RZ in case of DNS service instabilities • ICANN should investigate and catalog long term obligations of maintaining a larger RZ 	Yes	
6. Role for and action by CTO	Recommendation that OCTO consult with PTI, Verisign, root operators via RSSAC and larger DNS		

	technical community on above recommendations		
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
7.	•		
<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
8. <u>CCT-RT Recommendations 14 and 16 on DNS Abuse mitigation</u>			
Position:			

DRAFT