

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard:

## Name Collision

### CPWG SubPro Small Team

Post At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
Wednesday, 27 May, 19:00 UTC



**APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA**

Topic/Area:	<b>[27] SECURITY AND STABILITY [2.7.6]</b>	Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	28.05.2020
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NCAP Study 1</b>, Study 2 and Study 3</li> <li>• SAC090</li> </ul>				
Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to deal with risk or occurrence of name collisions in subsequent procedures?</li> </ul>				
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2007 policy, Recommendation 4: “Strings must not cause any technical instability.”</li> </ul>				
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None				
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 02. SubPro Security &amp; Stability – CPWG consensus building, 27 May 2020</li> <li>• Working Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, 26 May 2020</li> <li>• SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</li> <li>• 01. SubPro Name Collisions, 11 September 2019</li> </ul>				
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u></b>			Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?	
	<p><u>Affirmation (1):</u></p> <p>WG affirms Recommendation 4 of the 2007 policy, which states: “Strings must not cause any technical instability.”</p> <p><u>WG’s Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG agreed that the policy goal continues to be what it was in 2007, which is that any string must not cause any technical instability.</li> <li>• This still remains an appropriate objective, and therefore affirms Recommendation 4 from the 2007 policy.</li> </ul>			See position below.	

<p>1. Need for mechanism to evaluate risk of name collision</p>	<p><u>Recommendation (2):</u></p> <p>ICANN must have ready prior to the opening of the Application Submission Period a mechanism to evaluate the risk of name collisions in the New gTLD evaluation process as well as during the transition to delegation phase.</p> <p><u>WG's Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG agreed that ICANN must include a mechanism to evaluate the risk of name collisions in the TLD evaluation process as well during the transition to delegation phase is still relevant, with the addition of the requirement for such a mechanism to be ready prior to the next application period.</li> <li>• WG agreed that the requirement for a mechanism would promote predictability for applicants and other parties.</li> <li>• In response to concerns raised in comments, WG agreed that it did not have to recommend what the mechanism is.</li> </ul>	<p>See position below.</p>
<p>2. Recognition of existing framework and use of Controlled Interruptions</p> <p>3. "Do Not Apply" list</p>	<p><u>Affirmation (3):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG affirms continued use of the New gTLD Collision Occurrence Management framework unless and until the ICANN Board adopts a new mitigation framework –</li> <li>• Includes not changing the controlled interruption duration and the required readiness for human-life threatening conditions for currently delegated gTLDs and future new gTLDs.</li> </ul> <p><u>WG's Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to NCAP – WG agreed that it is up to the ICANN community and ICANN Board of Directors to determine any dependencies between the NCAP and the next round of new gTLD applications</li> <li>• Board letter 1 Nov 2019, "Board has not sought to establish a new dependency on completion of the PDP work based on commissioning NCAP Study 1 upon completion of Study 1, the Board can determine in</li> </ul>	<p>See position below.</p>

	<p>consultation with the community whether additional NCAP work is necessary and, if so, which elements should be a dependency for any of the other future milestones ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• WG notes that ICANN org, in cooperation with the NCAP Discussion Group, has since completed its Study 1, leveraging an outside consultant. The consultant who produced the Study 1 report made conclusions relating to Studies 2 and 3.</li><li>• Given that WG did not agree on a new mitigation framework, WG affirms continued use of the New gTLD Collision Occurrence Management framework unless and until the ICANN Board adopts a new mitigation framework.</li></ul> <p><u>Implementation Guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ICANN should develop a mechanism or test to determine the name collision risk for any given string - suggest putting them into three categories: high risk, aggravated risk, and low risk.</li><li>• High-risk strings should not be allowed to be applied for (if possible) or delegated, and aggravated risk strings should require the inclusion of a specific name collision mitigation framework.</li><li>• To the extent possible, ICANN should seek to identify high-risk strings in advance of opening the Application Submission Period, which should constitute a “Do Not Apply” list.</li><li>• ICANN should also seek to identify aggravated strings in advance, which would be expected to require a specific name collision mitigation framework. However, all applied-for strings should be subject to a DNS Stability evaluation to determine whether they represent a high, aggravated, or low risk of name collision.</li><li>• If controlled interruption (CI) for a specific label (usually a 2nd-level domain) is found to cause disruption, ICANN may decide to allow CI to be disabled for that label while the disruption is fixed, provided that the minimum CI period is still applied to that label.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p><u>WG's Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG agreed that ICANN should develop a mechanism or test to determine name collision risk for any given string in manner stated in IG</li> <li>• WG did not see the need to formulate guidance to address these concerns at this time – although agreed that SSAC's advice in SAC090 may provide guidance concerning the development of a risk mechanism or test.</li> <li>• Including "Do Not Apply" list as Implementation Guidance since high-risk strings are likely to cause technical instability by definition, so these should not be able to be delegated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The approach wrt CI received consensus support of WT4.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>Main Positions of Concern:</p>	<p>One school of thought suggests that there is no dependency between the work of SSAC on name collision and the completion of SubPro PDP WG's work</p> <p>ALAC have so far opted not to wade into the "dependency" debate, but instead to defer to SSAC's work on name collisions in responding to SubPro PDP WG's initial recommendations, including a reference to SAC090.</p> <p>In particular we have drawn a hard line at delegation, if not the launching of the application window, until the NCAP study(ies) are completed and recommendations are addressed in implementation, retrospectively for the new round, if the recommendations come in after the application window is launched.</p>	