

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Reserved Names

Justine Chew

Updated and shared on At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
On Wednesday, 16 September 2020, 19:00 UTC



APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	[22] RESERVED NAMES [2.7.1]	Priority:	HIGH	Settled On:	15.09.2020
Related:					
Key Issues:	Rules for handling Reserved Names at both Top Level and Second Level				
Policy Goals:	Existing policy is appropriate to maintain at the top level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 5: “Strings must not be a Reserved Word” • Recommendation 2: “Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain” 				
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None				
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SubPro Draft Final Report, 20 August 2020 • 06. SubPro Reserved Names – CPWG consensus summary, 8 June 2020 • Production Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, 8 June 2020 • 05. SubPro Reserved Names – CPWG consensus summary, 10 May 2020 • 04. SubPro Reserved Names – CPWG consensus building, 6 May 2020 • SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 • 03. SubPro Reserved Names, Closed Generics & Registrant Protection, 20 August 2019 				
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u>		Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?		
1. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : General requirements	Recommendation 2 from 2007 policy affirmed under Topic 24: String Similarity Evaluations, is also relevant here.		Acceptable. No further intervention needed.		
2. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : IGO / INGO	<u>Affirmation 21.1</u> : WG affirms Recommendation 5 from 2007 policy: “Strings must not be a Reserved Word.”				
3. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : Red Cross / Red Crescent Names	<u>Affirmation 21.2</u> : WG supports continuing to reserve as unavailable for delegation those strings at the top level that were considered Reserved				

	Names and were unavailable for delegation in the 2012 round per AGB s.2.2.1.2.	
4. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : High level agreement for reserving Special-Use Domain Names identified though IETF RFC 6761	<u>Affirmation 21.3</u> : WG acknowledges the reservation at the top level of Special-Use Domain Names through the procedure described in IETF RFC 6761 ¹	Acceptable. It is understood that “Special-Use Domain Names” as established by IETF RFC 6761 are strings not allowed as TLDs, they go into the “Top-Level Reserved Names List”.
5. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : High level agreement for reserving PTI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recommendation 21.4</u>: WG recommends reserving as unavailable for delegation at the top level the acronym associated with Public Technical Identifiers, “PTI”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full support for including “PTI” in the Top-Level Reserved Names List, which makes it unavailable for application. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the risk for “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIER”, and “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIERS” are acknowledged then maybe need to revisit risks for similar names in the Top-Level Reserved Names List.
6. <u>RN at the Second Level</u> : High level agreement for updating Schedule 5 re two-char letter-letter ASCII Labels	<u>Affirmation 21.5</u> : WG supports continuing to reserve as unavailable for registration those strings that on the then0current schedule of Reserved Names at the second level. The schedule may only change through the then-current process for making such changes.	Acceptable. No further intervention needed.
	<u>Recommendation 21.6</u> : WG recommends updating Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement (Schedule of Reserved Names) to include the measures for second-level Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes adopted by the ICANN Board on 8 Nov 2016.	Acceptable. No further intervention since this is really housekeeping.

¹ See <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6761>

<u>NEW ISSUES</u>	<u>SubPro PDP WG reactions</u>	Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
<p>7. <u>RN at the Top Level</u>: ISO 4217 Currency Codes</p>	<p>Issue (1): ISO 4217 alpha-3 currency codes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG discussed proposal to reserve at the top level currency codes included in the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 4217 list until there is a clear agreement with the international Central Banks (e.g. through IMF or BSI) as to whether these codes could be delegated and to which entities, not excluding themselves. • WG did not come to agreement on any clear justification to recommend preventative measures for these codes because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No clear risk or threat was identified in discussion <input type="checkbox"/> To the extent that an applicant applied for a string matching a currency code with the intent to use the TLD in association with the currency, there's opportunity for concerned parties to raise objections <input type="checkbox"/> GAC members could take action through GAC Early Warning or GAC Advice <input type="checkbox"/> So, believe existing measures are sufficient to address potential concerns about confusion or misuse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No consensus reached on the proposed position of <i>“Reserve until such time that there is clear agreement with the International Central Banks (eg through IMF or BIS) as to whether these codes could be delegated and to which entities, not excluding themselves.”</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>At-Large is split on whether there needs to be preventive protective measures placed on ISO 4217 Currency Codes; and opted to make our positions subject to GAC's position on this issue (if any).</u> <p>No formal feedback received from GAC on a position supporting reserving ISO 4217 Currency Codes. Preliminary feedback indicates no GAC position on this.</p>
<p>8. <u>RN at the Top Level</u>: Removal of two-char letter-number combinations from reservation</p>	<p>Issue (2): 2 Character letter-number combinations at top level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In IR, WG asked after the possibility of removing the reservation of two-character letter-number combinations at the top level • In 2012 Round, digits were disallowed entirely, so any possible move forward would be subject to removal of this restriction. • PC raised concerns about potential confusion with ccTLD. • WG considered possibility of addressing this potential confusion as to conduct an analysis as part of the string similarity review but did not come to a conclusion so, no recommendation to eliminate this reservation of 2-char letter-number combinations at TL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further intervention necessary. • Impact is two-char letter-number combinations at TL remain unavailable. • So long as these are unavailable, they remain “protected”, and limits end user confusion concerns.

Main Positions of Concern:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None on the slate of recommendations and affirmations.• No consensus was reached on the treatment of ISO 4217 Currency Codes, and we opted to make our split positions subject to GAC's position on this issue (if any). There being no GAC position on a need to reserve ISO 4217 Currency Codes, At-Large remains split on this issue.
----------------------------	---