

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Reserved Names

## CPWG SubPro Small Team

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



## APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	<b>[23] RESERVED NAMES [2.7.1]</b>		Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	
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"> <li>• Recommendation 5: “Strings must not be a Reserved Word”</li> <li>• Recommendation 2: “Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain”</li> </ul>					
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None					
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</li> <li>• <a href="#">03. SubPro Reserved Names, Closed Generics &amp; Registrant Protection, 20 August 2019</a></li> </ul>					
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u></b>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?			
1. <u>RN at the Top Level!</u> : High level agreement for RN for PTI and Special-Use Domain Names identified though IETF RFC 6761	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation to reserve names for PTI and to reserve Special-Use Domain Names through procedure described in IETF RFC 6761</li> <li>• Also, to amend “Reserved Names” referred to in 2012 AGB to “Unavailable Names”</li> </ul>	Yes	<b>Revisit with SSAC on SAC090 or ask for any update?</b>			

2. <u>RN at the Second Level</u> : High level agreement for updating Schedule 5 re two-char letter-letter ASCII Labels	Recommendation to update Schedule 5 to include measures for Two-Character Letter-Letter ASCII Labels to avoid confusion with corresponding Country Codes adopted by ICANN Board, 8 Nov 2016	Yes	Revisit with GAC to establish status of discussions between GAC members and ICANN Board
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?
3.			
<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
4. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : General requirements			
5. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : ISO 4217 Currency Codes  <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>			
6. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : Geonames		See: Scorecard on Geographic Names	See: Scorecard on Geographic Names
7. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : IGO / INGO			

8. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : Red Cross / Red Crescent Names			
9. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : Removal of two-char letter-number combinations from reservation			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep pressing for reservation of two-char letter-number combinations to avoid risk of confusion with ccTLDs (eg. O2, 3M); impact on end users coupled with questions around potential security risks</li> <li>• Two-char letter-number ASCII TLD space should be reserved exclusively for ccTLDs?</li> </ul>
10. <u>RN at the Second Level</u> : Voluntary reservation of up to 100 strings for operation/ promotion of TLD			
11. <u>RN at the Second Level</u> : Ability to reserve unlimited number of SL DNs for release at RO's discretion through ICANN-accredited Registrars			
12. <u>RN at the Second Level</u> : Sunrise process for SL DNs removed from RN list and released by RO			
Position:			