

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard:

Reserved Names

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 10 June 2020, 19:00 UTC



APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	[22] RESERVED NAMES [2.7.1]	Priority:	HIGH	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"> • 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"> • 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 2. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : IGO / INGO 3. <u>RN at the Top Level</u> : Red Cross / Red Crescent Names	<u>Affirmation (1):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG affirms the following recommendations from 2007 policy: <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.” • 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. 		Acceptable. No further intervention needed.		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG supports continuing to reserve as unavailable for registration those strings that are currently considered Reserved Names at the second level as of the publication date of this report and as required by future Consensus Policy. <p><u>WG’s Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the general framework created by the 2007 policy and subsequent implementation with respect to unavailable/reserved names at the top and second levels remains appropriate for subsequent procedures. • So, affirms Recommendation 5 from the 2007 policy, which prohibits the use of “Reserved Word(s)”, as well as Recommendation 2 which prohibits strings at the top level that are confusingly similar to existing TLDs • Affirms that strings that were unavailable at the top level in the 2012 round should remain unavailable and that strings at the second level that are currently unavailable should remain unavailable. • In developing this affirmation, the Working Group considered the GAC Principles on New gTLDs and noted that the final version of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook took into account the GAC Principles, including provisions regarding unavailable/reserved names. 	
<p>4. <u>RN at the Top Level</u>: High level agreement for reserving Special-Use Domain Names identified though IETF RFC 6761</p>	<p><u>Affirmation (2):</u> WG acknowledges the reservation at the top level of Special-Use Domain Names through the procedure described in IETF RFC 6761 ¹</p> <p><u>WG’s Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG supports work by the Internet Engineering Task Force with respect to Special-Use Domain Names, including documentation on 	<p>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”.</p>

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

	<p>how to establish when reserving such a name is appropriate, and the procedure for doing so as described in RFC 6761.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking into account the limited and judicious usage of the RFC 6761 process, WG recommends that ICANN reserves names in the New gTLD Program established as Special-Use Domain Names using the procedure described under RFC 6761. 	
<p>5. <u>RN at the Top Level: High level agreement for reserving PTI</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendation (3):</u> WG recommends reserving as unavailable for delegation at the top level the acronym associated with Public Technical Identifiers, “PTI”.</p> <p><u>WG’s Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered that Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) was incorporated in August 2016 as an affiliate of ICANN with the primary responsibility of operating the IANA functions. Terms associated with PTI are not included in the list of unavailable/reserved names from the 2012 round because PTI had not yet been established at the time the list was developed. • Therefore, recommends that for subsequent procedures, string “PTI” should be reserved and unavailable for delegation at the top level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full support for including “PTI” in the Top-Level Reserved Names List, which makes it unavailable for application. • However, PTI is a core service that the Internet relies on. The impact of someone masquerading as PTI is immensely higher than for some, if not all, the other names on the Top-Level Reserved Names List. So we should consider also reserving “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIER”, and “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIERS” because of risk involved in misuse of those terms – whether the reservation is by way of addition to the Top-Level Reserved Names List or another appropriate method also calls for consideration. <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.

<p>6. <u>RN at the Second Level</u>: High level agreement for updating Schedule 5 re two-char letter-letter ASCII Labels</p>	<p><u>Recommendation (4)</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 (<i>noting that discussions on this topic are ongoing, and this recommendation is subject to the outcomes of related discussions</i>).</p> <p><u>WG’s Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spec 5, Section 2 of the New gTLD RA requires ROs to reserve two-char ASCII labels within the TLD at the second level – WG notes developments regarding the registration of two-char domain names and recommends that ICANN update Spec 5, Sec 2 to reflect these authorizations and the “Measures for Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes. ▪ Specifically, as of 1 Dec 2014, ICANN authorized all new gTLD registries to release all digit/digit, digit/letter, and letter/digit two-char ASCII labels for registration to third parties and activation in the DNS at the second level. ² ▪ Further, effective 13 Dec 2016, ICANN authorized all new gTLD registries to release for registration to third parties and activation in the DNS at the second level all two-char letter/letter ASCII labels not previously authorized by ICANN for release and not otherwise required to be reserved, subject to implementing “Measures for Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes.” ³ 	<p>Acceptable. No further intervention since this is really housekeeping.</p>
--	--	---

² <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/spec5-amend-two-char-01dec14-en.pdf>

³ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/two-character-ltr-ltr-authorization-release-13dec16-en.html>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed relevant GAC Advice in relation to this issue as well as ICANN Org’s documentation <u>explaining how implementation is consistent with GAC Advice</u> ^{4 5} Understands that conversations regarding implementation continue to take place, and that Spec 5 could be updated, as necessary, to reflect any further developments. In developing recommendations regarding reserved names, WG reviewed & discussed relevant SSAC Advice, and specifically rec’s contained in <u>SAC090</u>. 	
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u>	Is this acceptable? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
7. <u>RN at the Top Level: Removal of two-char letter-number combinations from reservation</u>	<u>New Issue (1): 2 Character letter-number combinations at top level</u> <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.
8. <u>RN at the Top Level: ISO 4217 Currency Codes</u>	<u>New Issue (2): ISO 4217 alpha-3 currency codes</u> <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: 	No consensus reached as 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> ”

⁴ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/summary-documents-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf>

⁵ See also ICANN Board resolution: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-11-08-en#2.a>

	<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 • So, believe existing measures are sufficient to address potential concerns about confusion or misuse. 	<p><u>Status of Deliberations</u></p> <p>Varying opinions re: protection for these 3-char strings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Concerns of risk of confusion for end-users, thus requiring them to be protected and possibly unavailable for application <input type="checkbox"/> Given the possibility of name/string association/recognition by end-user, consumer trust goal requires that their availability for application be limited to trusted parties eg. one endorsed by the relevant government <input type="checkbox"/> No risk of confusion for end-users, if risks were perceived as unacceptable, then GAC/a GAC member could issue Advice/Early Warning or file an LPI Objection to either prevent the application from proceeding or allowing it to proceed but with some recommended safeguards in place. <input type="checkbox"/> Since GAC has not yet issued Advice on the availability of these codes as TLD, then why should At-Large be concerned at all. <p>Take up question with GAC – what does GAC think?</p>
--	---	--

Main Positions of Concern:	<p><u>On SubPro Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affirmation (1), Affirmation (2), and Recommendation (4) are acceptable.• Recommendation (3) is acceptable but insofar as the recommendation if for reserving as unavailable for delegation at the top level the acronym associated with Public Technical Identifiers, “PTI”, we suggest that consideration be given also to reserving “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIER”, and “PUBLICTECHNICALIDENTIFIERS” because of risk involved in misuse of those terms given that PTI is a core service that the Internet relies. <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No consensus was reached as yet on the treatment of ISO 4217 Currency Codes. There remain differing opinions on the need for their reservation as unavailable, or availability for application be limited to trusted parties, or curative protections in the form of objections. At-Large would like to know what GAC’s position on this issue is, if any.
----------------------------	---