

At-Large .NGO/.ONG Registry Agreement Amendment - Mandatory Technical Bundling of Second-Level Domains Workspace

Comment Close Date	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Announcement	Vote Open	Vote Reminder	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
26.11.2014	.NGO/.ONG Registry Agreement Amendment - Mandatory Technical Bundling of Second-Level Domains	No Statement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Krista Papac krista.papac@icann.org	n/a

For information about this PC, please click [here](#) >>

- [Comments Forum](#)

Brief Overview

On 9 September 2014, ICANN Board authorized the President and CEO to develop amendments to the .NGO and .ONG Registry Agreements between ICANN and Public InterestRegistry (PIR) to implement the mandatory technical bundling registry service. The proposed amendments being published for comment take into account and address the outstanding technical and implementation questions that were identified as part of the Registry Services Evaluation Process.

Comment Period: 6 Nov 2014- 26 Nov 2014

Reply Period: 27 Nov 2014- 6 Dec 2014

Section I: Description, Explanation, and Purpose

On 12 March 2014, Public Interest Registry (PIR), the registry operator for .NGO and .ONG TLDs, submitted a Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) [request](#) [PDF, 23 KB] to offer mandatory technical bundling of second level domain names for .NGO and .ONG under Exhibit-A of each respective Registry Agreement. PIR has defined a technical bundling as "the process of managing a Technical Bundle," which a Technical Bundle is defined as "a set of two domain names in different TLDs, with identical second level labels for which the following parameters are shared:

- Registrar Ownership
- Registration and Expiry Dates
- Registrant, Admin Billing, and Technical Contacts
- Name Server Association
- Domain Status
- Applicable grace periods (Add Grace Period, Renewal Grace Period, Auto-Renewal Grace Period, Transfer Grace Period, and Redemption Grace Period)

And for which at least the following parameters are unique:

- DS records as required based on RFC 5910".

In accordance with the [RSEP](#), PIR's [request](#) [PDF, 23 KB] was posted for public information and ICANN's preliminary determination identified that the proposed registry service might raise significant stability or security issues. The RSEP request was referred to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for further evaluation. The RSTEP report concluded that the proposal does not create "a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on stability of security" as defined in the RSEP. The RSTEP report and staff identified several potential technical and implementation questions associated with introducing the proposed new registry service to the DNS. This included the implications of unbundling of .NGO and .ONG, potential registrant and/or end user confusion, equivalency issues being discussed within the context of IDN variants, and other operational concerns. The RSEP proposal and RSTEP report was published for public comment as required by the RSEP. No comment was received for either public comment periods.

On 9 September 2014, the ICANN Board adopted the findings in the RSTEP report that PIR's proposal does not create "a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on stability or security", and approved PIR's request related to the introduction of the registry service to support the mandatory technical bundling of second level domain names for .NGO and .ONG. Furthermore, the ICANN Board authorized the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop an amendment to implement the new registry service that takes into account and appropriately addresses the related outstanding technical and implementation questions.

Accordingly, ICANN and PIR agreed to the proposed amendment language to identify that the operations of the top-level domain in the TLD Bundle must be identical, and that all services, actions, changes, decisions, requirements, and etc. that are implemented that impact any one top-level domain in the TLD Bundle must also be applied to all other top-level domains in the TLD Bundle. To further satisfy the outstanding technical and implementation questions, the amendment language covers specific services, actions, changes, decisions, and requirements in more detail.

Section II: Background

On 12 March 2014, Public Interest Registry (PIR) submitted a Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) request to offer mandatory technical bundling of second level domain names for .NGO and .ONG under Exhibit-A of each respective Registry Agreement. On 21 May 2014, ICANN staff posted the RSEP request for public information and conducted its review of the request under the RSEP. On 4 June 2014, ICANN staff's preliminary determination did not identify any significant competition issues. Separately, ICANN staff determined that the proposed registry service might raise significant stability or security issues, and informed PIR of the need to refer the proposal to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for further evaluation. On 6 June 2014, ICANN referred PIR's RSEP request to the RSTEP for further evaluation. On 10 June 2014, ICANN posted PIR's RSEP request for public comment. The public comment concluded on 30 July 2014 and no public comments were received. On 29 July 2014, the RSTEP report was posted for public comment. The public comment period concluded on 13 August 2014 and no public comments were received. The RSTEP report concluded that from a technical evaluation perspective, the proposal does not create "a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on stability or security" as defined in the RSEP Policy related to the introduction of the registry service to support the mandatory technical bundling of second level domain names for .NGO and .ONG. The RSTEP report and staff also identified several potential technical and implementation questions associated with introducing the proposed new registry service to the DNS, including: implications of unbundling of .NGO and .ONG; potential registrant and/or end user confusion; equivalency issues being discussed within the context of IDN variants; and other operational concerns.

Section III: Relevant Resources

- ICANN Board Resolution on 9 September 2014: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.a>
- Proposed [Amendment](#) [PDF, 100 KB] to .NGO Registry Agreement
- Proposed [Amendment](#) [PDF, 100 KB] to .ONG Registry Agreement

Section IV: Additional Information

- RSEP Webpage: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rsep-2014-02-19-en>
- RSEP Policy: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/policy-bd-2012-02-25-en>
- Public Interest Registry RSEP request posted for public information on 21 May 2014: <https://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/rsep/pir-request-21may14-en.pdf> [PDF, 23 KB]
- Letter to Public Interest Registry re: RSTEP referral Registry 4 June 2014: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/papac-to-coon-04jun14-en.pdf> [PDF, 318 KB]
- Letter from Public Interest Registry re: RSTEP referral 5 June 2014: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/diaz-to-papac-05jun14-en.pdf> [PDF, 85 KB]
- Letter to RSTEP 6 June 2014: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/papac-to-chapin-06jun14-en.pdf> [PDF, 950 KB]
- Public Comment for .NGO and .ONG Registry Services Evaluation Process Request – Introduction of Technical Bundling: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/tech-bundling-2014-06-10-en>
- RSTEP Review Team Report – Redacted 24 July 2014: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rstep-technical-bundling-proposal-redacted-24jul14-en.pdf> [PDF, 1.02 MB]
- Public Comment on RSTEP Review Team Report 29 July 2014: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rstep-technical-bundling-2014-07-29-en>

Staff Contact

Krista Papac
krista.papac@icann.org

FINAL VERSION TO BE SUBMITTED IF RATIFIED

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.

FIRST DRAFT SUBMITTED

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins.