

| Advice Item | Description | Statement of Understanding | Background on Issue | Board Action | Rationale | Does SubPro Currently Address? | How? | What Else Needs To Be Done? |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1 | Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS. | The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN Board should take the appropriate action to ensure criteria are established for determining if a syntactically valid domain label could be a top-level domain in the global DNS. | <p>In 2013, the IETF published a "Special-Use Domain Names," RFC 6761. The RFC describes what it means to say that a Domain Name (DNS name) is reserved for special use, when reserving such a name is appropriate, and the procedures for doing so. It also establishes an IANA registry for such domain names, and seeds it with entries for some of the already established special domain names.</p> <p>As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list.</p> | The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work. | The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topic of reserved names. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work. | Yes | <p>In section 2.7.1 of its Initial Report, on Reserved Names, the PDP WG preliminarily recommended that minimal changes are needed for the original Reserved Names recommendations and the implementation in the Applicant Guidebook. The existing reservations, including those related to string syntax should be maintained and additional reservations are needed for:</p> <p>1) Names relevant to Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) 2) Special-Use Domain Names established through the IETF RFC 6761 process.</p> | Nothing identified at this time. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|-----------|--|--|
| SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2 | <p>Recommendation 2: The SSAC understands the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications, ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied for new gTLD names, such as the reserved names listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the ineligible strings listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. As described in RFC 6761, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined special way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution.</p> <p>Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of private use names if so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?</p> | <p>The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 2 to mean that the scope of work presented in Recommendation 1 should include special use domain names as well as private use domain names, including those that are known to cause collisions such as .home, .corp, and .mail. Additionally, the scope of work should also include how ICANN should respond to future collisions between private use names and new gTLDs.</p> | <p>In 2013, the IETF published a "Special-Use Domain Names," RFC 6761. The RFC "describes what it means to say that a Domain Name (DNS name) is reserved for special use, when reserving such a name is appropriate, and the procedures for doing so. It also establishes an IANA registry for such domain names, and seeds it with entries for some of the already established special domain names.</p> <p>Private Enterprise Numbers (PENs) are created and maintained by PTI in a public registry. Any individual/private enterprise (organization) may request a PEN for use within their private networks. Some private use names collide with new gTLDs.</p> <p>As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list.</p> <p>The topic of name collision was addressed within the 2012 round of new gTLDs. The Board has also recently asked the SSAC to conduct a study. The SSAC published for public comment a draft plan.</p> | <p>The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.</p> | <p>The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topic of reserved names. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.</p> <p>With regard to name collision, the Board has asked the SSAC to conduct a study to present data, analysis and points of view, and provide advice to the Board regarding the risks posed to users and end systems if .CORP, .HOME, .MAIL strings were to be delegated in the root, as well as possible courses of action that might mitigate the identified risks. The Board requested that the SSAC to conduct the study in a thorough and inclusive manner that includes technical experts (such as members of IETF working groups, technical members of the</p> | Partially | <p>Regarding part 1.i of the recommendation, as noted in the field above, the PDP WG has preliminarily agreed that Special-Use Domain Names established through the IETF RFC 6761 process should be reserved in future new gTLD processes.</p> <p>Regarding part 2) of the recommendation, the PDP WG believes that Special-Use Domain Names established through the IETF RFC 6761 process are exceptional in nature and limited in scope. The WG is not aware of any other lists of names that may warrant similar exclusion.</p> <p>Regarding part 3) of the recommendations, the PDP WG considers .home, .corp, and .mail to be out of scope for New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, which is future looking in nature (see footnote). In the course of deliberations on Name Collisions, in section 2.7.8 of the Initial Report, the WG took SAC090 into account. The WG has not at this stage determined to formally recognize "private use" domains, though it provided preliminary recommendations on Name Collisions to seek to provide better guidance to applicants, while in large part supporting the continued adherence to the framework utilized during the 2012 round. Specifically in relation to parts 3.i and 3.ii of the recommendation, the WG preliminarily supports efforts to develop a data-driven "Do Not Apply" list, which would seek to prevent names that represent a similar level of risk to home and corp, for instance an unacceptable level of name collision risk.</p> <p>* The Working Group notes that there are a limited number of items in the charter that may have application to current TLDs, including both closed generics and certain aspects of name collisions, but these exceptions within the charter do not apply here.</p> | <p>Regarding part 1.2 of the recommendation, additional thought may be needed to consider how changes to the Special-Use Domain Names list would be treated during the application window, as well as after delegation.</p> <p>Regarding part 2) of the recommendation, the PDP WG could reach out to the SSAC to determine if there are specific lists and groups that should be considered or if the recommendation is more hypothetical in nature.</p> <p>Regarding part 3) of the recommendation, the PDP WG took SAC090 into consideration during deliberations and does not at this stage believe anything further is needed to address the recommendation.</p> <p>As an overall comment, the PDP WG recognizes that there may be some overlap with the Name Collisions Analysis Project (NCAP) and welcomes additional clarity.</p> |
| SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-3 | <p>Recommendation 3: Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.</p> | <p>The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN Board should take the appropriate action to establish an effective means of collaboration with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.</p> | <p>As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list, or the process for coordinating with other bodies to do so.</p> | <p>The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.</p> | <p>The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topics of reserved names and name collision. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.</p> | Partially | <p>The PDP WG, in the course of conducting its work, has sought input from the technical community, which in part, led to the preliminary recommendation to reserve Special-Use Domain Names established through the IETF RFC 6761 process.</p> <p>In addition, the PDP WG proactively sought feedback on its initial name collision framework via the DNS-OARC (DNS Operations, Analysis, and Research Center) mailing list and OARC 28 meeting, as well as the IETF DNSOP and RIPE DNS Working Group mailing lists, though no input was received.</p> | <p>The PDP WG has not considered a model for future engagement with the IETF and other technical bodies, though this may be beyond the scope of this PDP WG.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-4</p> | <p>Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.</p> | <p>The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 4 to mean that these recommendations should be addressed before a subsequent application process is opened for new gTLD.</p> | <p>As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list, or the process for coordinating with other bodies to do so.</p> <p>Since the launch of the 2012 round, the IETF has created a new RFC for special use names and recommends that the topic of reserved names taking into account this RFC, private use name, and name collision be addressed before another application process is opened.</p> | <p>The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.</p> | <p>The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topics of reserved names and name collision. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.</p> <p>With regard to name collision, a plan to address name collision was approved by the Board and remains in place codified in Registry Agreements. The Board has also recently asked the SSAC to conduct a name collision study.</p> | <p>Yes Partially</p> | <p>The PDP WG intends to include recommendations on both the Reserved Names list and Name Collisions, all of which would be envisioned to be implemented prior to the launch of the subsequent new gTLD procedures.</p> | <p>Nothing identified at this time. The PDP WG may need to explore what it, and perhaps the SSAC, considers the word "complete" to mean in this context. The PDP WG intends to provide its recommendations to the GNSO Council, but subsequent steps, including reconciling GNSO recommendations and possibly unfinished work of the NCAP, are up to the Board and the wider community.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|