



SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #19 1900 UTC 05 October 2017

Agenda

1

Welcome and
Opening Remarks
SOI updates

2

Name Collisions

3

Registry Services

4

AOB

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks ; SOI updates

2. Name Collisions

Name collisions: what's in today's agenda and what's still ahead

- **To be discussed today:**
 - **Results from GDD inquiry on reported collisions**
 - **Whether 2012-round gTLDs should keep readiness after 2 years of delegation**
 - **Whether SubPro gTLDs should have readiness or not, and length of such readiness**
- **Still to be discussed at a later date:**
 - **Classification of strings in low risk, aggravated risk or high risk**
 - **Name collisions in legacy and current gTLDs**

Name Collisions: Reported collisions from 2012-round

- No human-life threatening collisions
- 18 unique TLDs represented in the 34 occurrences
 - 7 brand/exclusive-use TLDs
 - 1 GeoTLD/Governmental registry
 - Lower than expected occurrences with GeoTLDs
 - No IDN TLDs (as expected)
- Median of 3 occurrences per TLD
- Median of 22 days between the delegation and the report, with some very late reporting (maximum was 568 days)
- 23 cases reported as service disruption, 9 as networking errors; 21 cases affected company networks, 7 a single local computer, 2 application development environments, 1 web application

Name Collisions: Reported collisions from 2012-round (cont.)

- **In 24 cases the registry was not contacted**
 - **ICANN Org determined that contacting the registry was not necessary given that the reporter was able to fix the issue(s) in their network relatively quickly, or the reporter did not respond when asked if they approved ICANN to put them in contact with the registry.**
- **In 5 the registry was put in contact with the reporter, in 1 registry stopped controlled interruption, in 1 no action was taken**
- **Few data on outcomes; all 5 known outcomes that were reported were that the network was updated**

Name Collisions Framework: two year readiness for current new gTLDs

- **All 2012-round gTLDs were required to pass a controlled interruption period and be able to respond within two hours for life-threatening collision reports, for the first two years of delegation**
- **WT4 options:**
 - **a) 2012-gTLDs should extend readiness beyond the 2-year period**
 - **b) 2012-gTLDs should only have such readiness in those 2 years as currently foreseen in the framework**

Name Collisions Framework: two year readiness for SubPro gTLDs

- **Should gTLDs in subsequent procedures be subject for such 2-year readiness for life-threatening collisions ?**
- **WT4 options:**
 - a. **SubPro gTLDs should have the same 2-hour for life-threatening collisions readiness during the first _ years (1/2/3/4/5/10)**
 - b. **No need for any such readiness**
 - c. **SubPro gTLDs should have readiness covering more conditions with _ hours/days SLA**
 - *. **Different response for different types of TLDs ?**

3. Registry Services

Registry Services

- Mainly used as a mean to collect information to build “Exhibit A” (Approved Services) in registry contracts
- Probably less useful when technical evaluation is done in bulk or not done at all (RSP Program)
- Undergoing discussions might streamline registry service adoption (“free to deploy” services, services requiring no contract amendment)
- Possible source of innovation, although not seen so far

Registry Services - Straw-person #1

Applicants will be allowed but not required to specify additional registry services beyond base Exhibit A services (DNS zone publication, WHOIS, EPP etc.)

List of previously approved registry services (IDN Languages, GPML, BTPPA) to be included by reference in AGB and contract.

When applicants informed additional registry services, those will be evaluated thru RSEP at evaluation time or contracting time, at applicant's request.

Registry Services - Straw-person #2

Applicants should provide name and full description of all the Registry Services to be provided. Descriptions should include both technical and business components of each proposed service, and address any potential security or stability concerns.

Applicant acknowledges that ICANN may establish two application evaluation tracks which will operate separately, one for applications which propose new registry services and one for applications which contain only the following pre-approved registry services: [LIST OF PRE-APPROVED SERVICES HERE]

Registry Services - Straw-person #3

Applicants will be allowed (but not required) to specify additional registry services. Registry services that can be included at any time and are already approved are: IDN registrations, certain additional marketplace Rights Protection Mechanisms that have been identified as “blocks”), and Bulk Transfer After Partial Portfolio Acquisition (BTPPA).

If the applicant includes additional registry services, the applicant is to specify whether it wants those services should be evaluated in parallel with the application evaluation, during the contract negotiation and execution process, or after the contract signing. ICANN will use the RSEP policy and process for evaluation of additional services.

Timing: Additional Registry Services evaluation should not extend the evaluation process and is likely to extend the contract negotiation process.

Registry Services: Straw-person comparison

- #1 and #3 are remarkably similar
- #3 still mentions an after signature possible timing, which would put this WG out of its charter (it's covered by RSEP Policy)
- #2 and #3 has guidance on timing and processing of applications in tracks where #1 is silent on it
 - In practice #1 creates 2 tracks since RSEP is an already established procedure, although not making that explicit
- #1 incorporates a list of pre-approved services by reference, although mentioning some, while #2 and #3 explicitly names a list
- #1 and #3 only requires applicant to inform about registry services that are not in the pre-approved list while #2 requires all services to be informed and described at application time

Registry Services: Straw-person decision matrix

1. 2+ Tracks
 - a. Explicit guidance
 - b. Implied guidance
2. List of pre-approved services
 - a. Enumerated
 - b. By reference
3. Enumerate which pre-approved services applicant will be provide
 - a. Not required
 - b. Required

4. AOB

Appendix. Backup Slides

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (1/2)

- **Data-driven decision making using trusted research-accessible data (like DITL and ORDINAL)**
- **Before the procedure, ICANN Org would provide a “do not apply” list and a list of “exercise care” strings where they already expect a more detailed study to be required**
- **Every application, whether or not to those already identified as “exercise care” strings, would be allowed to file a collision mitigation framework**
- **All applied-for strings would be evaluated as to their risk of collisions: low risk, aggravated risk, high risk**
- **A high risk finding terminates the application(s)**
- **An aggravated risk determination requires a non-standard mitigation framework to move forward**

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (2/2)

- **All low risk strings would share a common framework, using controlled interruption; ICANN Org would start controlled interruption right after their findings are published**
 - **Possible label-specific non-wildcard NXDOMAIN responses, based on affected party request, with ICANN Org approval**
- **Minimum 90-day interruption period**
- **Mitigation frameworks would be evaluated by RSTEP**
- **No APD or other per-label lists, unless required by a specific collision mitigation (ex: [appname].TLD)**

Name collisions in legacy and current gTLDs

- **Situation: previously registered domain**
 - **Example: owner of acme.com let the domain expire, new user registers it**
- **Possible additions to “Expired Domain Deletion and Expired Registration Recovery” policy:**
 - **Notification of previous domain owner**
 - **By whom ?**
 - **Disallowing contracted parties to disclose information that would stimulate collisions, like DNS query volumes in dropcatch lists**