ICANN Staff Proposed Implementation Document on GNSO Reserved Names Working Group Recommendations

Patrick Jones
4 September 2007

This document describes proposed ICANN staff implementation of the Final Report of the GNSO Reserved Names Working Group (23 May 2007), http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/final-report-rn-wg-23may07.pdf. It was prepared at the request of the Reserved Names Working Group (RN-WG) Chair to provide information to the GNSO Council regarding the implementation of the RN-WG recommendations.

The RN-WG was approved by the GNSO Council on 18 January 2007 (http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rn-wg/msg00005.html). The RN-WG was a suggested action item out of the 21 December 2006 teleconference of the GNSO Council (http://gnso.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg03130.html).

The original RN-WG Statement of Work is found in Appendix A of the 19 March 2007 RN-WG Report (http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/rn-wg-fr19mar07.pdf). According the Statement of Work:

> The purpose of the [RN-]WG will be to perform an initial examination of the role and treatment of reserved domain names at the first and second level, with the goal of providing recommendations for further consideration by the TF or Council. This working group should focus initially on defining the role of reserved [names], and how to proceed with a full examination of issues and possible policy recommendations. This will include prioritizing sub-elements of the broad topic of reserved names in a manner that would facilitate breaking the broad topic into smaller parts that could then be divided into separate policy efforts of a more manageable size and that might also allow some less complicated issues to be resolved in a more timely manner so that some policy changes might be included in the introduction of new g[eneric Top-level Domains] TLDs.

> The treatment of reserved names is a matter of contract for existing gTLDs and will be a matter of contract for future gTLDs. As such it relates to the work of both the Dec05 PDP regarding the Introduction of New gTLDs including [Internationalized Domain Names] IDNs and the Feb06 PDP regarding Contractual Conditions for Existing Registries, therefore, the WG needs to provide an initial examination of reserved names at both the top and second level for both existing and new gTLDs.

The RN-WG convened 10 times from 24 January 2007 to 15 March 2007, and completed an initial report of recommendations on 16 March 2007 (published on the GNSO website on 19 March 2007 and referred to as the 19 March 2007 Report in this document). The initial RN-WG recommendations were discussed during the ICANN meeting in Lisbon, Portugal. After the Lisbon meeting, the GNSO Council agreed to a revised Statement of Work and extension of the RN-WG to 10 May 2007.

The Final Report of the RN-WG was published on 23 May 2007 after an additional 6 meetings. The report was discussed by the GNSO Council during the ICANN meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and minor modifications to the RN-WG recommendations were suggested by the GNSO Council in its meeting on 12 July 2007 (see Draft GNSO Council minutes 12 July 2007, posted on 25 July 2007, http://gnso.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg03705.html). Chuck

Gomes provided an updated RN-WG Recommendation status table to the GNSO Council on 27 July 2007. The recommendations below reflect those updates.

Implementation has been divided into two paths: 1) implementation of the recommendations in new gTLDs, and 2) implementation of the recommendations in existing gTLDs under contract with ICANN.

1. Implementation in new gTLDs

ICANN staff has started creating implementation plans according to the Final Report of the RN-WG and the proposed Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs. The Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs is scheduled to be presented to the ICANN Board for consideration during the ICANN Annual Meeting in Los Angeles, California 27 October – 2 November 2007.

It is anticipated by the Working Group that the recommendations of the Final Report will be incorporated in the process for introducing new gTLDs; particularly as part of a posted Schedule of Reserved Names, and instructions to applicants in the Request for Proposal (RFP) for new TLDs.

2. Implementation in existing gTLDs under contract with ICANN

In anticipation of its adoption by the GNSO Council, ICANN staff is currently exploring options for implementation of the RN-WG recommendations on existing gTLDs.

Recommendations of the RN-WG have implications for the 16 existing gTLDs under contract with ICANN. A complete list of those gTLDs is available at http://www.icann.org/registries/agreements.htm.

Work is continuing related to ICANN/IANA names at the second level, and single letter/single digit names at the second level (and if applicable, third level). Regarding the ICANN/IANA names, the Working Group recommended, "Evaluate whether there is justification to continue reserving ICANN and IANA ASCII names at all levels as recommended in this report." It was suggested in the Working Group and during the GNSO Council meeting in San Juan that staff inquire with entities and organizations with names on the ICANN/IANA reserved list to see if these entities wish to maintain their reservation.

Some working group members suggested that ICANN staff should post a Request for Ideas or host a forum on potential allocation methods for the release of single letters and single digits at the second level in existing gTLDs.

3. Tables of Reserved Names

The tables below are summaries of all names that the RN-WG recommended be reserved, ordered alphabetically by name where possible in the first table and alphabetical by category in the second table. These tables are provided for convenience only; please refer to the recommendations provided in the Full Recommendation Table. The names listed are not case-sensitive.

Alphabetical Table

ASCII			IDN		
Top Level	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level**	**Top Level**	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level***
0	AFRINIC	AFRINIC	All Unicode versions of 'Example' and 'Test'	All Unicode versions of 'Example' ** and names that appear in the IDN Evaluation Facility.	All Unicode versions of 'Example' **
1	APNIC	APNIC			
2	ARIN	ARIN			
3	ASO	ASO			
4	ccNSO	ccNSO			
5	Example	Example			
6	GNSO	GNSO			
7	gtld-servers	gtld-servers			
8	IAB	IAB			
9	IANA	IANA			
a	iana-servers	iana-servers			
AFRINIC	ICANN	ICANN			
APNIC	IESG	IESG			
ARIN	IETF	IETF			
ASO	Internic	Internic			
b	IRTF	IRTF			
c	ISTF	ISTF			
ccNSO	LACNIC	LACNIC			
d	LATNIC	LATNIC			
e	NIC*	NIC*			
Example	rfc-editor	rfc-editor			
f	RIPE	RIPE			
g	root-servers	root-servers			
GNSO	Whois*	Whois*			
gtld-servers	www*	www*			
h					
i					
IAB					
IANA					
iana-servers					
ICANN					
IESG					
IETF					
Internic					
IRTF					
ISTF					
j					
k					
l					
LACNIC					
LATNIC					
m					
n					
NIC					
o					
p					
q					
r					
rfc-editor					

	ASCII			IDN		
Top Level	2nd Level	3rd Level	Top Level	2nd Level	3rd Level***
RIPE root-servers s t test u v w Whois www x y z						

	ASCII			IDN		
Top Level	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level**	**Top Level**	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level*****
RIPE root-servers s t test u v w Whois www x y z						

*   For use by registry operators only.

**   The RN-WG recommended that ICANN not try to translate 'example' into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist, except on a case by case basis as proposed by given registries.

*** Applicable only in cases where a registry registers names at the third level.

Reserved Names Table by Category

RN Category	ASCII			IDN		
	Top Level	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level**	**Top Level**	**2nd Level**	**3rd Level $^{\#\#\#}$**
Controversial	No	No	No	No	No	No
Geographic & Geopolitical	No	No	No	No	No	No
gTLDs at the 2nd & 3rd Level	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No
ICANN & IANA related	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	No*	No*
NIC, Whois, www	Yes	Yes**	Yes**	No	No	No
Single Letter, Single Digit Combinations	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Single Characters	Yes	No	No	No***	No	No
Symbols	Yes$^{\#}$	Yes$^{\#}$	Yes$^{\#}$	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tagged	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two or More Digits	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two IDN Characters	N/A	N/A	N/A	No***	No	No
Two Letters	Yes$^{\#\#}$	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

*   Except for Unicode versions of 'example' and 'test'
**   For use by registries only.

***   At the top level, requested strings should be analyzed on a case by case basis in the new gTLD process depending on the script and language used in order to determine whether the string should be granted for allocation in the DNS.

\#   Except for the use of the hyphen (-) where allowed.

\#\#   For ccTLD use only.

\#\#\#   Applicable only in cases where a registry registers names at the third level.

The Full Recommendation Table includes the recommendations of the RN-WG for each category along with a proposed staff implementation recommendation for new gTLDs and existing gTLDs.

FULL RECOMMENDATION TABLE

Detailed information for each of the recommendations in this table can be found in the Final Report of the RN-WG, http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/final-report-rn-wg-23may07.pdf.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
1	ICANN & IANA	All ASCII	Maintain the existing reservation requirement and extend it to the top level until further work is completed. Further work is recommended to send questions, receive and compile responses from organizations with related reserved names, and draft a report to the GNSO Council. Examples are icann.net, or admin.iana. The names listed as ICANN and IANA names will be reserved at all levels.	Maintain reservation in existing gTLD registries. IANA/ICANN names at the top level will be dealt with in the implementation of the new gTLD process.
2	ICANN & IANA	Top level, IDN	For all but "example", reservations are not required for Unicode versions in various scripts, or ACE [ASCII Compatible Encoding] versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist. All possible Unicode versions of the name "example" must be reserved. Any names that appear in the IDN evaluation facility which consist exclusively of translations of 'example' or 'test' that appear in the document at http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf shall be reserved.	Include in implementation of new gTLD process.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
3	ICANN & IANA	2nd & 3rd levels, IDN	For all but "example", reservations are not required for Unicode versions in various scripts, or ACE versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist. Do not try to translate 'example' into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist, except on a case by case basis as proposed by given registries. Any names that appear in the IDN evaluation facility which consist exclusively of translations of 'example' or 'test' that appear in the document at http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf shall be reserved.	Include provision in contractual conditions for new gTLDs. Include provision in IDN implementation document for existing gTLDs. For existing gTLD registries that follow the IDN Guidelines and offer IDNs, staff should inquire whether translations of 'example' or 'test' have already been registered.
4	Symbols	ALL	We recommend that the current practice be maintained, so that no symbols other that the '-' [hyphen] be considered for use, with further allowance for any equivalent marks that may explicitly be made available in future revisions of the IDNA protocol. [1]	Maintain practice in existing gTLDs and include in implementation for new gTLDs.

[1] The following RFCs require that domain names must begin with a letter or a digit so the use of the hyphen as a top level domain or the use of names beginning or ending with a hyphen at any level is not allowed: RFC 952, ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/pdfrfc/rfc952.txt.pdf. This RFC was later modified by RFC 1123, ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/pdfrfc/rfc1123.txt.pdf.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
5	Single and Two Character IDNs	IDN strings at all levels	Single and two-character U-labels on the top level and second level of a domain name should not be restricted in general. At the top level, requested strings should be analyzed on a case by case basis in the new gTLD process depending on the script and language used in order to determine whether the string should be granted for allocation in the DNS. Single and two character labels at the second level and the third level if applicable should be available for registration, provided they are consistent with the IDN Guidelines.[2] Examples are as follows: Chinese: 新 (new); Japanese: トロ (toro), 寿司 (sushi), Korean: 집(house) 돈(money); 손(hand), Hebrew: . א (alef); . גח (hag means holiday)	Include in new gTLD implementation. Include provision in IDN Implementation document for existing gTLDs.
6	Single Letters	Top Level	We recommend reservation of single letters at the top level based on technical questions raised. If sufficient research at a later date demonstrates that the technical issues and concerns are addressed, the topic of releasing reservation status can be reconsidered. Examples of names that would not be allowed include .a, .z.	Include in implementation of new gTLD process. No applications for single letters at the top level will be considered until research at a later date demonstrates that the technical issues and concerns are addressed.

---

[2] This is notwithstanding two letter TLDs will be allowed only as ccTLDs, when added to the ISO-3166 list, and as such all two letter ASCII strings will remain reserved at the top level and second level of a domain name, although registries may propose release of two letter LDH strings at the second level provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
7	Single Letters and Digits	2nd Level	We recommend that single letters and digits be released at the second level in future gTLDs, and that those currently reserved in existing gTLDs should be released. This release should be contingent upon the use of appropriate allocation frameworks. More work may be needed. Examples include a.com, i.info. In future gTLDs we recommend that single letters and single digits be available at the second (and third level if applicable).	The issue of 1-letter & 1-digit names in existing gTLDs to be dealt with by the Council separately. ICANN staff to develop proposed allocation methodologies by posting on the ICANN website a forum soliciting possible allocation methods regarding single letters and digits at the second level in existing gTLDs.
8	Single and Two Digits	Top Level	We recommend digits be reserved at the top level, in order to avoid potential confusion with IP addresses within software applications. Examples include .3, .99., .12343545 Any name that can be confused with an IP address, IPv4 and IPv6, should be reserved. (e.g., .3, .99, .123, .1035, .0xAF, .1578234)	Include in implementation of new gTLD process. No applications for digits at the top level will be considered.
9	Single Letter, Single Digit Combinations	Top Level	Applications may be considered for single letter, single digit combinations at the top level in accordance with the terms set forth in the new gTLD process. Examples include .3F, .A1, .u7.	Incorporated into new gTLD process.
10	Two Letters	Top Level	We recommend that the current practice of allowing two letter names at the top level, only for ccTLDs, remain at this time.[3] Examples include .AU, .DE, .UK.	Done for current gTLDs, maintain existing practice in implementation of new gTLD process. No applications for two letter names will be considered outside existing IANA practices.

---

[3] The subgroup was encouraged by the ccNSO not to consider removing the restriction on two-letter names at the top level. IANA has based its allocation of two-letter names at the top level on the ISO 3166 list. There is a risk of collisions between any interim allocations, and ISO 3166 assignments which may be desired in the future.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
11	Any combination of Two Letters, Digits	2nd Level	Registries may propose release provided that measures to avoid confusion with any corresponding country codes are implemented.[4] Examples include ba.aero, ub.cat, 53.com, 3M.com, e8.org.	Maintain current practice in existing gTLDs and include contractual condition for new gTLDs.
12	Tagged Names	Top Level ASCII	In the absence of standardization activity and appropriate IANA registration, all labels with hyphens in both the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n") must be reserved in ASCII at the top level.[5]	Include in implementation of new gTLD process.
13	N/A	Top Level IDN	For each IDN gTLD proposed, applicant must provide both the "ASCII compatible encoding" ("A-label") and the "Unicode display form" ("U-label")[6] For example: • If the Chinese word for 'Beijing' is proposed as a new gTLD, the applicant would be required to provide the A-label (xn--1lq90i) and the U-label (北京). • If the Japanese word for 'Tokyo' is proposed as a new gTLD, the applicant would be required to provide the A-label (xn--1lqs71d) and the U-label (東京).	Include in implementation of new gTLD process.

---

[4] The existing gTLD registry agreements provide for a method of potential release of two-character LDH [Letter-Digit-Hyphen] names at the second level. In addition, two character LDH strings at the second level may be released through the process for new registry services, which process involves analysis of any technical or security concerns and provides opportunity for public input. Technical issues related to the release of two-letter and/or number strings have been addressed by the RSTEP Report on GNR's proposed registry service. The GAC has previously noted the WIPO II Report statement that "If ISO 3166 alpha-2 country code elements are to be registered as domain names in the gTLDs, it is recommended that this be done in a manner that minimises the potential for confusion with the ccTLDs."

[5] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n")", this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).

[6] Internet Draft IDNAbis Issues: http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-klensin-idnabis-issues-01.txt (J. Klensin), Section 3.1.1.1

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
14	Tagged Names	2nd Level ASCII	The current reservation requirement be reworded to say, "*In the absence of standardization activity and appropriate IANA registration,* all labels with hyphens in both the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n") must be reserved in ASCII at the second (2nd) level.[7] – added words in *italics*. (Note that names starting with "xn--" may only be used if the current ICANN IDN Guidelines are followed by a gTLD registry.)	Recommend existing registries update their contractual provisions to include this recommendation. Incorporate language in renewal agreements for existing registries and incorporate into contractual conditions for new gTLDs.
15	Tagged Names	3rd Level ASCII	All labels with hyphens in both the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n") must be reserved in ASCII at the third (3rd level) for gTLD registries that register names at the third level."[8] – added words in *italics*. (Note that names starting with "xn--" may only be used if the current ICANN IDN Guidelines are followed by a gTLD registry.)	Recommend existing registries update their contractual provisions to include this recommendation. Incorporate language in renewal agreements for existing registries and incorporate into contractual conditions for new gTLDs.
16	NIC/WHOIS/WWW	Top ASCII	The following names must be reserved: NIC, Whois, www.	Include in implementation of new gTLD process.
17	NIC/WHOIS/WWW	Top IDN	Do not try to translate NIC, Whois and www into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist.	Include in implementation of new gTLD process.
18	NIC/WHOIS/WWW	Second and Third* ASCII	The following names must be reserved for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the Registry TLD: NIC, Whois, www. Registry Operator may use them, but upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the Registry TLD, they shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. (*Third level only applies in cases where a registry offers registrations at the third level.)	Maintain reservation for existing gTLDs and include in contractual provision for new gTLDs.

---

[7] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n")", this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).
[8] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n")", this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
19	NIC/WHOIS/WWW	Second and Third* IDN	Do not try to translate NIC, Whois and www into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transliterations if they exist, except on a case by case basis as proposed by given registries. (*Third level only applies in cases where a registry offers registrations at the third level.)	Recommend addition of language to contractual provisions for existing gTLDs or in renewal of existing gTLD agreements. Include provision in contractual provision for new gTLDs.
20	Geographic and geopolitical	Top Level ASCII and IDN	There should be no geographical reserved names (i.e., no exclusionary list, no presumptive right of registration, no separate administrative procedure, etc.). The proposed challenge mechanisms currently being proposed in the draft new gTLD process would allow national or local governments to initiate a challenge, therefore no additional protection mechanisms are needed. Potential applicants for a new TLD need to represent that the use of the proposed string is not in violation of the national laws in which the applicant is incorporated.

However, new TLD applicants interested in applying for a TLD that incorporates a country, territory, or place name should be advised of the GAC principles, and the advisory role vested to it under the ICANN bylaws. Additionally, a summary overview of the obstacles encountered by previous applicants involving similar TLDs should be provided to allow an applicant to make an informed decision. Potential applicants should also be advised that the failure of the GAC, or an individual GAC member, to file a challenge during the TLD application process, does not constitute a waiver of the authority vested to the GAC under the ICANN bylaws.

Note Recommendation 20 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs | Considered by the New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 20 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs. |

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
21	Geographic and geopolitical	All Levels ASCII and IDN	The term 'geopolitical names' should be avoided until such time that a useful definition can be adopted. The basis for this recommendation is founded on the potential ambiguity regarding the definition of the term, and the lack of any specific definition of it in the WIPO Second Report on Domain Names or GAC recommendations. *Note Recommendation 20 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	ICANN will avoid use of term "geopolitical names" in gTLD registry agreements. Considered by the New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 20 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
22	Geographic and geopolitical	Second Level & Third Level if applicable, ASCII & IDN	The consensus view of the working group is given the lack of any established international law on the subject, conflicting legal opinions, and conflicting recommendations emerging from various governmental fora, the current geographical reservation provision contained in the sTLD contracts during the 2004 Round should be removed, and harmonized with the more recently executed .COM, .NET, .ORG, .BIZ and .INFO registry contracts. The only exception to this consensus recommendation is those registries incorporated/organized under countries that require additional protection for geographical identifiers. In this instance, the registry would have to incorporate appropriate mechanisms to comply with their national/local laws. For those registries incorporated/organized under the laws of those countries that have expressly supported the guidelines of the WIPO Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications as adopted by the WIPO General Assembly, it is strongly recommended (but not mandated) that these registries take appropriate action to promptly implement protections that are in line with these WIPO guidelines and are in accordance with the relevant national laws of the applicable Member State.	The following sTLD agreements contain a geographical reservation provision: .CAT, .JOBS, .MOBI, .TEL and .TRAVEL. ICANN needs further clarification from the GNSO Council and the sponsors listed above on whether there is consensus on the removal of this provision from the sTLD registry agreements.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
23	gTLD Reserved Names	Second & Third Level ASCII and IDN (when applicable)	Absent justification for user confusion[9], the recommendation is that gTLD strings should no longer be reserved from registration for new gTLDs at the second or when applicable at the third level. Applicants for new gTLDs should take into consideration possible abusive or confusing uses of existing gTLD strings at the second level of their corresponding gTLD, based on the nature of their gTLD, when developing the startup process for their gTLD.	This recommendation will be incorporated in the implementation of the new gTLD recommendations as a contractual condition for new gTLDs. For existing registries, ICANN staff will continue discussion with the gTLD Registry Constituency and within the GNSO on removing this provision or limiting application to existing gTLDs. In the alternative, two registries may approach ICANN requesting release of name from reserve.
24	Controversial Names	All Levels, ASCII & IDN	There should not be a new reserved names category for Controversial Names.	Do not create new reserved names category for Controversial Names. Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6.

---

[9] With its recommendation, the sub-group takes into consideration that justification for potential user confusion (i.e., the minority view) as a result of removing the contractual condition to reserve gTLD strings for new TLDs may surface during one or more public comment periods.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
25	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	There should be a list of disputed names created as a result of the dispute process to be created by the new gTLD process. *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.
26	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	In the event of the initiation of a CN-DRP [Controversial Names Dispute Resolution] process, applications for that label will be placed in a HOLD status that would allow for the dispute to be further examined. If the dispute is dismissed or otherwise resolved favorably, the applications will reenter the processing queue. The period of time allowed for dispute should be finite and should be relegated to the CN-DRP process. The external dispute process should be defined to be objective, neutral, and transparent. The outcome of any dispute shall not result in the development of new categories of Reserved Names.[10] *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.
27	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	The new GTLD Controversial Names Dispute Resolution Panel should be established as a standing mechanism that is convened at the time a dispute is initiated. Preliminary elements of that process are provided in this report but further work is needed in this area. *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.

---

[10] Note that this recommendation is a continuation of the recommendation in the original RN-WG report, modified to synchronize with the additional work done in the 30-day extension period.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
28	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	Within the dispute process, disputes would be initiated by the ICANN Advisory Committees (e.g., ALAC or GAC) or supporting organizations (e.g., GNSO or ccNSO). As these organizations do not currently have formal processes for receiving, and deciding on such activities, these processes would need to be defined: o The Advisory Groups and the Supporting Organizations, using their own processes and consistent with their organizational structure, will need to define procedures for deciding on any requests for dispute initiation. o Any consensus or other formally supported position from an ICANN Advisory Committee or ICANN Supporting Organization must document the position of each member within that committee or organization (i.e., support, opposition, abstention) in compliance with both the spirit and letter of the ICANN bylaws regarding openness and transparency. *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.
29	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	Further work is needed to develop predictable and transparent criteria that can be used by the Controversial Resolution Panel. These criteria must take into account the need to: ▪ Protect freedom of expression ▪ Affirm the fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and the equal rights of men and women Take into account sensitivities regarding terms with cultural and religious significance. *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.

	Reserved Name Category	Domain Name Level(s)	Recommendation	Proposed Implementation
30	Controversial Names	Top Level, ASCII & IDN	In any dispute resolution process, or sequence of issue resolution processes, the Controversial name category should be the last category considered. *Note Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs*	Considered by New gTLD Committee in Recommendation 6 of the Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs.