

Report of Public Comments

Title:	.post Agreement Amendment		
Publication Date:	21 September 2012		
Prepared By:			
Comment & Reply Comment Period:		Important Information Links	
Open Date:	9 April 2012	Announcement	
Close Date:	9 May 2012	Public Comment Box	
Time (UTC):		View Comments Submitted	
Staff Contact:	Kurt Pritz	Email:	kurt.pritz@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
Section II: Contributors			
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of three community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>			
<u>Organizations and Groups:</u>			
Name	Submitted by	Initials	
ZADNA	Vika Mpisane	ZADNA	
Universal Postal Union (UPU)	Paul Donohue	UPU	
<u>Individuals:</u>			
Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials	
Steve Goldstein		SG	
Michele Neylon	Blacknight Solutions	MN	
Section III: Summary of Comments			
<p><i>General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).</i></p>			
<p><u>Opposition to .post Amendment & Proposed Consent for Reserved Name Second Level Registrations</u> UPU should be held to the terms of the agreement as signed; this is in agreement with the policy ICANN advocates in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook which requires new gTLD applicants not to accept registrations of IANA and other names. Perhaps ICANN should consider in the post-new gTLD</p>			

evaluation era amending the gTLD agreements to allow second level registration of reserved names where an appropriate authority (over a reserved name) consents to the second level registration. Example: if ZADNA consents to or requests registration of za.music, then the music registry operator should be allowed to accept such a registration. Same thing if the Kenyan Government wants kenya.africa, then the .africa registry operator should be allowed to accept such a registration. ZADNA (8 May 2012)

Rationale For and Timing of the Amendment Requirement

Why is this amendment being sought and why now? If there is no technical issue with the change then why impose a needless restriction? M. Neylon (10 May 2012)

Regarding com.post, what was ICANN's thinking? S. Goldstein (10 April 2012)

.Post Country Code Registrations--Clarification

This request's announcement had a minor error in it--a reference made by ICANN that UPU was requesting permission to use country codes, which ICANN subsequently rectified. In accordance with the relevant provisions contained in Appendix 6 of the .post sTLD Agreement, the UPU is already permitted to work in conjunction with its member countries to assign and use ISO-3166 country codes in .post domain name registrations. UPU (30 May 2012)

Support for .post Amendment

UPU reinforces its request that the current restriction pertaining to registration of previously-reserved IANA domain strings at the second level within the TLD be removed from the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement to allow the UPU to fulfill the .post objectives and the implementation of the .post Domain Management Policy as approved by its member countries.

- The need for submitting this RSEP request was identified as the outcome of preparations of comprehensive domain management policy and naming conventions resulting from extensive multi-stakeholder debates conducted within the UPU and finally decided by the bodies of the UPU over the past two years.
- The proposed service requested is merely seeking to implement recent ICANN decisions and recommendations concerning the use of previously-reserved strings, particularly the Final Report of the Reserved Names Working Group (GNSO New TLDs Committee) of 23 May 2007, as well as the current version of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (11 January 2012), in which such gTLD string second- or higher-level registration requirements no longer exist (see section 2.6, Draft New gTLD Registry Agreement and its Specification 5-“Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries”). UPU (30 May 2012)

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

During the public comment period, the UPU proposal received three comments in opposition. UPU addressed the comments during the reply period. UPU response to public comments can be

summarized as follows:

- UPU reinforces its request that the current restriction pertaining to registration of previously-reserved IANA domain strings at the second level within the TLD be removed from the .post Sponsored TLD Agreement to allow the UPU to fulfill the .post objectives and the implementation of the .post Domain Management Policy as approved by its member countries.
- The need for submitting this RSEP request was identified as the outcome of preparations of comprehensive domain management policy and naming conventions resulting from extensive multi-stakeholder debates conducted within the UPU and finally decided by the bodies of the UPU over the past two years.
- The proposed service requested is merely seeking to implement recent ICANN decisions and recommendations concerning the use of previously-reserved strings, particularly the Final Report of the Reserved Names Working Group (GNSO New TLDs Committee) of 23 May 2007, as well as the current version of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (11 January 2012), in which such gTLD string second- or higher-level registration requirements no longer exist (see section 2.6, Draft New gTLD Registry Agreement and its Specification 5-“Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries”). UPU (30 May 2012)

ICANN notes that the restriction UPU seeks to release no longer exists in the new gTLD Agreement.

The ICANN board was provided with the summary and analysis of the comments received. On 23 June 2012, the Board has considered and approved the request. Details can be found here:

<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-23jun12-en.htm#1.7>