Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

Section II: Contributors

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.

Organizations and Groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZADNA</td>
<td>Vika Mpisane</td>
<td>ZADNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Postal Union (UPU)</td>
<td>Paul Donohue</td>
<td>UPU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation (if provided)</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Neylon</td>
<td>Blacknight Solutions</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III: Summary of Comments

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).

Opposition to .post Amendment & Proposed Consent for Reserved Name Second Level Registrations

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
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: