

Patrick Jones

From: Steve Crocker [steve@shinkuro.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2006 9:36 PM
To: Patrick Jones
Cc: Pritz Kurt; Crocker Steve
Subject: Re: Initial Request for New Registry Service

Patrick,

In reference to the first request for a new registry service, viz a request from Tralliance to use a wild card in the .travel registry, SSAC does not see any material difference between Tralliance's request and the service that VeriSign initiated in September 2003. We believe our advice in that matter applies directly to Tralliance as well. The wording we used in the 2004 report (SSAC 006) was chosen carefully:

Recommendation (1): Synthesized responses should not be introduced into top-level domains (TLDs) or zones that serve the public, whose contents are primarily delegations and glue, and where delegations cross organizational boundaries over which the operator may have little control or influence. Although the wildcard mechanism for providing a default answer in response to DNS queries for uninstantiated names is documented in the defining RFCs (Requests for Comment), it was generally intended to be used only in narrow contexts (for example, MX records for e-mail applications), generally within a single enterprise, and is currently used in top-level domains that are generally small and well-organized.

We advise against Tralliance's proposal.

Steve

Steve Crocker
steve@shinkuro.com

Try Shinkuro's collaboration technology. Visit www.shinkuro.com. I am steve!shinkuro.com.

On Sep 1, 2006, at 5:44 PM, Patrick Jones wrote:

Dear Steve,

Please see the attached letter from Kurt on the first request for a new registry service and supporting documentation.

Regards,

Patrick

Patrick L. Jones

Registry Liaison Manager

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

9/13/2006

4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330

Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Tel: +1 310 301 3861

Fax: +1 310 823 8649

patrick.jones@icann.org

<1 Sept letter to SSAC.pdf>

<Search.travel 2.pdf>