INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR	**.int Doc 2**
STUDY PERIOD 2001-2004	**English only**
	Original: English

Workshop to develop a Recommendation
to clarify the management of '.int'

Geneva, 15-16 September 2003

WORKSHOP DOCUMENT

Source:	ITU/SPU
Title:	Jon Postel's comments on the draft ITU.int Policy and Procedures

At http://www.itu.ch/intreg/ you can find a very early draft of an .int Policy document. This is very preliminary and needs a lot of work but is a first shot. The links off the policy document are currently broken but will appear. A few comments:

I've taken a look at it. Looks good. A few comments below:

1. Is it really appropriate that the 'international databases' continue to be registered under .int? Also see the definition for international databases (limited to supporting Internet infrastructure services). Someone here has mentioned that he thought it might be more appropriate to migrate this under .net because .net seems to be also used for Internet infrastructure support (e.g., rs.internic.net). Comments?

No. I think we want to keep the databases under .INT. I think .NET will become much like .COM in the near future.

2. As I've written in the draft policy doc, I have defined 'international organizations as being 'international treaty organizations of a governmental nature'. Although referring to organizations that are currently in .int should not necessarily define the policy, organizations like 'ymca', who is in .int, obviously doesn't fall in this category.

How did "ymca" get in ??? No reason to let mistakes of the past dictate police for the future.

Specifically referring to governmental treaty organizations would also probably exclude organizations like ISO, IEC, IATA and International Committee of the Red Cross (CICR,ICRC). We also have the problem of organizations which started out as treaty organizations such as SITA (in .int) and Inmarsat, Intelsat (also in .int) who are/are in the process of being privatized/commercialized. I think we will need to broaden the definition to reflect what is in .int and be more flexible. The challenge is to come up with a good definition. Any comments?

Well, I'll really leave it up to you, though i favor sticking with the "international treaty defined organization" test. If you want to allow a broader set of orgs to be in INT please try to define the criteria you would use to decide what is in or out, and lets some of us give you test cases.

Contact:	Robert Shaw	Tel:	+41 22 730 5338
	ITU/SPU	Fax:	+41 22 730 6453
		Email	robert.shaw@itu.int

3. We don't know what fees we would charge (if any) but obviously if 'Internet databases' is maintained in .int, there obviously would not be a charge for those.

Right.

In the policy statement, we say specifically that we may waive fees (e.g., for humanitarian organizations?)

This gets interesting. If you will treat everyone the same, but waive fees for a few, there may be questions asked. I think you need to define up front the conditions for having fees waived. This also ties back to how orgs appropriate to register in INT are defined.

4. If the database category is maintained in .int and with the definition given, I suggest that this is cleared on application with the current Chair of the IAB (Point 3). Comments?

Ok with me. I think it is a good idea to tie the creation of a database needed to support the Internet infrastructure with a review by the chair of the Internet Architecture Board. Maybe the infrastructure and the architecture could be related?

5. Dispute resolution (which we hope is minimal) will have to be much better refined. We are tracking discussions on newdom and at http://www.law.georgetown.edu/lc/internic/domain1.html . And of course we will be getting input on the evolving drafts from our legal people here.

Ok. Good luck.

6. Rejecting applications on the basis of similarity to common 2nd level domain names under ISO 3166 country codes (e.g., .us, see Point 6) is probably not a good idea since there is no universal consensus on what these are but this is policy of some (http://www.namesnet.co.uk/text/guidelines.html) Comments?

Right. I think that may be a problem. I would not want to make those decisions on a case by case basis. Could you come up with a list up front?

7. Idem for rejection on basis of a number starting a domain name is probably also not a good idea since there is precedent (e.g., 3com.com, 7up.com). Could put in clause that usage should be justified and part of entity name or service?

Why bother with the restriction?

8. From traffic I've seen, it is probably not a good idea to bounce off newdom list or publically discuss in comp.protocols.tcp-ip.domains until very refined (or not at all)? Comments?

I don't think this needs review by newdom, or anybody else really. We can just do it. You should fully expect to revise your policies pretty regularly as you get some experience.

9. Note 'reserved' names concept which I got from SWITCH folks (along with a lot of other ideas). I think this is a good concept to avoid future problems and gives us a good reason to contact the various international organizations and let them know we're holding their common multilingual acronyms in reserve.

Again, I think you are better off if you can make that list before you start operations.

10. Note consideration for multilingual requirements (Point 5).

It is a nice touch.

11. As discussed, whatever refined policy we arrive at will have no impact on existing registrations except in the case of mutually agreed (between organization and Registry) migration of organizations that don't fit out of .int.

Correct.

12.   Note use of 'through a cooperative agreement with IANA' in definition of 'Registry' at the top - I think this will avoid political problems - trying to avoid use of the term 'delegated to';

Ok with me.

Other comments on the policy:

Somehow point 6 and all the reasons for rejecting a proposed name seemed a little low level (over detailed) for this document. Some of the reasons may be very difficult to enforce in an evenhanded manner (for example, "in bad taste (in any language)", or "when combined ... constitute an trademark infringement" (also in any language?)

On point 7 on Name Servers - I suggest requiring that the two nameservers be on different continents (shouldn't be hard for truly international organizations to arrange).

_____