1 June 2018

Subject: SSAC2018-14: Request to Appoint Timothy April to the SSAC

To: ICANN Board
Via: The SSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board

The purpose of this letter is to bring you up-to-date on proposed changes to the membership of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) and to provide an explanation for the attached request for Board action. This change is the result of ongoing new member evaluations conducted by the SSAC Membership Committee and approved by the SSAC.

The SSAC Membership Committee considers new member candidates and makes its recommendations to the SSAC. The SSAC has agreed with the Membership Committee's recommendation to nominate Timothy April as an SSAC member.

Tim has been the Senior Architect, Information Security at Akamai Technologies Inc since August 2011 and has some prior experience in teaching and research. The expertise and skills that he would bring to the SSAC both Content Delivery Networks design, development and operation as well as DDoS and Malware analysis, detection and mitigation. Timothy also havs experience with large scale nameserver (both authoritative and recursive) design, development and operations; protocol design and implementation; and general security review experience to add to the existing pool within SSAC.

The SSAC believes Timothy April would be a significant contributing member of the SSAC.

The SSAC Membership Committee respectfully requests that the Board appoint Timothy April to the SSAC for a term beginning immediately upon approval of the board and ending on 31 December 2020. Attached is his CV for your reference.

The SSAC welcomes comments from the Board concerning this request.

Rod Rasmussen
SSAC Chair

Contact Information Redacted

Attachment: Curriculum Vitae of

Report on the Transfer of the .LS (Lesotho) top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC)

5 June 2018

This report is a summary of the materials reviewed as part of the process for the transfer of the .LS (Lesotho) top-level domain. It includes details regarding the proposed transfer, evaluation of the documentation pertinent to the request, and actions undertaken in connection with processing the transfer.

FACTUAL INFORMATION

Country

The "LS" ISO 3166-1 code from which the application's eligibility derives, is designated for use to represent Lesotho.

Chronology of events

On 13 January 1993, the .LS top-level domain was delegated to the National University of Lesotho. As part of the initial delegation, the National University of Lesotho was the designated domain manager and administrative contact while Rhodes University in South Africa was designated as the technical contact.

After the initial delegation, several name server and contact change requests were completed, but the listed organizations stayed the same until 2012.

In 2012, The Parliament of Lesotho enacted Communications Act No. 4 of 2012 which established regulations for the telecommunications, broadcasting and postal sectors in Lesotho. Under this Act, the Lesotho Communications Authority (LCA) was assigned several tasks in relation to the communications sector, including the designation of an entity to administer Internet domain names.

On 9 August 2012, the National University of Lesotho authorized a change to update the administrative contact organization from the National University of Lesotho to LCA.

On 14 January 2016, LCA established the Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC) and designated LSNIC as the manager of the .LS top-level domain. LSNIC was incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the Companies Act 2011.

On 31 March 2017, .LS completed a request to change the technical contact for the .LS top-level domain from Rhodes University to LSNIC.

From 10 January 2018 to 7 February 2018, LCA held public consultations through newspapers and websites seeking community input on the transfer of the .LS top-level domain from the National University of Lesotho to LSNIC. No objection was received during this period.

On 15 March 2018, LSNIC commenced a request to PTI to transfer the management of the .LS top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC).

Proposed Manager and Contacts

The proposed manager is Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC). It is based in Lesotho.

The administrative contact is Nthabiseng Pule, ICT Manager of LCA. The administrative contact will remain the same post the transfer of .LS top-level domain to LSNIC.

The administrative contact is understood to be based in Lesotho.

The technical contact is Mamothokoane Tlali, System Manager of LSNIC.

EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST

String Eligibility

The top-level domain is eligible for transfer as the string for Lesotho is presently listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

Incumbent Consent

The incumbent manager is National University of Lesotho. Informed consent for the transfer of .LS top-level domain to Lesotho Network Information Centre Proprietary (LSNIC) was provided by Liteboho Maqalika-Lerotholi, the Registrar of the National University of Lesotho.

Public Interest

Government support was provided through a letter from Mr. Thesele 'Maseribane, Minister of Communications, Science and Technology. Additional support letters from significantly interested parties were provided by the following:

- Vodacom Lesotho (Pty) Limited, a telecommunication service provider
- LEC Communications (Pty) Limited, a wholesale Internet service provider
- LEO (Pty) Limited, an Internet service provider
- Internet Association of Lesotho, an association formed under the National

University of Lesotho

The application is consistent with known applicable laws in Lesotho. The proposed manager undertakes the responsibility to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

Based in country

The proposed manager is constituted in Lesotho. The administrative contact is understood to be a resident of Lesotho. The registry is to be operated in Lesotho.

Stability

The proposed domain manager, LSNIC, is acquiring all existing registry infrastructure and domain management staff from the National University of Lesotho. Only administrative changes related to the domain manager are included in this transfer request, therefore stability aspects relating to registry transfer have been evaluated with the view that there are no technical changes to the domain.

The application is not known to be contested.

Competency

The application has provided information on the technical and operational infrastructures and expertise that will be used to operate the domain.

Proposed policies for management of the domain have also been tendered.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

PTI is tasked with coordinating the Domain Name System root zone as part of a set of functions governed by a contract with ICANN. This includes accepting and evaluating requests for delegation and transfer of top-level domains.

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the significantly interested parties in countries to operate in a way that best suits their local needs. These are known as country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), and are assigned to responsible managers that meet a number of public-interest criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the manager has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through the IANA Services performed by PTI, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and transferring or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, the requests are implemented where they are found to meet the criteria.

Purpose of evaluations

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible managers charged with operating them, is guided by a number of principles. The objective of the assessment is that the action enhances the secure and stable operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.

In considering requests to delegate or transfer ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new manager, as well as from persons and organizations that may be significantly affected by the change, particularly those within the nation or territory to which the ccTLD is designated.

The assessment is focused on the capacity for the proposed manager to meet the following criteria:

• The domain should be operated within the country, including having its manager and administrative contact based in the country.

• The domain should be operated in a way that is fair and equitable to all groups in the local Internet community.

• Significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the prospective manager is the appropriate party to be responsible for the domain, with the desires of the national government taken very seriously.

• The domain must be operated competently, both technically and operationally. Management of the domain should adhere to relevant technical standards and community best practices.

• Risks to the stability of the Internet addressing system must be adequately considered and addressed, particularly with regard to how existing identifiers will continue to function.

Method of evaluation

To assess these criteria, information is requested from the applicant regarding the proposed manager and method of operation. In summary, a request template is sought specifying the exact details of the delegation being sought in the root zone. In addition, various documentation is sought describing: the views of the local internet community on the application; the competencies and skills of the manager to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed manager; and the nature of government support for the proposal.

After receiving this documentation and input, it is analyzed in relation to existing

root zone management procedures, seeking input from parties both related to as well as independent of the proposed manager should the information provided in the original application be deficient. The applicant is given the opportunity to cure any deficiencies before a final assessment is made.

Once all the documentation has been received, various technical checks are performed on the proposed manager's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, PTI will work with the applicant to address the issues.

Assuming all issues are resolved, an assessment is compiled providing all relevant details regarding the proposed manager and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.

TITLE: **March 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

DETAILED ANALYSIS:

1. Background:

In July 2016, ICANN called for expressions of interest to assist as host of the March 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which is to be held in the Latin American/Caribbean region. Staff recommends the Cancun International Convention Center (CICC) for ICANN67 in March 2020.

2. Site Visit:

- Cancun, Mexico: A preliminary site visit was conducted in February 2018.

3. Discussion of Issues:

- Meeting Rooms: The Cancun International Convention Center (CICC) has excellent conference facilities for an ICANN Meeting.

- Host Hotels: The Aloft Hotel, adjacent to the CICC will serve as the host hotel for the Meeting.

- Area Hotels: Many nearby hotels, all accessible via a short walk, ICANN Shuttle or short taxi ride, offer a wide variety of guest room accommodations at varying price points.

- Food & Beverage Outlets: The CICC will provide food for sale for Meeting delegates at a reasonable cost. In addition, there are several restaurant options in close proximity to CICC.

- Air Travel: Air access to Cancun is good, with direct flights from some major European cities and most large US cities all arriving at Cancun International Airport. However, most international itineraries will require one stop in route.

- Ground Transportation: Cancun International Airport is 27 kilometers/35 minutes from the meeting venue and area hotels. Taxi fare is approximately US$35.

- Safety & Security: A risk assessment by ICANN security has not identified any areas of concern for Cancun that would require other than standard security measures provided for an ICANN Meeting.

Staff recommends that the board approve Cancun, Mexico as the location of the March 2020 ICANN Meeting.

Board Approval Required:

4. CICC Contract Costs

- The contract for the CICC will include:

Confidential Negotiation Information

*Note that negotiations are in progress. This is currently an estimate, which we do not believe
 will be exceeded.

<u>Board Approval Not Required:</u>

5. Hotel Guest Room Costs – Board Approval Not Required:
- The contract for the Aloft Hotel will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Beachscape Standard Hotel will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Fiesta Americana Coral Beach Cancun will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Krystal Grand Punta Deluxe will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Krystal Cancun Standard will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

6. Hotel Courtesy Block
- The following hotels have provided a courtesy block of rooms (315 total rooms)
  - Presidente InterContinental Hotel
  - Fiesta Americana Coral Beach Cancun
  - Krystal Grand Punta Deluxe
  - Krystal Grand Punta Altitude
  - Krystal Cancun Standard
  - Krystal Cancun Club

Staff recommends that the board approve the expenditure (including contracting and disbursements) for the contract with the Cancun International Convention Center.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Below***

6. Other Hosting Proposals Received:

- Lima, Peru: Johnny Laureano from the Asociación de Usuarios de Internet del Perú submitted a hosting proposal. The proposed convention center is still in the process of selecting a management company. The host has not followed through with a valid proposal.

- Monterrey, Mexico: Monica Trevino from Cintermex Convention Center submitted a hosting proposal. The location was not suitable for an ICANN meeting due to security and accessibility concerns.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Above***

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	25 May 2018
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

TITLE: **June 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

DETAILED ANALYSIS:

1. Background:

In July 2016, ICANN called for expressions of interest to assist as host of the June 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which is to be held in the Asia Pacific region. The proposal that is recommended for approval, from Prof. Dr. Suhaidi Hassan of the Internet Society Malaysia Chapter, is discussed below.

2. Site Visit:

- Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: A preliminary site visit was conducted in May 2018.

3. Discussion of Issues:

- Meeting Rooms: The Kuala Lumpur Convention Center (KLCC) has excellent conference facilities for an ICANN Meeting.

- Host Hotels: The Mandarin Oriental, Grand Hyatt and Traders Hotel KL, all adjacent to the KLCC, will serve as the host hotels for the Meeting.

- Area Hotels: Many other nearby hotels, all accessible via a short walk, offer a wide variety of guest room accommodations at varying price points.

- Food & Beverage Outlets: The KLCC will provide food for sale for Meeting delegates at a reasonable cost. In addition, there are several restaurant options in close proximity to KLCC.

- Air Travel: Air access to Kuala Lumpur is good, with direct flights from most major Asia Pacific cities and many large European and Middle Eastern cities all arriving at Kuala Lumpur International Airport. However, some international itineraries will require one stop in route.

- Ground Transportation: Kuala Lumpur International Airport is 65 kilometers/60 minutes from the meeting venue and area hotels. Taxi fare is approximately US$35.

- Safety & Security: A risk assessment by ICANN security has not identified any areas of concern for Kuala Lumpur that would require other than standard security measures provided for an ICANN Meeting.

Staff recommends that the board approve Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia as the location of the June 2020 ICANN Meeting.

4. KLCC Contract Costs – Board Approval Required:

- The contract for the KLCC will include:
  Confidential Negotiation Information

*Note that negotiations are in progress. This is currently an estimate, which we do not believe
 will be exceeded.

5. Hotel Guest Room Costs – Board Approval Required:
- The contract for the Mandarin Oriental will be:
  - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Grand Hyatt will be:
  - Confidential Negotiation Information

6. Hotel Guest Room Costs – Board Approval Not Required:
- The contract for the Traders Hotel KL will be:
  - Confidential Negotiation Information

7. Subvention:
- The Malaysian Convention and Exhibition Bureau has offered Confidential Negotiation Information as
  subvention for the meeting to be held in Kuala Lumpur.

Staff recommends that the board approve the expenditure (including contracting and disbursements) for the contracts with the Kuala Lumpur Convention Center, Mandarin Oriental Hotel and the Grand Hyatt Hotel.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Below***

6. Other Hosting Proposals Received:

- Macao, China: Yannis Li (DotAsia), Bonnie Chun (HKIRC) and Paco Xiao (MONIC) submitted a proposal. However, we found this location to be more expensive than Kuala Lumpur.

- Auckland, New Zealand: Jordan Carter from InternetNZ submitted a proposal. However, we found this location to be more expensive than Kuala Lumpur.

- Tel-Aviv, Israel: Yoav Keren from Domain The Net Technologies Ltd. submitted a proposal. However, we found this location to be more expensive than Kuala Lumpur and not suitable for an ICANN meeting due to security concerns. With the proximity to the Gaza strip and the escalation of an Iran/Israel conflict we feel it is best to avoid this region.

- Sydney, Australia: Joanne Muscat from Business Events Sydney submitted a hosting proposal. However, this location was proposed by the meeting venue not a community member and is more expensive than Kuala Lumpur.

- Adelaide, Australia: Jacqui Lloyd from Adelaide Convention Bureau submitted a proposal. However, this location was proposed by the meeting venue not a community member and is more expensive than Kuala Lumpur.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Above***

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	25 May 2018
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

TITLE: **October 2020 ICANN Meeting Venue Contracting**

DETAILED ANALYSIS:

1. Background:

In July 2016, ICANN called for expressions of interest to assist as host of the October 2020 ICANN Public Meeting, which is to be held in the Europe region. The proposal that is recommended for approval, from Oliver Sueme from the eco Association of the Internet Industry in partnership with the Hamburg Convention Bureau, DENIC (.de) and the City of Hamburg is discussed below.

2. Site Visit:

- Hamburg, Germany: A preliminary site visit was conducted in January 2018.

3. Discussion of Issues:

- Meeting Rooms: The Congress Center Hamburg (CCH) has excellent conference facilities for an ICANN Meeting.

- Host Hotels: The Radisson Blu, adjacent to the CCH will serve as the host hotel for the Meeting.

- Area Hotels: Many nearby hotels, all accessible via a short walk, ICANN Shuttle or short taxi ride, offer a wide variety of guest room accommodations at varying price points.

- Food & Beverage Outlets: The CCH will provide food for sale for meeting delegates at a reasonable cost. In addition, there are several restaurant options in close proximity to CCH.

- Air Travel: Air access to Hamburg is good, with direct flights from most major European cities and easy transfers from other large cities around the world arriving at Hamburg Airport.

- Ground Transportation: Hamburg Airport is 10 kilometers/25 minutes from the meeting venue and area hotels. Taxi fare is approximately US$35.

- Safety & Security: A risk assessment by ICANN security has not identified any areas of concern for Hamburg that would require other than standard security measures provided for an ICANN Meeting.

- Bandwidth: The host will provide bandwidth for the meeting.

Board Approval Required

Staff recommends that the board approve Hamburg, Germany as the location of the October 2020 ICANN Meeting.

4. CCH Contract Costs – Board Approval Required:

- The contract for the CICC will include:

Confidential Negotiation Information

*Note that negotiations are in progress. This is currently an estimate, which we do not believe
 will be exceeded.

5. Hotel Guest Room Costs – Board Approval Required:
- The contract for the Radisson Blu will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

Additional Negotiations Not Requiring Board Approval:

6. Hotel Guest Room Costs – Board Approval Not Required:
- The contract for the Moevenpick Hotel; will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Reischof Hotel Hamburg will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Grand Elysee Hamburg will be:
    - Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Marriot Hotel Hamburg will be:

Confidential Negotiation Information

- The contract for the Mercure Hamburg Mette will be:
  - Confidential Negotiation Information

7. Hotel Courtesy Block
- The following hotels have provided a courtesy block of rooms (580 total rooms)
    Scandic Hotel Emporio
    Renaissance Hotel Hamburg
    Fairmont Vier Jahreszeiten
    NH Hamburg City
    NH Collection Hamburg City
    Barcelo Hamburg
    Intercity Hotel

8. Subvention
Confidential Negotiation Information

Staff recommends that the board approve the expenditure (including contracting and disbursements) for the contracts with the Congress Center Hamburg and the Radisson Blue Hotel.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Below***

9. Other Hosting Proposals Received:

- Paris, France: Laure Filloux from VIPARIS Palais des Congrès de Paris submitted a hosting proposal. However, this location was proposed by the meeting venue not a community member and is more expensive than Hamburg.

- Budapest, Hungary: Balazs Szucs from HungExpo Budapest submitted a hosting proposal. This location was proposed by the meeting venue and was not suitable for an ICANN meeting.

- The Hague, Netherlands: Identified by the ICANN meetings team as a possible location was also considered. The location was more expensive than Hamburg.

- Geneva, Switzerland: Identified by the ICANN meetings team as a possible location was also considered. The location was more expensive than Hamburg.

*** Confidential Proposal Information Set Forth Above***

Submitted by:	Nick Tomasso
Position:	VP, Global Meeting Operations
Date Noted:	25 May 2018
Email:	nick.tomasso@icann.org

Advice Item	Description	Statement of Understanding	Background on Issue	Board Action	Rationale
SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model, R-2	The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition process can be studied and if needed, improved.	The ICANN organization understands SAC047 Recommendation 2 to mean that ICANN org should preserve operational data about ex-registries and should define a framework to share such data with the community.	The 2012 new gTLD round included a measure intended to protect registrants called Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO). EBERO defined emergency thresholds for the five critical functions for gTLDs that if met allow ICANN org to take the operation of a gTLD from the registry operator and put in care of a contracted EBERO provider. In the worst case scenario a registry operator may not be able to regain a TLD that went to EBERO. As of this writing, there has been only one TLD going to EBERO. The TLD is still in EBERO.	The Board accepts this advice and directs the CEO or his designee to implement the advice.	ICANN org is already planning to work on a system that allows storing the data it may have about the performance monitoring of TLDs in general. Making the data, or a compacted form, available to the community could be considered as part of the existing ODI initiative.
SAC058: SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation, R-3	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of	The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques to be used by registrars and registries for validating registration data.	SSAC058 noted that "various studies that assessed the quality of domain name registration data have collectively shown that the accuracy of the data needs to be improved. To improve registration data accuracy, there needs to be 1) an incentive for the registrant to submit accurate data, or	The Board accepts this advice and notes that implementation has been completed.	On June 27, 2013 the ICANN Board adopted a resolution approving the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). The 2013 RAA contains a WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification detailing requirements for registrars to perform validation and verification of registration data upon registration, inter-registrar transfer, and change of registrant. Requirements include syntax validation in accordance with formats specified in SSAC058 as well as verification method for

	registration data will be substantial.		2) efforts by registry / registrar to follow up and check the accuracy of the submitted data; or 3) both."		registration data. Additionally, the Board-initiated gTLD Registration Data Services PDP Working Group's charter contains data accuracy as one of its work topics.
SAC061: SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services, R-2	The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process.	The ICANN organization understands SAC061 Recommendation 2 to mean that the ICANN Board should ensure that a formal risk assessment is completed and available for the PDP working group to consider before the PDP is finalized and moved to implementation.	One of the recommendations in the Expert Working Group (EWG) on Next Generation Directory Services' Initial Report is an Aggregated Registration Data Service that contains a copy of all of the collected registration data elements. SSAC061 voiced concerns that reliance on a single system or provider carries a significant risk, and raises questions with respect to legal jurisdiction and privacy laws. The SSAC "[did] not believe the risks of the ARDS system have been sufficiently investigated."	The Board accepts this advice and notes that implementation has been completed.	Subsequent to the issuance of SSAC061, the EWG conducted an online RDS Risk Survey. The Survey gathered input from registrants, registrars, registries, and the broad spectrum of individuals, businesses, and other organizations that consume registration data regarding the risks and benefits that a next-generation WHOIS replacement system might have for them. The EWG's Final Report referenced this effort and noted that the final results of the survey would be available to the ICANN Board to inform the Board's review of the EWG's final report as well as to serve as input to a future formal analysis of costs, risks and benefits for all stakeholders that would be impacted by replacement of WHOIS with the RDS. The EWG Final Report also recommended "performing a widely scoped risk assessment to confirm that the RDS principles recommended herein do in fact result in appropriate collection and disclosure of data for defined purposes, striking the right balance between risks and benefits." On April 26, 2015, the Board adopted a resolution accepting the EWG Final Report, and reaffirmed its request for an Issues Report on the Next-Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) PDP, with the EWG Final Report serving input into that PDP. In the same

				resolution, the Board adopted a Proposed Framework for the PDP that also reflected risk assessment, along with benefit analysis and cost model as areas of work for the PDP Working Group. The gTLD Registration Data Services PDP was launched on 19 November 2015 with the Proposed Framework being part of its charter.
SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1	Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.	The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN Board should take the appropriate action to ensure criteria are established for determining if a syntactically valid domain label could be a top-level domain in the global DNS.	In 2013, the IETF published a "Special-Use Domain Names," RFC 6761. The RFC "describes what it means to say that a Domain Name (DNS name) is reserved for special use, when reserving such a name is appropriate, and the procedures for doing so. It also establishes an IANA registry for such domain names, and seeds it with entries for some of the already established special domain names. As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list.	The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.	The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topic of reserved names. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.

SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2	Recommendation 2: The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications, ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied-for new gTLD names, such as the reserved names listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the ineligible strings listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. As described in RFC 6761, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined special way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution.	The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 2 to mean that the scope of work presented in Recommendation 1 should include special use domain names as well as private use domain names, including those that are known to cause collisions such as .home, .corp, and .mail. Additionally, the scope of work should also include how ICANN should respond to future collisions between private use names and new gTLDs.	In 2013, the IETF published a "Special-Use Domain Names," RFC 6761. The RFC "describes what it means to say that a Domain Name (DNS name) is reserved for special use, when reserving such a name is appropriate, and the procedures for doing so. It also establishes an IANA registry for such domain names, and seeds it with entries for some of the already established special domain names.

Private Enterprise Numbers (PENs) are created and maintained by PTI in a public registry. Any individual/ private enterprise (organization) may request a PEN for use within their private networks. Some private use names collide with new gTLDs.

As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the | The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work. | The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topic of reserved names. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.

With regard to name collision, the Board has asked the SSAC to conduct a study to present data, analysis and points of view, and provide advice to the Board regarding the risks posed to users and end systems if .CORP, .HOME, .MAIL strings were to be delegated in the root, as well as possible courses of action that might mitigate the identified risks. The Board requested that the SSAC to conduct the study in a thorough and inclusive manner that includes technical experts (such as members of IETF working groups, technical members of the GNSO, and other technologists). |

	Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of private use names If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and		introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list. The topic of name collision was addressed within the 2012 round of new gTLDs. The Board has also recently asked the SSAC to conduct a study. The SSAC published for public comment a draft plan.		

	.mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?				
SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-3	Recommendation 3: Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN Board should take the appropriate action to establish an effective means of collaboration with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list, or the process for coordinating with other bodies to do so.	The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.	The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topics of reserved names and name collision. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work.
SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-4	Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.	The ICANN organization understands SAC090 Recommendation 4 to mean that these recommendations should be addressed before a subsequent application process is opened for new gTLD.	As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the introduction of new gTLDs and in the 2012 round Applicant Guidebook. However, the policy does not address additions, or modifications to the reserved name list, or the process for coordinating with other bodies to do so. Since the launch of the 2012 round, the IETF has created	The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.	The GNSO is the body within ICANN responsible for developing policies for generic domain names. The current GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP is considering the topics of reserved names and name collision. As such, it would be within the PDP Working Group's existing charter to consider this recommendation in the course of its work. With regard to name collision, a plan to address name collision was approved by the Board and remains in place codified in Registry Agreements. The Board has also

			a new RFC for special use names and recommends that the topic of reserved names taking into account this RFC, private use name, and name collision be addressed before another application process is opened.		recently asked the SSAC to conduct a name collision study.
SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 1	Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to consider revising the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default, for example by allowing subscriptions to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber's access at any time.	The ICANN organization understands SAC097 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN org should consider revising the Central Zone Data Service (CZDS) system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default. The ICANN org understands that the SSAC recommends instead that the CZDS have automatic renewal as the default. The ICANN org also understands Recommendation 1 to mean that the CZDS system could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The ICANN org also understands Recommendation 1 to mean that the CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber's access at any time.	The CZDS was built to terminate user access at the end of the agreed on access period and force the requestor to request access to the zone files again once access has been terminated. This configuration has resulted in gaps in access to zone files for users.	The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system.	ICANN org has determined that implementation is feasible and can be added to the CZDS Product Road map for implementation in a release subsequent to the CZDS Platform Migration. ICANN org will consult with registry operators to accomplish implementation within the boundaries of the existing contractual requirements.
SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator	Recommendation 2: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a	The ICANN organization understands SAC097 Recommendation 2 to mean that the ICANN org should ensure that, in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conforms to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1.	A CZDS Terms and Conditions, which is an agreement between a user and the registry operator govern the access and use of the CZDS data. SAC097 recommendation 1 suggests an option to address the	The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to adjust the zone file access subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate	The CZDS Terms and Conditions govern the access and use of the CZDS data and to the extent that changes are needed to implement recommendation 1 of SAC097, those changes should be made. It should be noted however that through the implementation feasibility analysis of this recommendation, the ICANN organization

Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 2	result of implementing Recommendation 1.		problem of subscriptions to the CZDS terminating automatically by default. SSAC097 recommendation 2 assumes that implementation of this option may require amendments to the existing CZDS Terms and Conditions.	the implementation of Recommendation 1.	does not anticipate amendments to the CZDS Terms and Conditions being necessary as a result of implementing recommendation 1.
SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 3	Recommendation 3: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.	The ICANN organization understands SAC097 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN org should seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.	Currently, the majority of third party zone file access complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance are related to requests for access that have not yet been processed by registry operators (i.e., the requests are in "Pending" status in the CZDS). The current registry agreement does not impose a time by which registry operators must process requests for zone file access. Upon implementation of recommendation 1, ICANN org expects these complaints to decrease.	The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN's expectations with respect to zone file access.	Upon implementation of Recommendation 1, ICANN organization expects zone file access complaints to decrease because an auto-renewal feature in CZDS will reduce the number of pending requests for zone file access. In addition to the enhancement to CZDS, further education on this topic to registry operators can assist in reducing the number of complaints.

. |
| SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator | Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can | The ICANN organization understands SAC097 Recommendation 4 to mean that the ICANN organization should ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The | Currently, both ZFA and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are reported by registry operator's monthly reporting, as required by Section 2 of Specification 3 of the registry agreement (Registry Functions Activity | The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the | ICANN org will engage with registry operators or produce educational resources regarding common issues with reporting these metrics, and share the lessons learned and good practices for reporting ZFA and Web-based WHOIS query statistics. |

Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 4	be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.	ICANN organization also understands that the SSAC recommends that the ICANN organization clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric as soon as practicable.	Report Fields #02 and #04). The registry agreement's requirements are based on well-defined community standards and the reports are publicly available. ICANN org has observed some registry operators have challenges in this area.	public reporting for Web-based WHOIS query statistics.	