TABLE OF CONTENTS – BOARD PAPERS

AGENDA – 27 MARCH 2014 BOARD Meeting – 1.0 hour – last updated 13 March

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd	Expected Action	Potential Conflict of Interest
• **Assembly, Roll Call & Consent Agenda Vote** 20 min	**1. Consent Agenda**			
	1.a. Minutes: • 7, 17 February 2014 Meetings of the ICANN Board	John Jeffrey	Approval	
	1.b. Redelegation of the .VG domain representing the British Virgin Islands	Kuo-Wei Wu	Approval	
	1.c. Redelegation of the .ZM domain representing Zambia	Kuo-Wei Wu	Approval	
	1.d. SAC 062 advisory on Name Collision	Ram Mohan	Approval	
	1.e. Recommendations for the immediate collection of benchmarking metrics for the New gTLD Program to Support AoC Review on Competition, Consumer Trust and Choice	Bruce Tonkin and Sebastien Bachollet	Approval	

AGENDA – 27 MARCH 2014 BOARD Meeting – 1.0 hour – last updated 13 March

Time, etc.	Agenda Item	Shepherd	Expected Action	Potential Conflict of Interest
	1.f. Composition of the Board Working Group on Nominating Committee	Bruce Tonkin	Approval	
	1.g. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 49 Meeting	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	1.h. Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event & Hotel Teams of Meeting	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	1.i. Thank You to Local Hosts of ICANN 49 Meeting	Steve Crocker	Approval	
• **Discussion & Decision** 40 min	**2. Main Agenda**			
	2.a. Thank you to Departing Community Members	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	2.b. (T) Staff Assessment of ATRT2 Final Recommendations	Steve Crocker	Approval	
	2.c. AOB			

TITLE:	Redelegation of the .VG domain representing the British Virgin Islands to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands
PROPOSED ACTION:	For Board Consideration
IANA REFERENCE:	716470

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of ICANN's responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has prepared a recommendation to authorize the redelegation of the country-code top-level domain .VG, comprised of the ISO 3166-1 code representing the British Virgin Islands to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands (TRC).

Sensitive Delegation Information

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Resolved (2014.03.27.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .VG country-code top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.03.27.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated a request for ccTLD redelegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to change the sponsoring organisation (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .VG country-code top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Staff received multiple inquiries from the Internet community regarding the dispute within AdamsNames Ltd., the listed technical contact for .VG who is currently responsible for operating the name servers for the registry. The dispute raised concerns over the stability of the domain as well as the pricing for registering second-level domains under .VG.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

- The domain is eligible for continued delegation, as it is an assigned alpha-2 code that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard for the country of the British Virgin Islands;

- The currently listed sponsoring organization, Pinebrook Developments Ltd, is dissolved;

- The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;

- The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing this domain;

- The proposal has demonstrated appropriate local Internet community support;

- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;

- The proposal ensures the domain is managed locally in the country, and is bound under local law;

- The proposed sponsoring organisation has confirmed they will manage the domain in a fair and equitable manner;

- The proposed sponsoring organisation has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domain;

- The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;

- The current technical contact for the domain does not consent to a transfer, however, the proposed sponsoring organisation has provided a proper transfer plan for the domain to mitigate any risks relating to Internet stability if .VG were to be redelegated; and

- Staff have provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redelegation Report" will be published at http://www.iana.org/reports.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board notes that there is not consent for this change request from the current technical contact for the domain. However, in light of the formally appointed manager of the domain being dissolved, and a consensus in the local Internet community — including the government — that

the domain be redelegated, ICANN concludes that the interests of the local Internet community are best served by implementing the request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

SIGNATURE BLOCK:

Submitted by:	Kim Davies
Position:	IANA Function Liaison for Root Zone Management
Date Noted:	3 February 2014
Email:	kim.davies@icann.org

Report on the Redelegation of the .VG domain representing the British Virgin Islands to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission

3 February 2014

This report is being provided under the contract for performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function between the United States Government and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Under that contract, ICANN performs the "IANA functions", which include receiving delegation and redelegation requests concerning TLDs, investigating the circumstances pertinent to those requests, making its recommendations, and reporting actions undertaken in connection with processing such requests.

FACTUAL INFORMATION

Country

The "VG" ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent the British Virgin Islands.

Chronology of events

The currently designated manager for the .VG top-level domain is Pinebrook Developments Ltd, as described in the IANA Root Zone Database.

The Telecommunications Regulatory Commission (TRC) was established by the Telecommunications Act 2006. The TCR is empowered to "administer domain names" by section 6(h) of the Act. Section 41 elaborates this to include "registration and management of the Virgin Islands country code domain names".

Pinebrook Developments Ltd, the currently listed sponsoring organization for .VG, is no longer an active legal entity in the British Virgin Islands. The company was automatically dissolved under local law on 31 October 2010 for non-payment of fees for 10 years.

In early 2013, ICANN performed several administrative updates for .VG modifying both the administrative and technical contacts' emails and name servers. These updates were approved by both the administrative and technical contacts for the domain at the time.

A request to undo those change requests for .VG was submitted later by purported representatives of AdamsNames Ltd., the currently listed technical contact for .VG. At the same time, alternate domain modification requests were submitted by a different party purporting to represent AdamsNames Ltd. Upon investigation, ICANN staff determined there to be an active dispute between different business partners within the same organisation, and asked the parties to resolve the issues between one another

before any of the changes could proceed. During these events, one of the two AdamsNames representations started trading under the name of Meridian TLD.

In the following months, ICANN received multiple enquiries and complaints from the Internet community regarding the status of .VG and contradictory communications from AdamsNames. ICANN received reports of dysfunction in the domain registry, and a lack of clarity to registrants and registrars in whom they should transact with and the status of their registrations.

The TRC took interest in the status of the .VG domain and sought to move its operations to a stable situation. On 19 September 2013, TRC entered into an agreement with KSregistry GmbH, a fully owned subsidiary company of Key-Systems GmbH registered in the Federal Republic of Germany, to perform the registry services of .VG under contract. KSregistry had previously been involved in .VG operations as a technical provider to AdamsNames.

On 11 October 2013, the TRC commenced a request to ICANN for redelegation of the .VG top-level domain.

Proposed Sponsoring Organisation and Contacts

The proposed sponsoring organisation is the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission, a governmental regulatory body established in the British Virgin Islands.

The proposed administrative contact is Russell Jones, Chief Technology Officer of the Telecommunications Regulator Commission. The administrative contact is understood to be based in the British Virgin Islands.

The proposed technical contact is Oliver Fries, Chief Technology Officer, KSregistry GmbH.

EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST

String Eligibility

The top-level domain is eligible for continued delegation under ICANN policy, as it is the assigned ISO 3166-1 two-letter code representing the British Virgin Islands.

Public Interest

Support for the application to redelegate the domain was provided by Hon. Mark Vanterpool, the Minister for Communications and Works of the Government of the British Virgin Islands. Additional statements in support of this redelegation were provided by LIME BVI, the largest local ISP in the British Virgin Islands; Carib Gamer Association, an association representing local Internet users; and Infinite Solutions, the largest local computer-related retail store and services provider.

The application is consistent with known applicable local laws in the British Virgin Islands.

The proposed sponsoring organisation undertakes responsibility to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

Based in country

The proposed sponsoring organisation is constituted in British Virgin Islands. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in the British Virgin Islands. The registry is to be operated in the country.

Stability

The existing sponsoring organization has been dissolved, and as such ICANN is unable to obtain formal explicit consent for the transfer.

The current technical contact for the domain does not consent to the change request. A transfer plan was provided by the TRC for the redelegation of .VG to mitigate any risks relating to Internet stability. The TRC has advised the de-facto current operators of the domain registry of their redelegation approach, and as part of their plan, will reconcile the domain database with domain registrars and other involved parties.

Competency

The application has provided satisfactory details on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the .VG domain. Proposed policies for management of the domain have also been tendered.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

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

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the local Internet communities 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 by ICANN to responsible trustees (known as "Sponsoring Organisations") that meet a number of public-interest criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the trustee has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through ICANN's IANA department, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and redelegating or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, when appropriate, the requests are implemented and a recommendation for delegation or redelegation is made to the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

Purpose of evaluations

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible trustees 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 redelegate ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new Sponsoring Organisation, as well as from persons and organisations 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 sponsoring organisation to meet the following criteria:

- The domain should be operated within the country, including having its sponsoring organisation 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 trustee 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 sponsoring organisation 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 trustee to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed trustee; and the nature of government support fort he proposal. The view of any current trustee is obtained, and in the event of a redelegation, the transfer plan from the previous sponsoring organisation to the new sponsoring organisation is also assessed with a view to ensuring ongoing stable operation of the domain.

After receiving this documentation and input, it is analysed in relation to existing root zone management procedures, seeking input from parties both related to as well as independent of the proposed sponsoring organisation 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 sponsoring organisation's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, ICANN staff 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 sponsoring organisation and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.

TITLE:	Redelegation of the .ZM domain representing Zambia
PROPOSED ACTION:	For Board Consideration
IANA REFERENCE:	695358

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

ICANN has been asked to prepare a recommendation for the NTIA to authorize the redelegation of the country-code top-level domain .ZM, comprised of the ISO 3166-1 code representing Zambia, to the Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority.

Sensitive Delegation Information

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Resolved (2014.03.27.xx), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA Functions Contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .ZM country-code top-level domain to the Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.03.27.xx), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the ICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA Functions Contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated a request for ccTLD redelegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA to change the sponsoring organisation (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .ZM country-code top-level domain the Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Staff are not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the following IANA staff evaluations:

• The domain is eligible for continued delegation, as it is an assigned alpha-2 code that is listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard for the country of Zambia;

• The request is consented by the existing sponsoring organization, ZAMNET Communications Systems Ltd.;

• The relevant government has been consulted and does not object;

• The proposed sponsoring organization and its contacts agree to their responsibilities for managing this domain;

• The proposal has demonstrated appropriate local Internet community support;

- The proposal does not contravene any known laws or regulations;

- The proposal ensures the domain is managed locally in the country, and is bound under local law;

- The proposed sponsoring organisation has confirmed they will manage the domain in a fair and equitable manner;

- The proposed sponsoring organisation has demonstrated appropriate operational and technical skills and plans to operate the domain;

- The proposed technical configuration meets IANA's various technical conformance requirements;

- No specific risks or concerns relating to Internet stability have been identified; and

- Staff have provided a recommendation that this request be implemented based on the factors considered.

These evaluations are responsive to the appropriate criteria and policy frameworks, such as "Domain Name System Structure and Delegation" (RFC 1591) and "GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As part of the process established by the IANA Functions Contract, the "Delegation and Redelegation Report" will be published at http://www.iana.org/reports.

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions Contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANA functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of ICANN to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

SIGNATURE BLOCK:

Submitted by:	Kim Davies
Position:	IANA Function Liaison for Root Zone Management
Date Noted:	1 Feb 2014
Email:	kim.davies@icann.org

Sensitive Delegation Information

Sensitive Delegation Information

EXHIBIT A TO ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION NO. 2014.03.27.1c

Report on the Redelegation of the .ZM domain representing Zambia to Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority

1 February 2014

This report is being provided under the contract for performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function between the United States Government and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Under that contract, ICANN performs the "IANA functions", which include receiving delegation and redelegation requests concerning TLDs, investigating the circumstances pertinent to those requests, making its recommendations, and reporting actions undertaken in connection with processing such requests.

FACTUAL INFORMATION

Country

The "ZM" ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent Zambia.

Chronology of events

The currently designated manager for the .ZM top-level domain is ZAMNET Communication Systems Ltd, as described in the IANA Root Zone Database.

On 3 June 1994, the Communications Authority was established as a statutory body pursuant to the Telecommunications Act No. 469 of 1994. It was tasked with supervising and promoting the provision of telecommunication services throughout Zambia.

In August 2009, in accordance with the Information and Communication Technologies Act of 2009 the Communications Authority was renamed to Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority (ZICTA). According to the Act, ZICTA was to continue its responsibilities to regulate the provision of electronic communication services and products and monitor the performance of the sector. In addition, the responsibility of administering and managing the .ZM domain name space was also assigned to ZICTA through the enactment of the Electronic Communications and Transactions Act of 2009.

In October 2010, ZICTA organized a meeting to officially communicate to the local Internet stakeholders the intention to automate the .ZM registry and to redelegate the ccTLD from ZAMNET to ZICTA.

In March 2012, another meeting was held between ZICTA and the stakeholders, where it was agreed that the governing documents for the .ZM ccTLD should be sent to the ISPs for review.

On 29 March 2013, a meeting was held between ZAMNET and ZICTA in order to facilitate a smooth transition of the .ZM domain to the new registry.

The transfer of the technical operations and the deployment of the new system of the .ZM registry took place in March 2013.

In May 2013, ZICTA held a meeting with local Internet stakeholders to commence the new system usage by all registrars. At this time ZICTA had taken over the management of the .ZM registry and ZAMNET was serving as a registrar for the domain.

In June 2013, a meeting was held between ZICTA, ZAMNET and the ISP Association of Zambia to agree on the submission of the redelegation request of the .ZM ccTLD to ICANN.

On 9 July 2013, ZICTA commenced a request to ICANN for redelegation of the .ZM top-level domain.

Proposed Sponsoring Organisation and Contacts

The proposed sponsoring organisation is Zambia Information and Communications Technology Authority, a statutory body established under the repealed Telecommunications Act of 1994 and continued under the Information and Communication Technologies Act of 2009.

The proposed administrative and technical contact is Choolwe Andrew Nalubamba, Manager – Numbering and Naming for ZICTA. The contact is understood to be based in Zambia.

EVALUATION OF THE REQUEST

String Eligibility

The top-level domain is eligible for continued delegation under ICANN policy, as it is the assigned ISO 3166-1 two-letter code representing Zambia.

Public Interest

Support for the application to redelegate the domain was provided by Charity K. Ngoma, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Transport, Works, Supply and Communications in Zambia. An additional statements in support of this redelegation were provided by the Internet Service Providers Association of Zambia (ISPAZ).

The application is consistent with known applicable local laws in Zambia.

The proposed sponsoring organisation undertakes responsibility to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

Based in country

The proposed sponsoring organisation is constituted in Zambia. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in Zambia. The registry is to be operated in the country.

Stability

The request is deemed uncontested, with the currently listed sponsoring organisation consenting to the transfer.

Based on the information submitted, ICANN staff has not identified any stability issues that would warrant a transfer plan given the operations of the .ZM registry has already been transferred successfully to the proposed sponsoring organization.

Competency

The application has provided satisfactory details on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the .ZM domain. Proposed policies for management of the domain have also been tendered.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

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

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the local Internet communities 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 by ICANN to responsible trustees (known as "Sponsoring Organisations") that meet a number of public-interest criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the trustee has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through ICANN's IANA department, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and redelegating or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, when appropriate, the requests are implemented and a recommendation for delegation or redelegation is made to the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

Purpose of evaluations

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible trustees 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 redelegate ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new Sponsoring Organisation, as well as from persons and organisations 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 sponsoring organisation to meet the following criteria:

- The domain should be operated within the country, including having its sponsoring organisation 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 trustee 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 sponsoring organisation 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 trustee to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed trustee; and the nature of government support fort he proposal. The view of any current trustee is obtained, and in the event of a redelegation, the transfer plan from the previous sponsoring organisation to the new sponsoring organisation is also assessed with a view to ensuring ongoing stable operation of the domain.

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 sponsoring organisation 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 sponsoring organisation's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, ICANN staff 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 sponsoring organisation and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.

ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2014.03.27.1d

TITLE: SAC 062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the
                                 Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Consideration

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On 7 November 2013, ICANN's Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
published SAC 062: *SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision
Risk[1]* recommending that ICANN evaluate three concrete issues concerning name
collision risk for new TLDs as follows:

*Recommendation 1: ICANN should work with the wider Internet community,
including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to
reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is
appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).*

*Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions
regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and
why as part of its decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis:*

> *Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be
> collected?*

> *Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial
> or should the applicant operate it?*

> *Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and
> execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone
> partners exercised these capabilities?*

> *Termination of the trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both
> normal and emergency criteria)? What is to be done with the data collected?
> Who makes the decision on what the next step in the delegation process is?*

---

[1] http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac062.pdf

Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid reversal of the delegation of a TLD.

On 21 November 2013, the ICANN Board directed the President and CEO[2] to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated, and to produce a recommendation to the Board regarding the acceptance of that advice, no later than 90 days from the adoption of the resolution. The Board also directed that in the instances where ICANN recommends that the advice be accepted, to have the feasibility and costs of implementing the advice evaluated, and to provide an implementation plan with timelines and high-level milestones for review by the Board, no later than 120 days from the adoption of the resolution. This paper addresses to both Board requests, and the recommended implementation plan is included in the reference materials to this paper.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board accept the advice recommended by the SSAC in SAC 062 and direct the President and CEO to move forward with implementing the advice.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, on 12 November 2013, the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) published SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk.

Whereas, in SAC 062, the SSAC advice integrates the New gTLD Program Committee's recent decisions on Name Collision Risks, and provides specific

---

[2] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-21nov13-en.htm#2.d

recommendations and advice for further work by ICANN to mitigate risks from name collision.

Whereas, the Board previously adopted a resolution acknowledging receipt of the SSAC advice in SAC 062 and directing ICANN's President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated, and to produce a recommendation to the Board regarding the acceptance of that advice. The Board also directed that the feasibility and costs of implementing the advice evaluated, and an implementation plan be provided with timelines and high-level milestones for review by the Board, no later than 120 days from the adoption of the resolution.

Whereas, the Board has considered the advice of the SSAC in SAC 062, in addition to the feasibility and costs of implementing the advice.

Resolved (2014.03.27.xx), the Board adopts the SSAC advice in SAC 062, and directs ICANN's President and CEO, or his designee, to proceed with implementing the recommendations in SAC 062.

PROPOSED RATIONALE:

The ICANN Board's action today, addressing advice issued to the Board by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), is part of the Board's role to address advice put to it by the SSAC. Pursuant to Article XI, Section 2.2 of the ICANN Bylaws <http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws-XI>, the SSAC "advises the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security, stability, and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems."

On 5 August 2013, ICANN published Interisle's study entitled "Name Collision in the DNS"(the "Interisle study") as well as a staff proposal to mitigate the potential risks associated with name collisions involving new gTLDs. The staff proposal was posted for public comment and subsequently updated by staff based on the public comments. The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) approved the staff-revised proposal on 7 October 2013. The SSAC issued an advisory to the Board on 7 November 2013 concerning the mitigation of name collision risk (the "SAC 062"). In SAC 062, the SSAC provided advice to ICANN based on its assessment of the issues

identified in the Interisle study and ICANN's proposal to mitigate potential collision risks.

The action being approved today is to accept the SSAC's recommendations in SAC 062 concerning name collisions. As noted in SAC 062, the SSAC in general supports the NGPC proposal. SAC 062 focuses on three specific areas of the NGPC proposal where SSAC has advice: the action on high-risk strings, trial delegation, and the development of a monitoring framework for the root zone. Specifically, the SSAC recommends as follows:

Recommendation 1: ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level)

Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why as part of its decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis:

> *Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected?*

> *Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it?*

> *Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities?*

> *Termination of the trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)? What is to be done with the data collected? Who makes the decision on what the next step in the delegation process is?*

Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify

why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid reversal of the delegation of a TLD.

With respect to implementation of the SAC 062 advice, Recommendation #1 may be implemented following the model used to implement SAC 051: *SSAC Report on Domain Name WHOIS Terminology and Structure*[3], with regard to the development of a protocol replacement for WHOIS. The work (still undergoing) in the IETF is a good example of collaboration between ICANN and the IETF communities. However, it should be noted that work undertaken by the IETF/IAB would follow the internal processes instituted in that forum/group, which likely will result in ICANN acting as a participant in the process rather than in a supervisory role. ICANN does not expect an extra cost for working on this issue with the IETF/IAB since participating in these meetings and interacting with this community is already part of the normal course of business. Regarding the timeline for implementation, since ICANN would collaborate with the IETF/IAB, the timeline will be developed as ICANN begins its collaboration. Given previous experiences, it is likely that in a timeframe of 6 to 18 months the advice could be materialized in the form of a RFC.

---

[3] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf

With respect to Recommendations #2 and #3, ICANN is working with the community to develop a framework to address name collisions, which includes the specific measures in the mitigation strategy for name collision risks identified in SAC 062. The development of this framework is a follow-up action called for in the New gTLD Collision Occurrence Management Plan adopted by the NGPC on 7 October 2013. ICANN commissioned JAS Global Advisors LLC ("JAS") to produce the follow up study, and to produce recommendations to be implemented by all new gTLD registries. The JAS study provides a set of recommendations that describe a comprehensive approach to reducing current and future DNS namespace collisions, including the measures recommended by the SSAC in SAC 062. Currently, the recommendations in the JAS study are published for public comment. After the close of the public comment period, JAS will produce a final version of the study, taking into account public comments. The final JAS report is anticipated to be presented to the Board for consideration in May 2014. At that time, the Board will consider the fiscal impacts of the recommendations.

As part of its deliberations, the Board reviewed the following significant materials and documents:

- SAC 062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk <https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf>

- Interisle Consulting Group's "Name Collision in the DNS" <https://www.icann.org/en/about/staff/security/ssr/name-collision-02aug13-en.pdf>

- "New gTLD Collision Occurrence Management" <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-07oct13-en.pdf>

The SSAC's main function is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. Following this SSAC advice is expected to have a positive impact on the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system. Accepting the SSAC's advice is not part of ICANN's organizational administrative function requiring public

comment. However, it should be noted that SAC 062 calls for ICANN to work with the Internet community, particularly IETF/IAB regarding reservation of strings for private namespaces. As a result, the implementation of the advice would involve public input and participation, including for example, ICANN's public comment process and the IETF's open process to develop RFCs. There is no anticipated fiscal impact from this decision that has not already been identified in the existing budget.

Signature Block:

Submitted by:	Francisco Arias
Position:	Director, Technical Services
Date Noted:	4 March 2014
Email:	francisco.arias@icann.org

Pages 31 thru 40 have been removed intentionally.

Materials for Consent Agenda Item Number 5: "Collection of Metrics to Examine Impact on New gTLDs on Competition, Consumer Trust and Choice" are available separately in the 27 March 2014 Board Briefing Materials, entitled "Benchmarking Metrics."

Materials for Consent Agenda Item Number 6: "Composition of the Board Working Group on Nominating Committee" are available separately in the 27 March 2014 Board Briefing Materials, entitled "Composition of BWG-NomCom."

Directors and Liaisons,

Attached below please find the Notice of date and time for a Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors:

27 March 2014 – Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board of Directors (to be held directly after the ICANN 49 Public Forum) - at 10:00 UTC (6:00pm – 7:00pm in Singapore) – This Board meeting is estimated to last 1 hour.

http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/fixedtime.html?msg=ICANN+Public+Board+Meeting&iso=20140327T18&p1=236&ah=1

Some other time zones:
27 March 2014 - 3:00am PDT Los Angeles
27 March 2014 - 6:00am EDT Washington, D.C.
27 March 2014 -11:00am CEST Brussels

Consent Agenda
1. **Approval of Minutes of 7 February and 17 February 2014 Meetings of the ICANN Board**
2. **Redelegation of the .VG domain representing the British Virgin Islands**
3. **Redelegation of the .ZM domain representing Zambia**
4. **SAC 062 advisory on Name Collision**
5. **Collection of Metrics to Examine Impact of New gTLDs on Competition, Consumer Choice and Trust (Note: this item will be discussed by the board during the 26 Mar board meeting with intent to approve during the public board meeting)**
6. **Composition of the Board Working Group on Nominating Committee**
7. **Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN 49 Meeting**

8. **Thank You to Interpreters, Staff, Event & Hotel Teams of ICANN 49 Meeting**

9. **Thank You to Local Hosts of ICANN 49 Meeting**

Main Agenda

1. **Thank You to Departing Community Members**

2. **(T) Staff Assessment of ATRT2 Final Recommendations**

3. **AOB**

MATERIALS -- All Materials for this board meeting will be available
Contact Information Redacted **If you have trouble with access, please let us know and we will work with you to assure that you can use the BoardVantage Portal for this meeting.**

If call information is required, it will be distributed separately.

If you have any questions, or we can be of assistance to you, please let us know.

John Jeffrey

General Counsel & Secretary, ICANN

John.Jeffrey@icann.org <John.Jeffrey@icann.org>

<mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org <mailto:John.Jeffrey@icann.org> >
Contact Information Redacted