

ICANN Board Action for SSAC Advice Documents SAC047, SAC058, SAC061, SAC090, and SAC097 (08 June 2018)

Advice Item	Description	Statement of Understanding	Background on Issue	Board Action	Rationale
<p>SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model, R-2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>As of this writing, there has been only one TLD going to EBERO. The TLD is still in EBERO.</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and directs the CEO or his designee to implement the advice.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>SAC058: SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation, R-3</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and notes that implementation has been completed.</p>	<p>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</p>

	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.

<p>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As part of the new gTLD program, a reserved names list was defined in the 2008 GNSO policy for the</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>

	<p>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</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

	.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

<p>Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 2</p>	<p>result of implementing Recommendation 1.</p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>the implementation of Recommendation 1.</p>	<p>does not anticipate amendments to the CZDS Terms and Conditions being necessary as a result of implementing recommendation 1.</p>
<p>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 3</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>Monthly Activity Reports Recommendation 4</p>	<p>be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.</p>	<p>ICANN organization also understands that the SSAC recommends that the ICANN organization clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric as soon as practicable.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>public reporting for Web-based WHOIS query statistics.</p>	
--	---	---	---	---	--