# ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.1a

**TITLE:**                       **Acceptance of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC – Final Implementation Report**

**PROPOSED ACTION:**       **For Board Consideration and Approval**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The ICANN Board is being asked to accept the [Final Implementation Report](#) of the second Organizational Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC2 Review), including the status of implementation of recommendations from the RSSAC2 Review [as reported](#) by the RSSAC. The Board is also being asked to recognize the completion of the RSSAC2 Review.

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) of the ICANN Board has been overseeing the progress of the RSSAC2 Review and implementation thereof, including consultations with the Independent Examiner and the RSSAC. On [2 October 2018](#), the RSSAC2 Review Implementation Working Party (Implementation Working Party[1]) published the [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#) (Feasibility Assessment) for all six of the recommendations in the Independent Examiner's Final Report. On [3 May 2019](#), the ICANN Board accepted the Final Report and Feasibility Assessment. On [12 March 2020](#), the ICANN Board accepted the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan. The Implementation Working Party provided periodic, 6-month implementation progress reports to the OEC on [24 June 2020](#), [9 December 2020](#), [3 June 2021](#), and [13 December 2021](#), and a Final Implementation Report on [14 June 2022](#).

The RSSAC reports that it has made considerable progress on implementation of recommendations and findings within the [RSSAC2 Review Final Implementation Report](#), which was issued on [14 June 2022](#). The RSSAC considers two recommendations as fully implemented, two as steadily ongoing (as a part of RSSAC continuous improvement), and two dependent on the progress of the [Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS GWG)](#). No other significant action is required from the RSSAC for these six recommendations. For the recommendations

---

[1] This group refers to themselves as the "RWP" throughout their Implementation Reports, and elsewhere publicly.

where some aspects of work is ongoing, the RSSAC has demonstrated that substantial work has been completed, with limited aspects of work continuing. Having reviewed relevant documents, the OEC agrees with the RSSAC assessment.

**[PROPOSED] ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) is responsible for the oversight of all Organizational Reviews mandated by Article 4 Section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws, including the RSSAC Review(s). The OEC recommends that the ICANN Board accept the Final Implementation Report of the second Organizational Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC2 Review), and the status of implementation of recommendations from the RSSAC2 Review as reported by the RSSAC.

The OEC acknowledges that there is still work ongoing towards full implementation of some recommendations. As the remaining implementation work is limited and is dependent on the ongoing progress of the RSS GWG, the OEC recommends that the Board consider the RSSAC2 Review to be completed. Further, the OEC recommends that the Board request the RSSAC to provide periodic updates on progress toward completing implementation of the two recommendations that the RSSAC identified as dependent on the work of the RSS GWG. These periodic updates should start within six months from this Board action.

The OEC recommends that the ICANN Board encourage the RSSAC to continue monitoring the impact of the implementation of the recommendations from the RSSAC2 Review as part of its continuous improvement process.

The OEC makes its recommendation to the ICANN Board having reviewed all relevant materials, and based on its determination that the process was in compliance with the relevant Bylaw provisions and consistent with practices followed for Organizational Reviews of other structures.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, the second Organizational Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC2 Review) commenced in April 2017, in accordance with Article 4 Section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws.

Whereas, on 3 May 2019, the ICANN Board accepted the Final Report from the Independent Examiner, and the Feasibility Assessment, and also directed the RSSAC to convene an RSSAC2 Review Implementation Working Group (Implementation Working Party) to further the implementation plan of the recommendations, as detailed in the Feasibility Assessment, including appropriate implementation costing.

Whereas, on 12 March 2020, the ICANN Board accepted the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan and directed the Implementation Working Party to continue implementation, and to provide updates to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) through written implementation reports on progress every six months.

Whereas, the OEC and ICANN Board received periodic, 6-month reports on the progress of the review implementation from RSSAC2 Review Implementation Working Party on 24 June 2020, 9 December 2020, 3 June 2021, and 13 December 2021, and a Final Implementation Report on 14 June 2022.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board acknowledges the implementation work of the RSSAC aimed at improving the effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of the RSSAC, in line with the findings and recommendations from the Independent Examiner and the subsequent Detailed Implementation Plan, and accepts the status of implementation of recommendations from the RSSAC2 Review as reported by the RSSAC, thereby completing the RSSAC2 Review.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), for the two recommendations for which the RSSAC has reported that work is dependent on the RSS GWG, the Board requests the RSSAC to provide periodic updates on progress toward completing implementation, starting within six months from this Board action.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

**Why is the Board addressing the issue?**

To ensure the ICANN multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve its performance, ICANN conducts Organizational Reviews of its Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee) and the Nominating Committee, as detailed in Article 4 Section 4.4 of the ICANN Bylaws.

Reviews are critical to maintaining an effective multistakeholder model and in helping ICANN achieve its mission, as detailed in Article 1 of the Bylaws. Reviews also contribute to ensuring that ICANN serves the public interest.

The second Root Server System Advisory Committee Review (RSSAC2 Review) commenced in April 2017. The Independent Examiner conducting the review produced a [Final Report](#) that was published in July 2018. The Final Report included forty-two (42) findings resulting from their research and qualitative analysis, and six (6) recommendations designed to address those findings.

The ICANN Board accepted the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan on [12 March 2020](#). The RSSAC2 Review Implementation Working Party implemented the six recommendations, including those with dependencies and a part of a continuous improvement process. The status of recommendations and the level of remaining implementation work as of 14 June 2022 is documented in the [Final Implementation Report](#) that RSSAC produced at the request of the Board. Details of the activities that the RSSAC has carried out towards implementation and the rationale for the RSSAC2 Review conclusion are also provided in the Final Implementation Report.

The role of the ICANN Board is to ensure that the review process was in compliance with the relevant Bylaw provisions.

**What is the proposal being considered?**

The proposal being considered is for the Board to acknowledge the implementation work of the RSSAC aimed at improving the effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of the RSSAC, in line with the findings and recommendations from the Independent Examiner and the subsequent Detailed Implementation Plan, and accept the status of implementation of recommendations from the RSSAC2 Review as [reported](#) by the RSSAC, thereby completing the RSSAC2 Review. The Board is also being asked to consider requesting the RSSAC to provide periodic updates on progress toward completing implementation of the two recommendations for which the RSSAC has reported that implementation is dependent on the work of the RSS GWG, starting within six months from this Board action.

RSSAC response to the recommendations

In its Feasibility Assessment, the RSSAC2 Review Working Party (Implementation Working Party) accepted the six recommendations, and noted any objections or proposed modifications to recommendations where applicable, along with supporting rationale. The ICANN Board accepted the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan and the RSSAC2 Implementation Working Party proceeded with implementation work to address the findings identified by the Independent Examiner and supported by the RSSAC. The ICANN Board, through the OEC, received periodic, 6-month reports on the progress of the review implementation from the Implementation Working Party on 24 June 2020, 9 December 2020, 3 June 2021, and 13 December 2021, and a Final Implementation Report on 14 June 2022.

Implemented recommendations

The ICANN Board agrees with the RSSAC that the implementation of the six recommendations from the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC is complete, including a dependency and continuous improvement process.

The following recommendations are implemented, and part of a continuous improvement process:

- Recommendation 3: Formalize the responsibilities of the RSSAC to the ICANN Board and community in a work plan that is periodically reviewed and published, and hold the RSSAC accountable for work plan deliverables.
- Recommendation 3a: Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activities to assess the current status of root servers and root zone.
- Recommendation 4: Develop and implement a leadership training and succession plan.
- Recommendation 5: Engage more actively with the rest of ICANN and its community.

The implementation of the following two recommendations is dependent on the progress of Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS GWG):

- Recommendation 1a: Extend RSSAC membership by invitation to any qualified person.

- Recommendation 6a: Develop a more effective and transparent process for defining RSSAC Caucus projects, engaging its members and managing its membership, managing its work, and promoting its output.

RSSAC noted that it will continue to actively engage in threat assessment and risk analysis of the RSS as well as the rest of ICANN and its community. With all the progress noted on the previous Implementation Progress Reports, from a project management perspective, the Implementation Working Party considers the implementation of Recommendation 3a and Recommendation 5 as steadily ongoing as part of the RSSAC operations and continuous improvement process, and complete. RSSAC will also continue to monitor the progress of RSS GWG with specific attention to how the outcome of the RSS GWG work will address the implementation of Recommendation 1a and Recommendation 6a.

Consequently, the Implementation Working Party considers that the implementation of the second RSSAC Organizational Review is completed with the submission of its fifth and Final Report (14 June 2022).

Board considerations and actions

In taking this action, the ICANN Board relies upon all relevant documents pertaining to the RSSAC2 Review in detail. Specifically, it considered the Independent Examiner's Final Report and the RSSAC2 Review Working Party (Implementation Working Party) Feasibility Assessment, the Public Comment input, presentations from the Independent Examiner and the Implementation Working Party, and input from the RSSAC with regard to work completed after the Final Report and Feasibility Assessment were submitted to the OEC.

The Board accepts that the RSSAC has made considerable progress on the implementation of recommendations since the RSSAC2 Review Detailed Implementation Plan, and has provided an appropriate response to each of the findings presented by the Independent Examiner during the Review. As such, the typical cadence and process for Organizational Reviews has been completed by the work and progress of the RSSAC toward implementation.

The ICANN Board is requesting the RSSAC to provide periodic updates on progress toward completing implementation of the two recommendations for which the RSSAC

has reported that work is progressing under the Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS GWG), starting within six months from this Board action.

**Which stakeholders or others were consulted?**

The ICANN community, including the RSSAC itself[2], provided input during the Review process (including stakeholder interviews, an online survey, and Public Comment proceeding). No further input is required.

**What concerns, or issues were raised by the community?**

The RSSAC noted that it had concerns about the report and believed several recommendations (2a, 3b, 3c, 6, 6b and 6c) were out of scope of the review. Specifically, the RSSAC noted that it believed the report failed "to comment on the efficacy of the RSSAC as an advisory committee", and concentrated "much of its effort on how the RSSAC is perceived, rather than on how well it functions".

In addition to the Public Comment consultation feedback, the RSSAC also provided direct feedback to the Independent Examiner on initial drafts of the Assessment Report, Draft Final Report and Final Report. The RSSAC's concerns were addressed prior to RSSAC2 Review implementation activity.

**What factors did the Board find to be significant?**

The Board found it significant that the RSSAC had concerns with the Independent Examiner's Final Report, and notes that improvements to the Organizational Reviews addressed by the Third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) in its recommendations will inform the future of Organizational Reviews.

**Are there positive or negative community impacts?**

This ICANN Board action is expected to have a positive impact on the community as it supports the continuing process of facilitating periodic reviews of the ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as mandated by the Bylaws.

---

[2] As well as the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG), Business Constituency (BC), At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG), and Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG), and two individual Public Comment submissions.

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

There have been minimal fiscal impacts from the recommendations implemented to date. There is potential for impacts to result from the approval and implementation of recommendations from the RSS GWG, which will be assessed if and when appropriate.

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

This ICANN Board action is not expected to have a direct effect on security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS.

**How is this action within ICANN's mission and what is the public interest served in this action?**

This ICANN Board action is consistent with ICANN's commitment pursuant to Section 4 of the Bylaws to ensure the ICANN multistakeholder model remains transparent and accountable, and to improve the performance of its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. This action will serve the public interest by contributing to the fulfillment of ICANN's commitment to maintaining and improving its accountability and transparency.

**Is Public Comment required prior to Board action?**

No additional Public Comment is required.


**Submitted by**: Theresa Swinehart

**Position**: Senior Vice President, Global Domains and Strategy (GDS)

**Date Noted**: 26 July 2022

**Email**: theresa.swinehart@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD OF DIRECTORS**
**SUBMISSION NO. 2022.09.22.1b**

**TITLE:**  **Appointment of Root Server Operator Organization Representatives to the RSSAC**

**PROPOSED ACTION:**  **For Board Consideration and Approval**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Per Article 12, Section 12.2(c)(ii) of the ICANN Bylaws, the Chair of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) submits the following members for appointment to the RSSAC:

- Howard Kash, United States Army Research Laboratory

- Karl Reuss, University of Maryland

- Barbara Schleckser, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

- Ryan Stephenson, Defense Information Systems Agency

These individuals have been selected by their root server operator organizations to serve on the RSSAC.

**RSSAC RECOMMENDATION:**

The RSSAC Chair recommends the ICANN Board of Directors appoint Howard Kash, Karl Reuss, Barbara Schleckser, and Ryan Stephenson as the RSSAC representatives of their respective root server operator organizations.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, the ICANN Bylaws call for the establishment of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) with the role to advise the ICANN community and ICANN Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System.

Whereas, the ICANN Bylaws call for the ICANN Board of Directors to appoint one RSSAC member from each root server operator organization, based on recommendations from the RSSAC Chair.

Whereas, the RSSAC Chair has recommended to the ICANN Board of Directors the appointments of representatives from Defense Information Systems Agency; National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); United States Army Research Laboratory; and University of Maryland to the RSSAC.

Resolved (2022.09.22.XX), the ICANN Board of Directors appoints Howard Kash, Karl Reuss, Barbara Schleckser, and Ryan Stephenson to the RSSAC through 31 December 2025.


**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

In May 2013, the root server operator organizations agreed to an initial membership of representatives for the RSSAC, each nominating an individual. The ICANN Board of Directors approved the initial membership of the RSSAC in July 2013 with staggered terms. The current term for the representatives from Defense Information Systems Agency; National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); United States Army Research Laboratory; and University of Maryland expires 31 December 2022.

Today, the Board is taking action pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.2 (c)(ii) of the ICANN Bylaws to appoint members to the RSSAC.

The appointment of RSSAC members is not anticipated to have any fiscal impact on the ICANN organization that has not already been accounted for in the budgeted resources necessary for ongoing support of the RSSAC.

This resolution is an organizational administrative function for which no public comment is required. The appointment of RSSAC members contributes to the public interest and the commitment of the ICANN organization to strengthen the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Submitted by: | Kaveh Ranjbar |
| Position: | RSSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board |
| Date Noted: | 10 August 2022 |
| Email and Phone Number | kaveh.ranjbar@board.icann.org |

## ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.1c

**TITLE:**                             **Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**
                                                 **Member Appointments**

**PROPOSED ACTION:**          **For Board Consideration and Approval**

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) respectfully requests the appointment of Gabriel Andrews and Peter Thomassen as new Committee members.

The Chair further requests acknowledgement of the service of Cristian Hesselman who was appointed to the SSAC on 16 May 2017 and resigned due to work commitments on 15 June 2022, and of Paul Ebersman who was appointed to the SSAC on 3 February 2017 and resigned his membership due to work commitments on 17 July 2022.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee desires two actions from the ICANN Board: 1) to appoint Gabriel Andrews and Peter Thomassen to the SSAC and 2) to formally thank Cristian Hesselman and Paul Ebersman for their work while members of the SSAC.

### PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Whereas, the Board, at Resolution 2010.08.05.07 approved Bylaws revisions that created three-year terms for SSAC members, required staggering of terms, and obligated the SSAC Chair to recommend the reappointment of all current SSAC members to full or partial terms to implement the Bylaws revisions.

Whereas, in January 2022, the SSAC Membership Committee initiated an annual recruitment cycle and submitted to the SSAC its recommendations for new member appointments on 27 May 2022.

Whereas, on 5 June 2022, the SSAC approved the new member recommendations.

Whereas, the SSAC Membership Committee, on behalf of the SSAC, requests that the Board should appoint Gabriel Andrews and Peter Thomassen to the SSAC for terms beginning immediately upon approval of the Board and ending on 31 December 2025.

Whereas, Cristian Hesselman was appointed to the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee on 16 May 2017.

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge and thank Cristian Hesselman for his service to the community by his membership on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Whereas, Paul Ebersman was appointed to the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee on 3 February 2017.

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge and thank Paul Ebersman for his service to the community by his membership on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the Board appoints Gabriel Andrews and Peter Thomassen to the SSAC for terms beginning immediately upon approval of the Board and ending on 31 December 2025.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Cristian Hesselman and Paul Ebersman have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service to ICANN.  The ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in all future endeavors.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

The SSAC is a diverse group of individuals whose expertise in specific subject matters enables the SSAC to fulfill its role and execute its mission. Since its inception, the SSAC has invited to its membership individuals with deep knowledge and experience in technical and security areas that are critical to the security and stability of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

The SSAC's continued operation as a competent body is dependent on the accumulation of talented subject matter experts who have consented to volunteer their time and energies to the execution of the SSAC mission.

Further, it is the practice of the SSAC to seek Board recognition of the service of Committee members upon their departure.

Gabriel Andrews is a Supervisory Special Agent with the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) where he has worked primarily as an investigator on Criminal Computer Intrusion matters and in FBI Headquarters roles supporting such investigations.  His current position is to lead FBI

engagement within ICANN and other multistakeholder Internet-related bodies where the work of such bodies is likely to impact law enforcement and/or public safety equities.  He is also a member of the Governmental Advisory Committee Public Safety Working Group.

Peter Thomassen has more than 20 years of experience in the Internet and security industry. In 2001, he founded a4a, a boutique web hosting company. From 2012-2014, he served as Chief Technology Officer for the not-for-profit dotHIV registry. In 2014, Peter founded deSEC, a free, managed DNSSEC hosting platform. It is deSEC's mission to enhance the security of online data transmission, by spreading the seamless use of state-of-the-art encryption technology. Peter is currently the Chief Technology Officer of deSEC. In 2018, he joined SSE Secure Systems Engineering, a German IT Security Consultancy, as a Senior Security Expert in software development projects from various enterprise and public sector industries. Today, as a Senior Solutions Architect at SSE, he is an active member of the IETF with contributions to various working groups that have overlap with the DNS.

This resolution is an organizational administrative function for which no public comment is required. The appointment of SSAC members is in the public interest and in furtherance of ICANN's mission as it contributes to the commitment of the ICANN to strengthen the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

**Signature Block:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submitted by: | James Galvin |
| Position: | Liaison to the ICANN Board from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee |
| Date Noted: | 30 August 2022 |
| Email: | james.galvin@board.icann.org |

**ICANN BOARD SUBMISSION No. 2022.09.22.1d**

**TITLE:** **March 2024 ICANN Meeting Venue and Hotel Contracting**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** **For Board Consideration and Action**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Board is being asked to authorize ICANN organization to take all steps necessary to complete contracting for the host venue and hotels in San Juan, Puerto Rico for the March 2024 ICANN Public Meeting. While it is the President and CEO's responsibility to identify and select sites for ICANN's Public Meetings in accordance with the Board-approved strategy, per the ICANN Contracting and Disbursement policy the Board must approve any expenditures that will exceed US$500,000, as this will. The Reference Materials for this paper summarize the steps taken to locate a site for the March 2024 Public Meeting and outline the facility costs.

**ICANN ORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATION:**

ICANN organization recommends that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursement for the host venue and hotels for the March 2024 ICANN Public Meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico in an amount not to exceed <sup>Confidential Negotiation Information</sup>

**BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE (BFC) RECOMMENDATION *(Subject to BFC Approval):***

The BFC recommends that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all actions necessary to enter into contracts, and make expense disbursements pursuant to those contracts, for the host venue and hotels in San Juan, Puerto Rico, where ICANN will hold its March 2024 Public Meeting in an amount not to exceed <sup>Confidential Negotiation Information</sup>

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its first Public Meeting of 2024 in the North America region.

Whereas, selection of a San Juan, Puerto Rico location adheres to the geographic rotation guidelines established in the Meeting Strategy Working Group.

Whereas, ICANN organization has completed a thorough review of the venue and hotels and finds the ones in San Juan, Puerto Rico to be suitable.

Whereas, both ICANN organization and the Board Finance Committee have recommended that the Board authorize the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to enter into and make disbursement in furtherance of contracts for the March 2024 ICANN Public Meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to engage in and facilitate all necessary contracting and disbursements for the host venue and hotels for the March 2024 ICANN Public Meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in an amount not to exceed Confidential Negotiation Information

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), specific items within this resolution shall remain confidential for negotiation purposes pursuant to Article 3, section 3.5(b) of the ICANN Bylaws until the President and CEO determines that the confidential information may be released.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

As part of ICANN's Public Meeting strategy, ICANN seeks to host a meeting in a different geographic region (as defined in the ICANN Bylaws) three times a year. ICANN79 is scheduled for 2-7 March 2024. Following the change of the ICANN73 meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico to a virtual meeting, ICANN agreed with the venue and hotels to hold a future meeting in San Juan.

ICANN org previously confirmed that the San Juan, Puerto Rico meeting location meets the Meeting Location Selection Criteria. Selection of this North America location adheres to the geographic rotation guidelines established in the Meeting Strategy Working Group. ICANN org did not conduct a broader search for other available locations for this meeting due to the already confirmed suitability of the venue.

The Board Finance Committee (BFC) has carried out its standard due diligence in reviewing the proposed Board decision to recommend approval to the Board. As part of this diligence, the BFC has reviewed the financial risks associated with the proposed decision and the information provided by the org on the measures in place to mitigate those risks. The BFC has found these financial risks and the mitigation in place reasonable and acceptable.

The Board reviewed the organization's briefing for hosting the meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and the determination that the proposal met the significant factors of the Meeting Location Selection Criteria, as well as the related costs for the facilities selected, for the March 2024 ICANN Public Meeting.  ICANN conducts Public Meetings in support of its mission to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems and acts in the public interest by providing free and open access to anyone wishing to participate, either in person or remotely, in open, transparent, and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes.

There will be a financial impact to ICANN in hosting the meeting and providing travel support as necessary, as well as to the community in incurring costs to travel to the meeting.  However, such impact would be faced regardless of the location and venue of the meeting.  This action will have no impact on the security or the stability of the Domain Name System.

This is an Organizational Administrative function that does not require public comment.

| | |
|---|---|
| Submitted by: | Nick Tomasso |
| Position: | VP, Global Meeting Operations |
| Date Noted: | 18 August 2022 |
| Email: | nick.tomasso@icann.org |

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.1e**

**TITLE:**                    **Approval of Guidelines for Implementation of**
                              **Internationalized Domain Names Version 4.1**


**PROPOSED ACTION:**          **For Board Consideration and Approval**


**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The ICANN Board is being asked to approve the Internationalized Domain Name
Implementation Guidelines (IDN Guidelines) version 4.0, except its guidelines 6a, 11,
12, 13, and 18 which are deferred from consideration on the request of the Generic
Names Supporting Organization (GNSO). The approved subset of guidelines will be
published as IDN Guidelines version 4.1. These Guidelines relate to IDN registration
policies and practices, and are designed to minimize the risk of consumer confusion.
After approval from the ICANN Board, the currently applicable version 3.0 will be
superseded and the updated version 4.1 of the Guidelines will become contractually
binding for all generic top-level domain (gTLD) registries and registrars offering IDN
registrations and expected for adoption by the IDN country code top-level domains
(ccTLDs) delegated through the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process.

The last update to the guidelines was done in 2011. As there has been significant
experience gained in the implementation of IDNs, the Board Variant Working Group
(now Board IDN and Universal Acceptance Working Group) advised to update the IDN
Guidelines after its meeting with the GNSO members at ICANN50 in June 2014.
IDNGWG was formed in October 2015, based on the nominees of the supporting
organizations and advisory committees. The IDNGWG reviewed the collective
experience in implementing IDNs, the recent technical standards and recommendations,
and the work being undertaken by the community for defining rules for domain labels
in different languages and scripts. Based on these considerations and multiple public
consultations, the IDNGWG proposed the updated IDN Guidelines 4.0.

On 10 May 2018, the expert IDN Guidelines working group (IDNGWG) published the final proposed draft of the IDN Guidelines 4.0. The GNSO Council chair requested the ICANN Board to defer its consideration on 30 April 2019, while the GNSO considered any policy implications of the IDN Guidelines 4.0 under its remit. The GNSO subsequently included the guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 for consideration in the IDN Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) charter. On 21 January 2022, the GNSO chair and vice chairs wrote to the ICANN Board agreeing with the Board suggestion to move forward with the consideration of the remaining guidelines in IDN Guidelines version 4.0. The guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 will be considered by the ICANN Board after the IDN EPDP has concluded.

**ICANN CEO RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the recommendations from the IDNGWG to implement the IDN Guidelines and the subsequent request from the GNSO to defer its guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 until these are considered under IDN EPDP (also considered separable for delayed implementation by the IDNGWG), ICANN CEO recommends that IDN Guidelines version 4.0, except guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, 18 and associated additional notes, be approved as IDN Guidelines version 4.1 for implementation. The Board IDN and Universal Acceptance Working Group has also reviewed and recommended approval.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, Internationalized Domain Names Implementation Guidelines (IDN Guidelines) were initially adopted by the ICANN Board in 2003 and subsequently updated in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2011 to reflect best practices and protocol updates through the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).

Whereas, the current version 3.0 of the IDN Guidelines was last updated in 2011 and there has been much experience gained in implementing IDNs during this period.

Whereas, an expert IDN Guidelines Working Group (IDNGWG) was formed in 2015 based on nominations by the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO), At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), and Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) to update version 3.0 of the Guidelines.

Whereas, the IDNGWG, after incorporating inputs received during the comment periods, published the final proposed draft of the IDN Guidelines version 4.0 on 10 May 2018 for consideration by the ICANN Board at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf.

Whereas, the IDNGWG identified the guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, 18, and 19 are separable for implementation at a later stage from the remaining guidelines in IDN Guidelines version 4.0.

Whereas, the GNSO asked to defer its guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 of IDN Guidelines until these are considered under its IDN Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP).

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board approves the deferral of the subset of guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 of the IDN Guidelines version 4.0 from consideration until the completion of IDN EPDP.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board approves the guidelines in the IDN Guidelines version 4.0, except the deferred guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, 18 and associated Additional Notes, directs these to be published as IDN Guidelines version 4.1 and to supersede version 3.0.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to implement the updated IDN Guidelines version 4.1.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

Article 1, Section 1.1 (a)(i) of the ICANN Bylaws provides that ICANN coordinate the development and implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains ("gTLDs"), for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS. The IDN Guidelines relate to IDN registration policies and practices, designed to minimize the risks of cybersquatting and consumer confusion.

All gTLD registries and registrars offering IDN registrations are contractually required to implement the IDN Guidelines.

In addition, as part of the Terms and Conditions of Submission of Fast Track Request, it is expected through the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process that "IDN domain names are to be registered in accordance with a publicly available registration policy that shall comply on an ongoing basis with … the IDN guidelines as updated and published from time to time on the ICANN website, all subject to and within the limits of relevant applicable national law and public policy."

The IDN Guidelines were last updated in 2011. Since then, through the work of the community in implementing IDNs and additional work by the technical and script communities in identifying technical and linguistic requirements respectively, there has been significant experience gained on implementing IDNs. This includes updates in terminology around IDNs, definition of the formal representation of the IDN tables through the standards track RFC 7940, principles to design label generation rules in RFCs 6912 and 8228. SSAC has provided additional advice to support consistency and manageability of variant labels for different levels of domain names in SAC60. Finally, the script communities globally have done significant work documenting how these scripts should be used in domain names through their work on Root Zone Label Generation Rules (RZ-LGR) and subsequent work on reference second level LGRs.

Based on the community experience with implementing IDNs accumulated since 2011, following their meeting with GNSO members, ICANN Board Variant Working Group advised ICANN org to update the IDN Guidelines at ICANN50 in June 2014. ICANN

org issued a call for nominations of experts from the ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC and SSAC on 20 July 2015.  The IDNGWG was constituted based on the nominations received.

The IDNGWG updated the guidelines with an open and transparent process, interacting with the community to gather public feedback and incorporated it in developing these guidelines, as follows:

1. Initial issues list presented at ICANN55 (March 2016)

2. Interim draft presented at ICANN57 (November 2016)

3. Complete draft published for public comment (March 2017)

4. Complete draft presented at ICANN58 (March 2017)

5. Final draft presented at ICANN60 (November 2017)

6. Final draft published for public comment (December 2017)

7. Second public comment analysis presented at ICANN61 (March 2018)

The IDNGWG finalized the Guidelines based on the feedback received during these public consultations and published the final proposed draft of the Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names version 4.0 on 10 May 2018 at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf. In addition, the IDNGWG recommended that the Guidelines be implemented in two phases, based on the feedback from the community that some of the guidelines may take longer to implement, as per the following details:

- Phase 1 for all the guidelines, except those deferred for Phase 2, effective six months after approval
- Phase 2 covering guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, 18 and 19, effective 18 months after approval

On 30 April 2019, before the ICANN Board considered the IDN Guidelines 4.0, the chair of the GNSO Council wrote to the chair of the ICANN Board that "The GNSO Council formally and respectfully requests that the ICANN Board defer a vote on the IDN Guidelines 4.0 issue while we consider any policy implications under our remit."

The GNSO subsequently included the guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, and 18 for consideration in the IDN Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) charter (which are the guidelines identified by IDNGWG for Phase 2 implementation except guideline 19). On 21 January 2022, the GNSO Council chair and vice chairs wrote to the ICANN Board agreeing with the Board suggestion to move forward with the consideration of the remaining guidelines in IDN Guidelines version 4.0.

The Board has reviewed various materials and factors in its deliberations and in taking its action today. The relevant and significant materials include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Previous versions of IDN Implementation Guidelines

- Standards track RFC 7940: Representing Label Generation Rulesets Using XML

- Informational RFC 6912: Principles for Unicode Code Point Inclusion in Labels in the DNS

- Informational RFC 8228: Guidance on Designing Label Generation Rulesets (LGRs) Supporting Variant Labels

- IANA Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA) tables

- Maximal Starting Repertoire and Root Zone Label Generation Rules

- Reference Second Level Label Generation Rules

- Unicode Security Considerations (UTR#36) and Unicode Security Mechanisms (UTS#39)

- User Experience Study: Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs and SAC60: SSAC Comment on Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs Report

The IDN Implementation Guidelines address IDN registration policies and practices, and are designed to minimize the risks of cybersquatting and consumer confusion, and respect the interests of communities using local languages and scripts. The ICANN

Board has reviewed the draft IDN Guidelines and notes the comprehensiveness of the Guidelines covering the topics of Transition to IDNA2008, Format of IDN Tables, Consistency of IDN Tables and Practices, IDN Variant Labels, Similarity and Confusability of Labels, Publishing IDN Registration Policy and Rules and Terminology. The Board also notes that the guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13, 18 and associated additional notes are considered separable for later implementation by IDNGWG and will consider these after the IDN EPDP has concluded, as per the request by the GNSO. The remaining subset of the IDN Guidelines can be implemented as IDN Guidelines version 4.1.

The IDN Guidelines version 4.1 will have a positive impact on registrants and end-users because these Guidelines address the security, stability and confusability issues related to the use of IDNs.

The IDN Guidelines version 4.1 will have a fiscal impact both on ICANN org and the community. ICANN org will have to undertake communication to registries and registrars to inform them about the update in the Guidelines and develop additional processes and tools to be able to determine how effectively the Guidelines are being implemented by registry operators and registrars under relevant contracts. The registry operators will also need to update their registration policies and practices to address the recommendations in the IDN Guidelines version 4.1. For ICANN, the fiscal impact has been accounted for in the FY23 budget and any additional requirements will be incorporated in the future budgets.

The Board's decision is in the public interest and within the ICANN mission. The IDN Guidelines assist in providing a coordinated approach to improve registration practices and the usage of IDNs at the second level, therefore, contributing to the continued openness, interoperability, resilience, security and stability of the DNS.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by:   Sarmad Hussain

Position:  Sr. Director, IDN and UA Programs

Date Noted:   8 June 2022

Email: sarmad.hussain@icann.org

# Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names Version 4.1

**22-September 2022**

# 1   Introduction

These Guidelines are about the implementation of Internationalized Domains Names (IDN) under Internet Domains. IDN is standardized by IETF in IDNA 2008.

The main audience of this document is Top-Level Domain (TLD) registries that offer or plan to offer registration of IDNs under their Registry Agreements. For other registries (e.g. Country Code TLD registries) this document is intended as the best current practice. These Guidelines are also intended for registrars offering registration of IDNs.

The sections on Additional Notes and Glossary of Relevant Terms are considered an integral part of these guidelines.

The document has been prepared by members of the IDN Guidelines Working Group (IDNGWG), listed in Appendix A, constituted following the Call for Community Experts.

## 1.1   Document Version

This document supersedes version 3.0 of the Guidelines, following the expansion of the DNS under the 2012 New gTLD Program and the 2009 IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process.

From the set of guidelines proposed in version 4.0 by IDNGWG, this version 4.1 defers guidelines 6a, 11, 12, 13 and 18, as resolved by the ICANN Board.

## 1.2   Scope

With regards to the contents of the TLD zone file, the scope of this document is limited to only the owner-name of the DNS records which are added to the zone file by the registration system. Excluded from scope are any glue records and right-hand or target names.

# 2   IDN Guidelines

## 2.1   Transition

1.  TLD registries supporting Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) must do so in strict compliance with the requirements of the IETF protocol for Internationalized Domain Names in Applications, as defined in the standards track RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892 and 5893 or any RFC that replaces or updates the listed RFCs.

2. Code points permitted in IDNA 2003 but disallowed in IDNA 2008 must not be accepted for registration regardless of the extent to which such code points appear in domain names registered prior to the protocol revision.

3. When a pre-existing domain name requires a registry to make transitional exception to any of these Guidelines, the terms of that action must also be made readily available online, including the timeline for the resolution of such transitional matters.  Also see 18(a).

4. No label containing hyphens in both the third and the fourth positions may be registered unless it is a valid A-label, with reservation for transitional action. Labels with hyphens in both the third and the fourth positions are explicitly reserved to indicate encoding schemes, of which IDNA is only one instantiation. These guidelines are not intended to assist with any other instantiations.

## 2.2   Format of IDN Tables

5. A TLD registry must publish one or several repertoires of Unicode code points[1] that are permitted for registration and must not accept the registration of any domain name containing an unlisted code point. Each such list must indicate the script or language(s) it is intended to support.

6. IDN Tables must be placed in the IANA Repository for IDN Practices. Further:
    (a) (Deferred) Except as applicable in 6(b) below, registries must use RFC 7940: Label Generation Ruleset (LGR) Using XML format to represent an IDN Table;
    (b) Registries with existing IDN Tables already present within the IANA Repository for IDN Practices at the time these guidelines are published are encouraged to transition to the LGR format;
    (c) The IDN Table must include the complete repertoire of code points, any IDN variant code points and any applicable contextual rules which the TLD registry uses to determine if an IDN label is acceptable for registration.

## 2.3   Consistency of IDN Tables and Practices

7. TLD registries are encouraged to collaborate on issues of shared interest. TLD Registries may form or join an existing consortium to coordinate contact with external communities, elicit the assistance of support groups, and establish global fora to address common current and emerging challenges in the development and use of IDNs. The maturity and needs of particular IDN communities will vary greatly. Therefore, while collaboration is considered good practice, the assessment of the importance and utility of such consortia is left to the Registry Operator.

8. TLD registries seeking to implement new IDN Tables or to modify existing ones may use available Reference Second Level LGRs (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/second-

---

[1] Code points can be individual or could also include code point sequences, as suggested in RFC 7940.

[level-lgr-2015-06-21-en](#)) as is or as a reference.  IDN Tables may deviate from Reference Second Level LGRs. Notwithstanding the foregoing, registries seeking to implement IDN Tables (i.e. new or modifications of existing ones) that pose any security and/or stability issues must not be implemented.

9.  TLD registries offering registration of IDN labels with the same language or script tag (RFC 5646) are encouraged to cooperate and contribute toward the development and update of the Reference Second Level LGRs with the goal of minimizing the difference between the reference LGRs of that language or script and the implemented IDN Tables for the same language or script.

10. Any information fundamental to the understanding of a TLD registry's IDN policies that is not published by IANA must be made directly available online by the TLD registry. Including references to the linguistic and orthographic sources used in establishing IDN policies and tables is useful for implementers to understand the context of such policies.  The registry should also encourage its registrars to call attention to these policies for all IDN registrants.  If material is provided both via the IANA Repository of IDN Practices and other channels, the registry must ensure that its substance is concordant across all platforms.

## 2.4   IDN Variant Labels

11. (Deferred) IDN Variant Labels generated by an IDN Table must be either (a) allocatable only to the same registrant as the primary IDN label, or (b) blocked from registration.  Also see 18(b).

12. (Deferred) TLD Registries may activate an IDN Variant Label, provided that i) such IDN Variant Label is requested by the same registrant or corresponding registrar as the Primary IDN Label, ii) such IDN Variant Label is registered to the registrant of the Primary IDN Label, and iii) such IDN Variant Label conforms with the registry policy and IDN Tables.

In exceptional cases, i) to support a widely acceptable practice within Internet users of a language or script community, or ii) to abide by language or script established conventions, a TLD Registry may opt to activate a limited number of IDN Variant Labels at its discretion, according to its policies. In such cases, the TLD Registry must have mechanism to limit automatic activation of IDN Variant Labels to a minimum.  Also see 18(c) and Additional Note I.

## 2.4.1  Harmonization of IDN variant code points across IDN Tables

13. (Deferred) TLD registries must ensure that all applicable IDN Tables with an IDN variant policy for a particular TLD have uniform IDN variant code points that properly account for symmetry and transitivity properties of all IDN variant code point sets across these IDN Tables. Exceptions to this guideline vis-à-vis symmetry and transitivity properties should be clearly documented in the TLD registries' public policy. At the same time, TLD registries shall re-evaluate potential variant relationships that may require to create new IDN variant

## 2.5 Similarity and Confusability of Labels

### 2.5.1 Within-script homoglyphs

14. TLD registries are encouraged to consider IDN policies to minimize confusion of IDN labels with other labels within the same script, specifically arising due to homoglyph characters. Also see Additional Note IV.

### 2.5.2 Commingling of cross-script code points in a single label

15. All code points in a single IDN label must be taken from the same Unicode script as determined by the Unicode Standard Annex #24: Unicode Script Property (http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr24). Exceptions to this guideline are permissible for languages with established orthographies and conventions that require the commingled use of multiple Unicode scripts. Also see Additional Notes V and VI.

16. In the case of any exceptions made allowing mixing of Unicode scripts, visually confusable characters from different scripts must not be allowed to co-exist in a single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding IDN policy and IDN Table is clearly defined to minimize confusion between domain names. Also see Additional Note IV.

### 2.5.3 Whole-Script Confusables

17. TLD registries are encouraged to apply additional constraints on registrations that minimize Whole-Script Confusables as determined by Unicode Technical Report #36: Unicode Security Considerations (http://unicode.org/reports/tr36) and Unicode Technical Standard #39: Unicode Security Mechanisms (http://unicode.org/reports/tr39). Also see 18 (d) and Additional Note VII.

## 2.6 Publishing IDN Registration Policy and Rules

18. (Deferred) TLD Registries should publish IDN policies or guidance related to registration of IDN labels at publicly accessible location on the TLD Registry's website. In addition to general policies or guidance on IDN registrations, these should include the following:

    (a) A timeline related to resolution of transitional matters, if applicable

    (b) IDN Variant Label allocation policy, if applicable

    (c) IDN Variant Label automatic activation policy, if applicable

    (d) Policy for minimizing Whole-Script Confusables and data sources used, if applicable.

    (e) IDN Table as per Guideline 6 above.

## 2.7 Terminology

19. The community is encouraged to adopt the relevant terminology used in these Guidelines as defined in Appendix B.

## 2.8   Additional Notes

IV.  For Guidelines 14 and 16: It is important to understand that not all visual similarity issues can be addressed by IDN Tables and IDN policies.  Other policies such as dispute resolution policies may be necessary to mitigate against abusive registrations exploiting visually similar characters.  For example, even for ASCII letters, digits and hyphen (LDH) based repertoire, where the small letter "l" and digit "1" may be considered visually confusable characters, the mitigation policy for abuse is often addressed by dispute resolution policies, leveraging other bodies of knowledge (e.g. Trademark Law) to evaluate whether similarities between domain names causes confusion and abuse.

V.   For Guideline 15: For example, Japanese language normally mixes Hiragana, Katakana and Han scripts.  Also, for Chinese, Japanese and Korean languages, the IDN tables commonly mix "a-z" Latin letters.

VI.  For Guideline 15: This guideline does not aim to preclude the use of relevant subset of code points with "common" or "inherited" script property in the Unicode standard with the particular language and script, e.g., digits and hyphen.

VII. For Guideline 17: TLD Registries may use data references such as Unicode's intentional.txt, the cross-script IDN variant code points in the Root Zone LGR or other authoritative sources.

# Appendix A: Members of IDN Guidelines WG

|    | Name | Supporting Organization/ Advisory Committee |
|----|------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Satish Babu | **ALAC** |
| 2  | Wael Nasr | **ALAC** |
| 3  | Mats Dufberg | **ccNSO** |
| 4  | Pablo Rodríguez | **ccNSO** |
| 5  | Edmon Chung | **GNSO** |
| 6  | Christian Dawson | **GNSO** |
| 7  | Chris Dillon | **GNSO** |
| 8  | Kal Feher | **GNSO** |
| 9  | Dennis Tan | **GNSO** |
| 10 | Jian Zhang (unitl 7 April 2017) | **GNSO** |
| 11 | Patrik Fältström (will only review work) | **SSAC** |

# Appendix B: Glossary of Relevant Terms

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Activated | | State of an IDN label after Activation; <br><br> The resulting string should be activated for use. (This is the same as a Preferred Variant [RFC3743].) | As defined in RFC 7940, Section 7.3 | |
| Allocatable | | An IDN label which can be Allocated | | Allocated, Allocation of a Label |
| Allocated | | State of an IDN label after Allocation <br><br> The resulting string should be reserved for use by the same operator of the origin string but not automatically allocated for use. | As defined in RFC 7940, Section 7.3 | Allocatable, Allocation of a Label |
| Allocation of a label | | A label with respect to a zone, whereby the label is associated administratively to some entity that has requested the label | As defined in Integrated Issues Report of Variant Issues Project | Allocatable, Allocated |
| Blocked | | State of an IDN label after blocking <br><br> The resulting string is a | | Blocking of a Label |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | valid label [generated based on a given LGR (or IDN Table and IDN registration rules)] but should be blocked from registration. This would typically apply for a derived variant that is undesirable due to having no practical use or being confusingly similar to some other label | As defined in [RFC 7940, Section 7.3](#) | |
| Blocking of a label | | An action taken on a given label with respect to a zone, according to which the label is unavailable for allocation to anyone | As defined in [Integrated Issues Report](#) of Variant Issues Project | Blocked |
| Code Point | | A value, or position, for a character, in any coded character set | As defined by Unicode at [http://unicode.org/glossary/#code_point](#)<br><br>Used in the context of Unicode standard in this document | Code Point Sequence |
| Code Point Repertoire for the Zone | | Also known informally as a zone repertoire. A set of code points permitted in U-labels in a | As defined in [Integrated Issues Report](#) of Variant Issues Project. Used | Repertoire, Code Point Repertoire |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | zone | synonymously for Code Point Repertoire or just Repertoire | |
| Code Point Sequence | | A sequence of two or more Code Points (e.g. as specified in an LGR) | As explained in RFC 7940, Section 5.1 | Code Point |
| Delegation of a label | | A label with respect to a zone, indicating that in that zone there are NS resource records at the label and that there is no SOA resource record at the label (i.e., that this is the parent zone: there are also NS records with the same owner name in the child zone, but in that child zone there must be an SOA record as well) | As defined in Integrated Issues Report of Variant Issues Project | Delegated |
| Glyph | | A synonym for *glyph image*. In displaying Unicode character data, one or more glyphs may be selected to depict a particular character. These glyphs are selected by a rendering engine during composition and layout processing | As defined by Unicode at http://unicode.org /glossary/#glyph | |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|------|---------|-----------|-------|---------------------|
| Homoglyph | | An abstract character or a conceptual character that is represented with the same glyph as another abstract character or conceptual character | As defined in Integrated Issues Report of Variant Issues Project | |
| IDN Variant Code Point(s) | | Code point(s) that may be used as alternative for code point(s) in the zone repertoire based on a given IDN Table | | |
| IDN Variant Label | | A label generated as a variant of a Primary IDN Label based on a given LGR (or IDN Table and IDN registration rules) | | Label, IDN Label, Primary IDN Label |
| Internationalized Domain Name Label | IDN label | A label valid as per IDNA 2008 | | Label |
| Internationalized Domain Name Table | IDN Table | Specification of permitted code points and combition of those in domains name labels. Also see LGR | Formats specified in RFC 7940, RFC 4290 and RFC 3743 | LGR |
| Internationalized Domain Names | IDNs | Domain names containing characters not included in the traditional DNS preferred form ("LDH"). IDNs under discussion are | | |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | implemented using IDNA | | |
| Internationalized Domain Names in Applications 2003 | IDNA 2003 | | Defined by standard track RFCs 3454, 3490, 3491, 3492<br><br>IDNA2003 has been superseded by IDNA2008 | IDNA 2008 |
| Internationalized Domain Names in Applications 2008 | IDNA 2008 | | Defined by standard track RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892 and 5893 | IDNA 2003 |
| Label | | Part of a domain name separated by dots | | |
| Label Generation Ruleset, or Label Generation Rules | LGR | LGRs are algorithms used to determine whether, and under what conditions, a given identifier label is permitted, based on the code points it contains and their context. These algorithms comprise a list of permissible code points, variant code point mappings, and a set of rules that act on the code points and mappings. | As introduced in RFC 7940.<br><br>Format specified in RFC 7940. Additional formats include those specified in RFC 4290 and RFC 3743 | IDN Table |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | LGRs form part of an administrator's policies. In deploying Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs), they have also been known as IDN Tables | | |
| Primary IDN Label | | An IDN Label applied-for or submitted by a registrant | | Label, IDN Label, IDN Variant Label |
| Variant | | The term "variant" is used generally to identify different types of linguistic situations where different code points or labels are considered to be the same (i.e. a variant) of another. Because of the wide-ranging understanding of the term, to avoid confusion more specific terms such as "IDN Variant Code Point" or "IDN Variant Label" should be used | | IDN Variant Code Point, IDN Variant Label |
| Whole Label Evaluation Rules | WLE Rules | Context-based and whole label rules. The "rule" element also contain the character classes that they depend on, and any | As explained in RFC 7940, Seciton 6 | |

| Term | Acronym | Definition | Notes | Other related Terms |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | actions that assign dispositions to labels based on rules or variant mappings | | |
| Whole-Script Confusables | | It may be possible to compose an entire label in a script that will be essentially always identical in form to a label in another script, such as "scope" in Cyrillic looking just like "scope" in Latin. Such strings are called whole-script confusables | Definition derived from http://unicode.org /reports/tr36/#Mi xed_Script_Spoof ing | |

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.2a**

| | |
|---|---|
| **TITLE:** | **Deferral of the Third Registration Directory Service Review (RDS3)** |
| **PROPOSED ACTION:** | **For Board Consideration and Approval** |

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Board is being asked to defer the [Third Registration Directory Service Review (RDS3)](#), formerly known as the RDS-WHOIS Review. This review is scheduled to start in October 2022, based on the current timing defined by the ICANN [Bylaws](#). Considering recent developments with Specific Reviews outlined below, it is neither prudent nor feasible to initiate the RDS3 in October 2022.

Board [action](#) on the recommendation issued by the [Third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3)](#) pertaining to the future Registration Directory Services (RDS) Reviews impacts the timing of the RDS3. Specifically, the ATRT3 recommended "suspending any further RDS Reviews until the next ATRT Review can consider the future of RDS Reviews in the context of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) Phase 2 Final Report recommendations, the results of the Board's consideration of these, as well as any other developments which affect Directory Services." The Board approved the ATRT3 recommendations, subject to prioritization, recognizing that the ICANN community and organization will need time to plan for and execute those recommendations, once prioritized for implementation. The ICANN community prioritized the above-mentioned recommendation (ATRT3 recommendation 3.1) as high priority in May 2022.

Additionally, the Second Registration Directory Service Review (RDS2) completed its work and delivered its [Final Report](#) to the Board on 3 September 2019, with the Board [taking action](#) on the 22 recommendations on 25 February 2020: 14 recommendations approved, four recommendations placed into "pending" status, two recommendations passed through to other parts of the ICANN community[1], and two recommendations rejected. The implementation work is underway for recommendations approved by the Board, with seven recommendations

---

[1] Recommendations that require policy development were passed through to the GNSO Council in recognition of the policy role of the GNSO and the community's prerogative to initiate policy development processes (see [Board resolution](#)).

1

implemented as of 30 June 2022. However, the current timing for the RDS3 would not provide sufficient time to complete implementation of the remaining the RDS2 recommendations, before starting the next review cycle – thus impacting the feasibility of timing.

As noted by the ATRT3, ongoing work to address the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report recommendations and the proposed System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD) will impact the RDS[2]. This continues to be a significant dependency, further impacting the feasibility of timing of the RDS3.

**[Proposed] ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

With the above issues, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) recommends that the Board defer the RDS3, acknowledging that although the Bylaws state that the RDS Review should be conducted every five years, pursuant to ATRT3 recommendations, the prudent way forward is to proceed with the community's recommendation to defer the RDS3. The OEC recommends that it would be neither prudent nor feasible to begin this review in October 2022, given the ATRT3 recommendation to suspend the next RDS Review and before the implementation of the RDS2 recommendations has been completed. The OEC discussed this issue in depth at its 30 August 2022 meeting.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, Section 4.6 (e) of the ICANN Bylaws stipulates that the Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current generic top level domains (gTLD) registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data ("Directory Services Review"). The Registration Directory Service Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous RDS Review Team was convened; the Second Registration Directory Services Review (RDS2) was convened in October 2017.

Whereas, on 30 November 2020 the Board approved recommendations from the Third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) pertaining to reviews, subject to prioritization

---

[2] See EPDP Phase 2 Final Report (August 2020) and the proposed System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD).

and community agreement on the Bylaws change. The prioritization of the recommendations by the community is complete, with the ATRT3 recommendation 3.1 to defer the next RDS Review categorized as high priority. The ATRT3 recommended suspending any further RDS Reviews until the next ATRT can consider the future of RDS Reviews in the context of the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report recommendations, the results of the Board's consideration of these, as well as any other developments which affect Directory Services (such as the proposed SSAD).

Whereas, the RDS2 Review Team completed its work and delivered its [Final Report](#) to the ICANN Board on 3 September 2019, with the Board [taking action on 22 recommendations](#) on 25 February 2020. The implementation work is underway for recommendations approved by the Board, with seven recommendations implemented as of [30 June 2022](#).

Whereas, the ICANN Board's OEC recommends the Board to defer the RDS3, determining that it would be neither prudent nor feasible to begin this review now, given the ATRT3 recommendation to suspend the next RDS Review and before the implementation of RDS2 recommendations has been completed.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board defers the Third Registration Directory Services Review (RDS3) to allow the ICANN community and organization sufficient time to plan for and implement pertinent ATRT3 recommendations. The Board acknowledges that the Bylaws state that the RDS Review should be conducted every five years. The Board also acknowledges the ATRT3 recommendation, to suspend RDS3 until the next ATRT Review makes a further recommendation on timing. The Board will oversee the implementation of ATRT3 recommendations and determine whether the timing of the RDS3 should be re-examined based on the changing environment, including various dependencies such as the ongoing work related to the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report recommendations, including the proposed SSAD.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

This ICANN Board action is an essential step in its oversight responsibility over Specific Reviews, including the review of the Registration Directory Services (RDS), formerly known as the RDS-WHOIS Review. The Board recognizes that the current timing specified in the Bylaws to commence the RDS3 in October 2022 is not prudent, in the context of recently issued community recommendations approved by the Board and currently being implemented, as well as ongoing work related to the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report recommendations, including the proposed SSAD. By deferring the start of the RDS3, the Board is acting in line with the ATRT3

recommendations as also supported by the ICANN community. The Board expects that since ATRT3 recommendations have been prioritized and implementation design work is underway, the implementation work will result in a package of proposed amendments to the ICANN Bylaws, some of which will address the timing of future reviews, including the RDS3.

ATRT3 Recommendation 3.1 called for "suspending any further RDS Reviews until the next ATRT Review can consider the future of RDS Reviews in the context of the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report recommendations, the results of the Board's consideration of these, as well as any other developments which affect Directory Services." The Board approved this recommendation in November 2020, subject to community agreement on a Bylaws change, stating that "When deemed appropriate through the prioritization process, the Board directs ICANN org to begin the process to make the appropriate Bylaw amendments, but if the Empowered Community rejects the Bylaws changes, further ICANN community discussion would be required before implementation."

This Board action supports the Board's continued commitment to proactively implement community-issued recommendations, and to evolve Specific Reviews in collaboration with the ICANN community, to produce impactful outcomes that serve the public interest. Continuously improving delivery of Specific Reviews is a cornerstone of ICANN's commitment to accountability and transparency. It is in the public interest to continue to conduct a periodic review of the effectiveness of the gTLD registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data ("Directory Service Review").

A Public Comment proceeding is not considered necessary, since the ATRT3 recommendation to suspend the RDS3 until the next ATRT Review was the subject of two Public Comment proceedings – on both the Draft and Final ATRT3 Reports.

This Board action is expected to result in positive impact to the security, stability, or resiliency of the Internet's DNS, by allowing sufficient time to implement community recommendations and assess their impact as well as by enabling a community-based evaluation of the future of the RDS Review. This action is anticipated to result in positive budgetary or financial implications in the near term, in that the expenditure for the next RDS Review will be deferred. It is also anticipated to have a positive impact on community and ICANN org resources.

**Submitted by**: Xavier Calvez

**Position**: Senior Vice President, Planning & Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

**Date Noted**: 30 August 2022

**Email**: xavier.calvez@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.2b**

**TITLE: Initiating the Implementation of SAC113 Recommendation 1**

**PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Consideration and Approval**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Many enterprises and device vendors who create private networks use domain names that are not present in the DNS root zone for their own private purposes. Issues for users of these private networks can arise when resolvers in the private networks accidentally leak these names into the public DNS, or when users and their devices move between their private networks and the Internet.

SAC113 contains a single recommendation asking the ICANN Board to identify and reserve a single string at the top-level of the DNS naming hierarchy for private use. That reserved string must never be delegated. In addition, SAC113 outlines four criteria for choosing the string.

The SSAC advice is being handled through the Board Action Request Register (ARR) process. Steps 1 and 2 have been completed. These steps require the Board to acknowledge receipt of the advice and to ensure that the Board and the SSAC have a mutual understanding of any actionable items contained in the advice.

This paper focuses on step 3 of the Board ARR process, which requires an evaluation of the actionable items in the advice the preparation of materials for Board consideration. The paper proposes a four-step process to implement this single recommendation 1 from "SAC113: SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs". It also contains the relevant Board resolutions to direct ICANN org to carry out the first step in that process.

**BTC RECOMMENDATION:**

The BTC recommends that the Board adopt a four-step approach to addressing the advice from the SSAC in SAC113, and direct ICANN org to initiate the first step of the process. Briefly, the four proposed steps of the process are:

1. Conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed approach outlined in steps 2, 3, and 4;
2. Instruct IANA to choose the string using the criteria from SAC113;
3. In step 2, conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed string chosen by IANA; and
4. Pass a Board resolution to reserve the proposed string.

At the end of this process, a string will be reserved in perpetuity from delegation into the DNS root zone.

**ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND:**

Along with recommending that the Board identify and reserve in perpetuity a single string at the top-level of the DNS, SAC113 outlines four selection criteria for the chosen string:

1. It is a valid DNS label.
2. It is not already delegated in the root zone.
3. It is not confusingly similar to another TLD in existence.
4. It is relatively short, memorable, and meaningful.

Following analysis of SAC113, the BTC proposes following four steps to implement the SSAC's recommendation:

1. Conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed approach in steps 2, 3, and 4
2. Instruct IANA to choose the string using the criteria described in SAC113
3. In step 2, conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed string chosen by IANA
4. Pass a Board resolution to reserve the proposed string

The Board initiates step 1 by instructing ICANN org to launch a Public Comment proceeding on the overall approach described above. This proceeding will gather community feedback on the

approach and will allow the community to identify specific concerns and issues with the proposed approach.

This first Public Comment proceeding will be limited to seeking input on the process of having IANA choose a string using the criteria described in SAC113, to be reserved at the top-level for private use. This limited scope will be made clear when the proceeding is opened, as will the fact that the proceeding is not an opportunity to propose a string for this purpose, and there will be a subsequent Public Comment proceeding where input as to whether the chosen string matches the SAC113 criteria will be sought.

The draft Board resolution directing ICANN org to conduct this first Public Comment proceeding is included in this Board paper. Activation of the requisite Board resolutions for the other three steps is contingent on the feedback received during the first Public Comment proceeding and drafts of these additional Board resolutions are thus not covered in this paper.

The Board can initiate the second step in the proposed four-step process if no significant issues that could change the proposed approach are identified in the first Public Comment proceeding. If, however, significant issues are uncovered through the Public Comment proceeding, ICANN org may recommend as part of the required Report of Public Comments that the Board make changes to the process. The Board will then decide whether to retain the original four-step approach and proceed to instruct IANA to choose a string, or make a change to the process.

In proceeding to propose a string, IANA may seek input from other stakeholders and external parties. Following its investigation, IANA will present its selected string and the supporting rationale to the ICANN Board. The Board will initiate step 3 by instructing ICANN org to carry out a Public Comment proceeding, for the community to identify any blocking issues concerning the string selected by IANA.

This second Public Comment proceeding to review the string chosen by IANA will be limited to soliciting feedback on whether or not the chosen string adheres to the string selection criteria in

SAC113. Proposals for alternative strings, comments on the process itself, or comments on the general efficacy of private-use TLDs will be out of scope for this Public Comment proceeding.

Unless specific blocking issues are identified in the string proposed by IANA, the ICANN Board can proceed to step 4 of the process by passing a resolution to permanently reserve that string from delegation in the root zone. If, however, based on the Report of Public Comments received, the Board determines that there are significant problems with the selected string, the Board may consider instructing IANA to choose a different string.

ICANN Org is initiating both public comment proceedings in order to implement an SSAC recommendation. This can be done in a manner similar to how the [public comment proceeding was handled for SAC053 and Dotless domains](#).

Although anyone can respond to a public comment proceeding, the specific interested parties listed below should be identified for direct outreach through the relevant ICANN Org teams.

- The SSAC
- The IETF community through the IESG and IAB
- The GNSO Council
- The ccNSO Council

Other Considerations

Reserving the chosen string through an ICANN Board resolution as a final step will formally complete adoption of the SAC113 recommendation. A Board resolution resolving to never delegate the selected string into the root zone of the DNS will serve as conclusive documentation that prohibits the selected string from being placed into the root zone unless and until the resolution is overtaken by a later resolution.

Once it is known that this string will never be delegated into the DNS root zone, other fora may wish to add this string to more specific lists of reserved names. This would be both a likely and desirable outcome.

In 2016 the SSAC published SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace. Recommendation 3 from SAC090 states:

> 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.

Completing the process outlined in this paper and reserving a string intended for private-use contributes to fulfilling this recommendation.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, on 18 September 2020 the SSAC published SAC113: SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs, recommending that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified and reserved at the top level of the DNS for private use, and that this particular string must never be delegated.

Whereas, the Board Technical Committee and ICANN org have evaluated the feasibility of the SSAC's advice in SAC113 and developed a proposed approach for implementing the advice.

Whereas, on 20 October 2020 Göran Marby, President and Chief Executive Officer of ICANN org wrote Alissa Cooper, Chair, Internet Engineering Task Force and Mirja Kühlewind, Chair, Internet Architecture Board requesting further discussion on the recommendation of SAC113.

Whereas, on 12 November 2020 Alissa Cooper on behalf of the Internet Engineering Steering Group, and Mirja Kühlewind on behalf of the Internet Architecture Board responded.

Whereas, the Board has considered the SSAC advice and the implementation recommendations from the Board Technical Committee and ICANN org relating to this advice.

Resolved (2022.09.22.XX), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to conduct a Public Comment proceeding on a proposed procedure to identify and reserve a string for private use in accordance with the recommendation contained in SAC113. The Board

requests that the ICANN org prepare and submit a Report on the Public Comments received during this proceeding in order to assist the Board to determine its disposition on instructing IANA to choose a string to be reserved from delegation.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

*Why is the Board addressing the issue now?*
The Board Action Request Register (ARR) is a framework intended to improve the process for the Board's consideration of recommendations to the ICANN Board, including advice from ICANN Advisory Committees. The SSAC published SAC113: SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs on 18 September 2020, and the Board is considering the SSAC's advice in line with the ARR framework. The Board's action today is intended to make additional progress on addressing the advice in SAC113.

SAC113 makes the case from a technical, security, and stability perspective to reserve a top-level string for private use. While it is usually preferable to use a sub-domain of a registered domain name for private use, this is not always the case, with the result that different strings get used for this purpose. SAC113 argues that to help facilitate coordination, and help prevent ad hoc usage of different strings, a dedicated string should be reserved for private use.

From SAC113:

> The DNS has no explicit provision for internally-scoped names, and current advice is for the vendors or service providers to use a sub-domain of a public domain name for internal, or private use. Using sub-domains of registered public domain names is still the best practice to name internal resources. The SSAC concurs with this best practice, and encourages enterprises, device vendors, and others who require internally-scoped names to use sub-domains of registered public domain names whenever possible. However, this is not always feasible and there are legitimate use cases for private-use TLDs.

SAC113 documents and explains the problem of uncoordinated, or ad hoc, usage of different top-level strings for private use. This is a legitimate and significant problem that others have

identified as well; for example, various efforts within the IETF have also recognized this as a problem.

SAC113 recognizes Internet users' need for private namespaces to exist and recommends a means to help handle some of these issues.

*What is the proposal being considered?*

The Board is considering a four-step process to implement the recommendation contained in SAC113, by first initiating a Public Comment proceeding to gather feedback on the planned four steps to reserve a string for private use. Based on the feedback received during that Public Comment proceeding, the Board may choose to continue with the second step of the process, or change the process.

The four proposed steps are:

1. Conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed approach in steps 2, 3 and 4;
2. Instruct IANA to choose the string using the criteria described in SAC113;
3. In step 2, conduct a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed string chosen by IANA; and
4. Pass a Board resolution to reserve the proposed string.

*Which stakeholders or others were consulted?*

SAC113 discusses many of the efforts, both ongoing and abandoned, in the IETF to try and resolve this issue. Since the publication of SAC113 the ICANN Board and the IAB have exchanged correspondence about SAC113, briefly summarized below.

In the first correspondence from the ICANN Board to the IETF/IAB Chairs, the Board asked for clarification on what the definition of a 'technical use' was for domain names. Since the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between ICANN and the IETF considers 'assignments of domain names for technical uses' something the ICANN Board cannot delegate, assign, or instruct IANA to reserve unilaterally.

In its response, the IAB/IETF states:

> We understand SAC113 to be a proposal for the ICANN board to allocate an ICANN Reserved Name, and we believe that it being reserved by ICANN would necessarily require that the chosen string also be removed from consideration for any technical use specified by the IETF. In keeping with our commitment to a single, global namespace (RFC 2826), such a reservation would ensure that the IETF would not consider any special-use name with the same string. Procedurally, if the ICANN board chooses to reserve a string following the advice of SAC113, we would expect the string to be reserved within the IANA-managed reserved domain registry rather than the special-use domain names registry.

The IAB/IETF did not voice any objection to the ICANN Board permanently reserving a top-level string.

***What concerns or issues were raised by the community?***

Community members have noted that, even if a top-level string is reserved for technical use, there is no way to compel equipment vendors, protocol designers, and others to use it. It is also not possible to determine the extent to which the chosen string will be used. It is therefore conceivable that implementing SAC113 could ultimately have no material effect on the DNS.

It is also likely not possible to choose a single string that will enjoy universal agreement as being the most appropriate string for this purpose. Different stakeholders and individuals may have different ideas of what the best string is for this purpose, and it will not be possible to identify a single string that will be acceptable to all stakeholders. This consequence is, however, distinct from the ability to choose a string that adheres to the criteria set forth in SAC113. The proposed process to implement SAC113 includes Public Comment opportunities that will allow concerned communities and individuals to provide their input.

***What significant materials did the Board review?***

The Board has reviewed SAC113, an Options Paper developed by staff, correspondence between ICANN and the IAB, and the MoU between ICANN and the IETF.

*What factors did the Board find to be significant?*

The Board recognizes that the problem highlighted in SAC113 is a legitimate and significant one that could, if not addressed, materially affect the DNS. SAC113 lays out a path forward and the process which the Board plans to follow to implement SAC113 includes specific opportunities for all stakeholders to provide additional input.

*Are there positive or negative community impacts?*

A positive impact from this Board resolution is to initiate a process that will eventually provide a designated namespace for the private use of vendors and other users of the DNS. There are no negative community impacts with this proposal.

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

No additional fiscal impact is anticipated as a result of initiating the proposal outlined in this paper. Any resourcing that may be required to fully implement SAC113 is expected to be covered by existing ICANN org resources.

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

The SSAC has identified many security, stability, and resiliency issues associated with the uncoordinated use of private-use names in SAC113. The proposal discussed in this paper attempts to address them by providing a designated namespace for this use. It is impossible to determine the extent to which the proposal outlined in this paper will alleviate these issues. However, it will not introduce any new security, stability or resiliency issues. It will also not increase the severity of any known and existing security, stability, or resiliency issues.

*Is this decision in the public interest and within ICANN's mission?*

Reserving a string from delegation permanently is in the public interest for the reasons outlined in this resolution and rationale. It is also within the scope of ICANN's mission as described in the Bylaws. Specifically, Section 1.1 (a) (i) which states: "[ICANN] Coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System [..]".

In its letter to the Board, the IAB/IETF agreed that this reservation was within the scope of ICANN based on ICANN's MoU with the IETF.

*Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN's Supporting Organizations or ICANN's Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment or not requiring public comment?*

This is neither a defined policy process with ICANN's supporting organizations nor an ICANN org administrative function. The Public Comment proceedings outlined in the four-step implementation plan are not required by the ICANN Bylaws, but are part of the proposed process for implementing SAC113. The purpose of this specific Board action is to initiate the first such Public Comment proceeding.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: David Olive, SVP
and Andrew McConachie,
Technology and Policy Director

Policy Development Support

Date Noted: 11 August 2022

Email: david.olive@icann.org,
andrew.mcconachie@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.22.2c**

**TITLE: ccNSO proposed policy on retirement of ccTLDs**

**PROPOSED ACTION: For Board Consideration and Adoption**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

On 17 September 2021, the ccNSO concluded the development of a proposed policy for a process to retire ccTLDs. The goal of the proposed policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and document a process that is orderly and reasonable up and to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone and excluding the event that causes the retirement of a ccTLD (removal of a country code from ISO3166 or other event in case of IDN ccTLD). The proposed policy is directed at ICANN and focuses on the IANA Naming Function and was submitted to the Board for its consideration and decision under ICANN Bylaws Annex B Section 15. The Board is being asked to consider and approve the proposed policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs.

**[PROPOSED] BOARD GROUP RECOMMENDATION:**

**[SUBJECT TO AD-HOC BOARD GROUP APPROVAL]** The Board Ad-Hoc Group on the ccTLD Retirement Process (Board Group) recommends that the Board adopt the proposed ccNSO's policy recommendations for the retirement of ccTLDs as included in the September 2021 Board Report from the ccNSO Council.

**ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND:**

In December 2015, the ccNSO Council discussed the launch of a formal ccNSO Policy Development Processes to address the lack of policy with respect to retirement of ccTLDs and to introduce a Review Mechanism on issues pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs. This discussion was grounded in the need to ensure the predictability and

1

legitimacy of decisions with respect to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

In March 2017, and in accordance with Annex B section 3 and 4 of the ICANN Bylaws, the ccNSO Council decided to initiate ccNSO Policy Development Process 3 with the initial focus on developing a policy for Retirement of ccTLDs (Part 1), and only after the substantive work on that topic would have been concluded, focus on the development of policy recommendations for a Review Mechanism pertaining to decisions on delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs (Part 2).

After extensive consultation of the ccNSO membership, broader ccTLD community and other stakeholders during ICANN69 and a public consultation from 3 March 2021 until 14 April 2021, the ccNSO Council decided on 4 June 2021 to expedite the ccNSO decision-making on the proposed policy recommendations for the Retirement of ccTLDs.

The ccNSO concluded the development of a proposed policy for a process to retire ccTLDs in September 2021, following the ccNSO Council's adoption of the policy recommendations in June 2021 and a ccNSO Members vote in July 2021, in accordance with Annex B of the Bylaws. The requisite Board Report was submitted to the Board for its consideration in September 2021.

At the ICANN Board's October 2021 workshop, the Board noted the need to create an grouping of Board members to support the Board in considering the ccNSO's policy recommendations. After a charter was developed,  in March 2022, ICANN's Board Governance Committee confirmed the membership and scope of the Board Ad-Hoc Group on the ccTLD Retirement Process (Board Group) and confirmed the scope of the Board Group's work to:

    1.    Oversee and provide guidance to ICANN org on responses to the public comments received

    2.    Oversee and provide guidance to ICANN org on preparation of the report(s) to the Board on the proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs

    3.    Review and provide guidance to the Board on matters relating to the overall implementation of the proposed policy

4. Preparation of advice to the Board to the manner in which ccNSO proposed policy recommendations should be handled by the Board going forward.

As required under the Bylaws, a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed policy recommendations was conducted from November 2021 until January 2022 (https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/ccnso-proposed-policy-on-the-retirement-of-cctlds-22-11-2021). The public input received did not identify additional issues other than those that were already raised and addressed during the ccNSO Policy Development process itself.

ICANN org conducted an implementation feasibility assessment over the recommendations, primarily focusing on the impact on the IANA Naming Function, and no issues were identified that would require additional policy work nor obstacles in implementation. Given the very low occurrence of the retirement of ccTLDs, automation of the processes will not be required.

In discussing the proposed policy recommendations, the Board Group noted the need to provide operational clarity regarding the concept of a "non-functional ccTLD Manager", to avoid future ambiguity in application of the policy. In the proposed policy a Functional Manager is defined as a ccTLD Manager listed in the IANA Root Zone database who is active with respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IANA Function Operator can officially and effectively communicate (see Board Report page 17). A "non-functional ccTLD Manager" is a ccTLD Manager that does not meet these requirements. The Board Group notes that the application of the policy to a non-functional ccTLD Manager is an operational matter that should be addressed during implementation of the policy, and is not a dependency for the Board's adoption of the policy.

With respect to the applicability of the policy recommendations the Board Group noted the following points:

o According to the policy recommendations, the policy would apply to all entries in the Root Zone database which are identified as ccTLDs and are subject to a Retirement Triggering Event, which is defined as:

1.    For 2 letter ccTLDs which corresponded to an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element – The deletion of the Alpha-2 Code Element from the ISO 3166-1 Standard by the ISO 3166-1 Maintenance Agency ("ISO 3166/MA").

2.    For 2 letter Latin ccTLDs which do not correspond to an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element – The ISO 3166-1 MA making a change (other than making it an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element) to any of these.

3.    For IDN ccTLDs – The Triggering Event will be identified in the Policy on the (de)selection of IDN ccTLD strings, which was initiated on 21 May 2020.

o The policy does not apply retroactively but may provide guidance on an approach on such matters.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION:**

Whereas, In March 2017, the ccNSO Council decided to initiate ccNSO Policy Development Process initially to develop a policy for Retirement of ccTLDs (Part 1), and only after the substantive work on that topic would have been concluded, develop policy recommendations for a Review Mechanism pertaining to decisions on delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs (Part 2).

Whereas, the working group that developed the retirement policy concluded its work in February 2021 and suggested together with the Review Mechanism Working group to separate Part 1 and Part 2.

Whereas, after a public consultation the ccNSO Council decided on 04 June 2021 to split ccPDP3 into two separate policies: 1. Policy recommendations on the retirement of ccTLDs and 2. Policy recommendations for a Review Mechanism.

Whereas, the ccNSO Policy Recommendations pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs were adopted by the ccNSO Council on 17 June 2021.

Whereas, the ccNSO Council decision to adopt the ccNSO Policy Recommendations pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs was supported by the required threshold of the ccNSO membership.

Whereas, on 28 September 2021 the ccNSO Policy Recommendations pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs were submitted to the Board for consideration and decision through the required Board Report..

Whereas, the input received during a  Public Comment proceeding  on the proposed policy (see https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/country-code-top-level-domains-cc-tlds/ccnso-proposed-policy-retirement-cctlds-pcp-summary-report-02-02-2022-en.pdf) raised no new issues.  All issues raised  had otherwise been identified and addressed during the ccNSO Policy Development Process.

Whereas, in response to the Board's notification as required under the Bylaws (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-06dec21-en.pdf), the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) did not identify any particular public policy issue, nor did the GAC note any particular objection to the recommendations (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ismail-to-botterman-31jan22-en.pdf).

Whereas, the Board has considered the ccNSO policy recommendations pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs, and notes the Board Ad-Hoc Group on the ccTLD Retirement Process (Board Group)'s recommended action to adopt all recommendations within the Board Report.

Resolved (2022.09.22.XX) the Board adopts the ccNSO Retirement of ccTLDs Policy Recommendations as set forth in Attachment A, sections1-5 of the Board Report (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/board-report-proposed-policy-retirement-cctlds-17sep21-en.pdf).

Resolved (2022.09.22.XX), the Board directs the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to implement the recommended policy contained in the Board Report.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

*Why is the Board addressing the issue now?*

In August 2021, the ccNSO concluded the development of a proposed policy for a process to retire ccTLDs. The goal of the proposed policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and document a process that is orderly and reasonable up and to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone and excluding the event that causes the retirement of a ccTLD (removal of a country code from ISO3166 or other event in case of IDN ccTLD). The proposed policy is directed at ICANN and focuses on the IANA Naming Function and was submitted to the Board for its consideration and decision under ICANN Bylaws Annex B Section 15.

*What is the proposal being considered?*

The Board is considering a process to retire ccTLDs, excluding the event that would initiate the retirement and excluding the removal of the ccTLD from the Root Zone database.

This Policy applies to all entries in the Root Zone database which are identified as ccTLDs and are subject to a Retirement Triggering Event, which is defined as:

1. For 2 letter ccTLDs which corresponded to an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element – The deletion of the Alpha-2 Code Element from the ISO 3166-1 Standard by the ISO 3166-1 Maintenance Agency ("ISO 3166/MA").

2. For 2 letter Latin ccTLDs which do not correspond to an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element – The ISO 3166-1 MA making a change (other than making it an ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 Code Element) to any of these.

3. For IDN ccTLDs – The Triggering Event will be identified in the Policy on the (de)selection of IDN ccTLD strings, which was initiated on 21 May 2020.

Once confirmed that a Retirement Triggering Event has occurred and that the ccTLD should be retired, the Manager of the ccTLD shall promptly be notified that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone five years from the date of the notice (Notice of Removal), unless the Manager has requested an extension and this extension was granted.

If the Manager wishes to request an extension of the default five-year removal process, it must request the extension as part of a Retirement Plan. Granting an extension to the Default Retirement Date is discretionary, but shall not be unreasonably withheld.

If no agreement can be reached on a Retirement Plan within the required timeframe, the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone five years from the date the Notice of Removal was sent to the Manager of the ccTLD to be retired.

This Policy will not change or amend the role that the ICANN Board of Directors has with respect to individual cases of ccTLD delegation, transfer and revocation.

***Which stakeholders or others were consulted?***
Under the ccNSO Policy Development process the community has been extensively consulted, and the concerns raised during these consultations have been addressed, as extensively documented in the ccNSO's Board Report.

As required under Article 3.6 (a) (ii), the Board conducted a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed policy from November 2021, until January 2022.

In addition, and pursuant to Article 3, Section 6(a) (iii) of the Bylaws, the Board invited the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) to provide advice in the event that the proposed policy raises public policy issues. In its response, the GAC noted that GAC Members had monitored the progress of the ccNSO's work on this matter, and it appreciated the regular updates the ccNSO provided to the GAC as the ccNSO worked to develop its recommendations. Throughout the process, GAC Members did not identify any particular public policy issue, nor did they note any particular objection to the recommendations.

*What concerns or issues were raised by the community?*

Community members, including the GAC, have not raised any concerns beyond issues that were raised and addressed during the ccNSO Policy Development Process itself.

*What significant materials did the Board review?*

The Board has reviewed the following documents:

- o ccNSO Board Report: Proposed Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs included in Attachement A, Section 1-5. (https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/board-report-proposed-policy-retirement-cctlds-17sep21-en.pdf)
- o Letter from chair of the GAC on ccNSO Proposed Policy on retirement of ccTLDs. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/ismail-to-botterman-31jan22-en.pdf )
- o Public comment Summary ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs (https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/country-code-top-level-domains-cc-tlds/ccnso-proposed-policy-retirement-cctlds-pcp-summary-report-02-02-2022-en.pdf )
- o 21 July 2022 Letter from ccNSO Council to Samantha Eisner on intent to exclude retirement issues from ICANN's accountability mechanisms (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/reynoso-to-eisner-21jul22-en.pdf)

*What factors did the Board find to be significant?*

The Board recognizes that in the past, several ccTLDs were retired although such occurrence is rare. The proposed policy institutionalizes the practice that has developed, increases the predictability of a process as impactful as the retirement of ccTLDs, and balances all interests involved.

The Board understands that there are items raised within the Board Report that may need to be addressed in implementation.  One such issue is that ccNSO policy recommendations reference a review mechanism and suggest that retirement decisions are excluded from ICANN's accountability mechanisms, specifically the Independent Review Process ("IRP") and Reconsideration Request process as set out in Article 4 of the Bylaws. However, the ICANN

Bylaws language on the IRP and Reconsideration Requests appear to include retirement decisions as within scope. This issue was flagged in April 2022 for the ccNSO Council through a separate ccPDP working group that is working on the development of a review mechanism. In July 2022 the ccNSO Council indicated its position (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/reynoso-to-eisner-21jul22-en.pdf) that retirement matters should be excluded from the accountability mechanism. The ccNSO Council noted the work ongoing to develop those review mechanisms, and that further clarity on the path forward as it relates to the interaction between retirement actions and ICANN's accountability mechanisms will be forthcoming through the outputs of those policy development working groups.  The ICANN Board considered whether it was practical and feasible to move forward with action on the retirement recommendations without resolution of the review mechanism issue, and ICANN org confirmed that there was minimal risk in adopting the retirement policy recommendations at this time. ICANN org also noted that the risk in continuing without a formal retirement policy in place is far greater that the risk in proceeding without closure of the review mechanism issue, also supporting the Board's action today. ICANN org also confirmed that any work towards initiating any necessary Bylaws amendment processes would be separate from the consideration of the retirement recommendations, and therefore would be considered at a future date. The Board group is not the ICANN Board or committee responsible to sherd such work to implementation

### *Are there positive or negative community impacts?*

A positive impact from this Board resolution is the provision of clear and predictable guidance and the documentation of a process that is orderly and reasonable up to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone. There are no negative community impacts with this proposal.

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

No additional fiscal impact is anticipated as a result of adoption and implementation of the recommended policy.  Any resourcing that may be required to fully implement the proposed policy is expected to be covered by existing ICANN org resources.

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

No security, stability, or resiliency issues have been identified relating to the DNS.

*Is this decision in the public interest and within ICANN's mission?*

The policy for Retirement of ccTLDs is within the scope of the ccNSO and the ICANN policy process and the retirement of ccTLDs is within ICANN's mission to coordinate at the overall level the Internet's domain name system. The retirement of ccTLDs is a process, and requires procedures that potentially directly impacts ccTLDs, and, hence, the allocation and assignment of names in the Root Zone of the DNS.

*Is this either a defined policy process within ICANN's Supporting Organizations or ICANN's Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment or not requiring public comment?*

This is a defined policy process with ICANN's country code Names Supporting Organization. This decision is taken following the ccNSO Policy Development Process, and has been subject to a Public Comment process.

Signature Block:

  David Olive & Bart Boswinkel

  Policy Development Support

  Date Noted: 29 August 2022

  Email: David.Olive@icann.org,
  Bart.Boswinkel@icann.org

**ICANN BOARD PAPER NO. 2022.09.11.2j**

TITLE:                              **Thank You to Community Members**

PROPOSED ACTION:          **For Board Consideration and Approval**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

ICANN wishes to acknowledge the considerable effort, skills, and time that members of the stakeholder community contribute to ICANN. In recognition of these contributions, ICANN wishes to express appreciation for and thank members of the community when their terms of service end in relation to our Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Customer Standing Committee, Empowered Community Administration, Nominating Committee, and the Public Technical Identifiers Board.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

ICANN org recommends the ICANN Board of Directors recognize ICANN community members who concluded a term of service between ICANN72 and ICANN75, the recipient of the 2022 ICANN Community Excellence Award, and the recipient of the 2022 Dr. Tarek Kamel Award for Capacity Building.

**PROPOSED RESOLUTION**:

Whereas, ICANN wishes to acknowledge the considerable effort, skills, and time that members of the stakeholder community contribute to ICANN.

Whereas, in recognition of these contributions, ICANN wishes to express appreciation for and thank members of the community when their terms of service end in relation to our Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Customer Standing Committee, Empowered Community Administration, Nominating Committee, and the Public Technical Idenitifiers Board.

Whereas, the following members of the Address Supporting Organization are concluding their terms of service:

- Louie Lee, Address Supporting Organization Address Councilor

- Nurani Nimpuno, Address Supporting Organization Address Councilor

- Aftab Siddiqui, Address Supporting Organization Address Councilor

- Wafa Zaafouri, Address Supporting Organization Address Councilor

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Louie Lee, Nurani Nimpuno, Aftab Siddiqui, and Wafa Zaafouri have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization are concluding their terms of service:

- Laura Margolis, Country Code Names Supporting Organization Councilor

- Marie-Noémie Marques, Country Code Names Supporting Organization Councilor

- Dotty Sparks de Blanc, Country Code Names Supporting Organization Member

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Laura Margolis, Marie-Noémie Marques, and Dotty Sparks de Blanc have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service. The ICANN Board of Directors wishes Laura Margolis and Marie-Noémie Marques well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond. The ICANN Board of Directors joins the ICANN community in celebrating the legacy of Dotty Sparks de Blanc.

Whereas, the following members of the Generic Names Supporting Organization are concluding their terms of service:

- Maxim Alzoba, Generic Names Supporting Organization Councilor

- Heather Forrest, Intellectual Property Constituency President

- Philippe Fouquart, Generic Names Supporting Organization Chair

- Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency Chair

- Dean Marks, Intellectual Property Constituency Vice President

- Flip Petillion, Generic Names Supporting Organization Councilor

- Juan Manuel Rojas, Generic Names Supporting Organization Councilor

- Bruna Martins dos Santos, Noncommercial Stakeholder Group Chair

- Waudo Siganga, Commercial Stakeholder Group Executive Committee Member

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Maxim Alzoba, Hether Forrest, Philippe Fouquart, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Dean Marks, Flip Petillion, Juan Manuel Rojas, Bruna Martins dos Santos, and Waudo Siganga have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service. The ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the At-Large community are concluding their terms of service:

- Satish Babu, Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization Chair

- Amrita Choudhury, Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization Vice Chair

- Eduardo Diaz, North American Regional At-Large Organization Chair

- Pari Esfandiari, At-Large Advisory Committee Member

- Lianna Galstyan, Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization Vice Chair

- Maureen Hilyard, At-Large Advisory Committee Chair

- Joanna Kulesza, At-Large Advisory Committee Vice Chair

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr, At-Large Advisory Committee Liaison to the Generic Names Supporting Organization

- Marita Moll, At-Large Advisory Committee Member

- Sindy Obed, At-Large Advisory Committee Member

- Barrack Otieno, At-Large Advisory Committee Liaison to the Country Code Names Supporting Organization

- Holly Raiche, At-Large Advisory Committee Member

- Greg Shatan, At-Large Advisory Committee Member

- Jonathan Zuck, At-Large Advisory Committee Vice Chair

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Satish Babu, Amrita Choudhury, Eduardo Diaz, Pari Esfandiari, Lianna Galstyan, Maureen Hilyard, Joanna Kulesza, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Marita Moll, Sindy Obed, Barrack Otieno, Holly Raiche, Greg Shatan and Jonathan Zuck have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their

terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Governmental Advisory Committee are concluding their terms of service:

- Jorge Cancio, Governmental Advisory Committee Vice Chair

- Pua Hunter, Governmental Advisory Committee Vice Chair

- Guiguemde Ragnimpinda Jacques Rodrigue, Governmental Advisory Committee Vice Chair

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Jorge Cancio, Pua Hunter, and Guiguemde Ragnimpinda Jacques Rodrigue have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Root Server System Advisory Committee have concluded their terms of service:

- Anand Buddhdev, Root Server System Advisory Committee Alternate Representative

- Brad Verd, Root Server System Advisory Committee Vice Chair

- Kevin Wright, Root Server System Advisory Committee Representative

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Anand Buddhdev, Brad Verd, and Kevin Wright have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of

service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee have concluded their terms of service:

- Cristian Heselman, Security and Stability Advisory Committee Member

- Paul Ebersman, Security and Stability Advisory Committee Member

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Cristian Heselman and Paul Ebersman have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Customer Standing Committee are concluding their terms of service:

- Lars-Johan Liman, Customer Standing Committee Chair

- Gaurav Vedi, Customer Standing Committee Member

- Laxmi Prasad Yadav, Customer Standing Committee Liaison from the Governmental Advisory Committee

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Lars-Johan Liman, Gaurav Vedi, and Laxmi Prasad Yadav have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following member of the Empowered Community Administration has concluded his term of service:

- Oscar Robles, Empowered Community Administration Member

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Oscar Robles has earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for his term of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes him well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following member of the Public Technical Identifiers Board is concluding her term of service:

- Lise Fuhr, Public Technical Identifiers Board Chair

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Lise Fuhr has earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for her term of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes her well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Nominating Committee are concluding their terms of service:

- Damon Ashcraft, Nominating Committee Chair-Elect

- Paul Diaz, Nominating Committee Delegate

- Ole Jacobsen, Nominating Committee Associate Chair

- Juhani Juselius, Nominating Committee Delegate

- Scott McCormick, Nominating Committee Delegate

- Adetola Sogbesan, Nominating Committee Delegate

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Damon Ashcraft, Paul Diaz, Ole Jacobsen, Juhani Juselius, Scott McCormick, and Adetola Sogbessan have earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for their terms of service, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, Vanda Scartezini received the 2022 ICANN Community Excellence Award.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Vanda Scartezini has earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for her dedication to ICANN's multistakeholder model, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes her well in her future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, Wolfgang Kleinwächter received the 2022 Dr. Tarek Kamel Award for Capacity Building.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), Wolfgang Kleinwächter has earned the deep appreciation of the ICANN Board of Directors for his consistent contributions over decades to local, regional, and global capacity-building programs and pioneering the school of internet governance concept, and the ICANN Board of Directors wishes him well in his future endeavors within the ICANN community and beyond.

Whereas, the ICANN Board acknowledges the extraordinary impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the ICANN community and its work.

Resolved (2022.09.22.xx), the ICANN Board recognizes the incredible resilience of the ICANN community to affirm the mission of ICANN and looks forward to a renewed commitment to the multstakeholder model.

**PROPOSED RATIONALE:**

Community-driven work is at the core of ICANN's mission. Countless hours are spent in working groups across the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and other groups, including the Cutomer Standing Committee, Empowered Community Administration, Nominating Committee and the Public Technical Identifiers Board. Together, these community groups develop and refine policies that ensure the security, stability, and resiliency of the global Internet. The Board is grateful for the community's tireless efforts and cooperative spirit shown over the last year.

**Signature Block:**

Submitted by: Maarten Botterman

Position: The Chairman of the
ICANN Board

Date Noted: 31 August 2022

Email:
maarten.botterman@board.icann.org