

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

TECHNICAL CATEGORY/DNS ABUSE (Drew, Calvin, Fabro, Gao)			
Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result (why?)
Vet Registry Operators	Conduct business diligence, criminal, and cybersquatting background screening of the entity and individual to ensure that the applicant would not adversely affect the security and stability of the DNS.	Yes	(Waiting for ICANN Registry Services and ICANN Compliance statistics on this)
DNSSEC Deployment	Improve the security and stability of the DNS and prevent DNS cache poisoning by protecting the integrity of authoritative DNS server queries.	Yes (Mostly) http://stats.research.icann.org/dns/tld_report/	Only 5 out of 1202 cases not protected. (0.05%)
Prohibition of Wildcarding	Prevent end users from being directed to unintended domain names. Ensure that DNS queries are precise to preserve the security and stability of the system.	Yes	Included in the 2013 RAAs. (Waiting for ICANN Compliance statistics on this)
Removal of orphan glue records	Prevent malicious domain abuse (e.g. fast flux attack domains) Reduce probability of orphaned records being used for phishing purposes. Ensure the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS.	Yes (partially or fully?)	SAC 048: SSAC Comment on Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook, May 2011 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-048-en.pdf

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

Require Thick WHOIS records	To maintain and provide both sets of data (domain name and registrant) via WHOIS develop a secure method for a gaining registrar to gain access to the registrant contact information, Increased Response consistency, stability and ease of accessibility of information about each domain		Specification 3 of the 2013 RAA3 ICANN Board adoption of GNSO Council Policy Recommendations for a new Consensus Policy on Thick WHOIS (as set forth in section 7.1 of the Final Report of October 2013)
Centralization of Zone File access	More easily provide zone file access to approved requestors such as law enforcement agents, IP attorneys, and researchers	Yes https://czds.icann.org/en	There is a monthly report implemented, and publicly available
Documented Registry and Registrar level abuse contacts	Ensure that end users can easily report abuse to the appropriate contact	Yes https://forms.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/registrars/standards-complaint-form	
Expedited Registry Security Request process	Permit Registries to take appropriate emergency security actions when necessary, exempt from contractual compliance (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ersr-2012-02-25-en)	Yes	
Create draft framework for high security zone (HSZ) verification			

SPECS 11 - GAC ADVICE (Laureen, Carlton, Carlos)

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result (why?)
Regulated and Highly Regulated Sectors			
Registry must require Registrant terms to include a requirement of compliance w/applicable laws	Yes	Encourage lawful activities; give Registry/Registrar contractual tools to deal with Registrants engaged in unlawful activities	Is this different then requirements for legacy gTLDs? Zone file research may shed light on whether this provision has had an impact
Registry must require Registrars to notify Registrants that compliance w/law required	Yes	Foundational requirement for preceding safeguard	This should appear in all new gTLD Registry Registrar agreements. See above for whether it has had an impact.
Registry to require Registrants collecting sensitive health and financial information must secure properly	Yes if registrants engage in this collection of sensitive info	Protect sensitive health and financial information	Consider how to assess this. Perhaps sampling of health and financial gTLDs. Consider verified gTLDs which have voluntarily agreed to higher restrictions to protect users of their .pharmacy .bank etc. domains
Establish relationship with relevant regulatory bodies to mitigate risks of illegal acts	Yes	Promote relationship w/ law enforcement/regulatory bodies to respond to complaints and thereby mitigate risks of illegal acts	Unclear. Work on voluntary efforts by Registrars to establish model complaint form for LEA indicates there is still work to be done in this area to ensure that Registrars and LEAs can work together efficiently and effectively

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

Registry require Registrants to provide Abuse POC	Yes	Ensure an easy channel to report complaints	Any way to spot check? ICANN Compliance shows complaints in this area
Highly Regulated Sectors			
Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result (why?)
Registry must verify/validate Registrant's credentials for relevant sector	No b/c advice n/accepted	Screen out bad actors at start of registration process to mitigate risk of bad actors operating in highly regulated domains	Board did not accept this advice as given. Unclear whether the decision not to accept this advice has had an impact on either trust or illegal acts. Note: certain registries have voluntarily adopted more stringent verification/ validation; security; and restrictions on use of anonymous registration services. Could we compare zone files in these domains and incidents of abuse to domains in highly regulated industries which haven't adopted more stringent registration policies?
Registries consult w/authorities if in doubt about authenticity of credentials	No b/c advice n/accepted	Screen out bad actors at start of registration process to mitigate risk of bad actors operating in highly regulated domains	See comment above.
Registry checks to ensure	No b/c advice n/accepted	Ensure that bad actors or those	See comment above.

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

Registrants continued validity and compliance w/ approp. regs and licensing requirements		with lapsed credentials/licenses are screened out so that they c/n operate in highly regulated domains	
Special Safeguards			
Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result (why?)
Registry will develop Registration policies to minimize risk of bullying/harassment	Only for .fail; .gripe; .sucks; .wtf	Minimize risk of cyber bullying	Unclear. Could approach these Registries and gather info
Registry will require Registrars to prohibit Registrants from misrepresenting endorsement or affiliation w/gov't or military	Only for .army; .navy; .airforce	Minimize risk of false affiliation/endorsement	Unclear. Could approach these Registries and gather info
General			
Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result (why?)
Reconsider permitting use of singular and plural versions of same string	No b/c advice n/accepted	Reduce risk of consumer confusion	Unclear whether public is confused. Does consumer survey get at this issue?
RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS (David, Jamie)			
Safeguard	Intent	Triggered?	Result

Safeguards & Measurement Table available at:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727388/SafeguardMethodandApproachV2.docx?version=2&modificationDate=1466605609000&api=v2>

DEADLINE TO COMPLETE ANALYSIS: 21 June 2016

			(why?)