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Advice Item Status
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item
ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advise Item
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Reference Number
SAC2002-06

Link to Advice Document

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG's report, the next step in the process should be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track record in designing financing programs-review the report, comment on its findings and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG's recommendations.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1) on 20 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2) on 30 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Advisory Document Recommendation
ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-7)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-6)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-5)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-4)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-3)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-2)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: Isoc/Pir Issue (R-1)

Issue Date
1/31/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 2 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request

Advisor Provider
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
ALAC-01-01-00-EN

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/12402

Advisory Item
ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

Issue Date
12/24/20

Action(s) Taken
Phase 1 | Understanding Request
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-6)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Ensure rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whoislookup, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) requests or to require Contracted Parties to simplify the process of whoislookup. CANN understands that ALAC believes that these changes would facilitate improved reporting on the rate of abuse in the registration ecosystem that falls within ICANN's remit. CANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN to require Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC's expectations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, CANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the whoislookup process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Direct ICANN Org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. We interpret this to mean that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to use ISAR to identify operators with high concentrations of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abuse behaviors within ICANN's remit once, with respect to the latter, agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN's remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). CANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to identify and acquire data needed to publish more actionable DAAR data and to identify registrants that sponsor or engage in high concentrations of domain registrations engaged in such behaviors. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out &quot;systemic&quot; abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out &quot;systemic&quot; abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability. We interpret this to mean that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to do so now with respect to malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abuse behaviors within ICANN's remit, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, CANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF calling for an Issues Report on this topic or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC's advice. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Do not process registrations with &quot;third party&quot; payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payor is or the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, CANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF calling for an Issues Report on this topic or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC's advice. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Adopt an &quot;on-the-border, on-the-abuse&quot; Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to require Contracted Parties to adopt an &quot;anti-crime, anti-abuse&quot; Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement. We interpret this to mean that the ALAC is advising the Board to cause ICANN to require Contracted Parties from high-marking WHOIS (eventually RDAP) requests or to require Contracted Parties to simplify the process of whoislookup. CANN understands that ALAC believes that these changes would facilitate improved reporting on the rate of abuse in the registration ecosystem that falls within ICANN's remit. CANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN to require Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC's expectations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, CANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the whoislookup process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Complete industry-wide good behavior for us, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request. CANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. CANN organ understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to compel Contracted Parties to adhere to industry-wide good behavior, for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, CANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties regarding (i) pricing and (ii) industry best practices. We interpret &quot;abuse&quot; in this context to refer, for the time being, to harmful activity insofar as it intersects with the DNS and involves the use of the DNS ecosystem that falls within ICANN's remit; namely registration services. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, CANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF calling for an Issues Report on this topic or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC's advice. CANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, three liaisons to the RSSAC, and four RSSAC Caucus members, and one RSSAC research fellow attended the workshop. The RSSAC workshop also featured remote participation to facilitate broader RSSAC Caucus attendance. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 23 April 2019 to 25 April 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 05 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 19 Nov 2019.

The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 1 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that bodies involved in the deliberations of the GWG, but is open to invitations to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 18 Nov 2019.

The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 2 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC not be given any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 05 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.

The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Governance Working Group (GWG). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 05 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.

The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 4 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formally is required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 Aug 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.
Committee (SSAC)  
Security and Stability Advisory  
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)  

Advice Item Recommendation  

Advice Document Recommendation  

Phase  

Action(s) Taken  

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC105  
SAC105: The DNS and the internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges  
3/10/19  
The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily life by seamlessly and autonomously sensing and acting upon our physical environment through tens of billions of connected devices. While this makes the IoT vastly different from traditional Internet applications like email and web browsing, we expect that a significant number of IoT deployments will use the DNS to locate remote services that they need, for instance to enable telemetry data transmission and collection for monitoring and analysis of sensor data. In this report, the SSAC provides a discussion on the interplay between the DNS and the IoT, arguing that the IoT represents both an opportunity and a risk to the DNS. It is an opportunity because the DNS provides functions and data that can help make the IoT more secure, stable, and transparent, which is critical given the IoT's interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measurement studies suggest that devices may stress the DNS, for instance, because of complex DDoS attacks carried out by bots that grow to hundreds of thousands or in the future millions of infected IoT devices within hours. We also identify and discuss five challenges for the DNS and IoT industries (e.g., DNS and IoT operators and software developers) address these opportunities and risks, for instance by making the DNS's security functions (e.g., response verification and encryption) available on popular IoT operating systems and by developing a shared system that allows different DNS operators to automatically and continually exchange data on IoT botnet activity. Unlike typical SSAC publications, the aim of this report is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. We therefore provide a tutorial-style discussion that is more forward looking than operational in nature. Our discussion partly falls within ICANN's and SSAC's remit, but also goes beyond it, for instance, because the challenges we identify will take a wider range of players to address. We explicitly do not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)  
RSSAC052  
RSSAC052: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence  
3/19/19  
This page of the RSSAC052 states, "RSOs must be autonomous and independent," and this must is preserved in future RRS governance models. RSOs must remain independent from each other as well as from any overarching organization, government, or community. This serves to prevent capture of the RRS by an entity that might diverge from the guiding principles of the RRS as set forth in RSSAC037. This document illustrates important aspects of Root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RRS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. As RSSAC052 does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board, the ICANN Org understands that there is no action for the ICANN Board and the item is closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)  
ALAC109  
ALAC109: GAC – ALAC Joint Statement on EPDP  
1/23/19  
The GAC and the ALAC take this opportunity to congratulate the EPDP team and the GNSO Council on the development and approval of the Phase 1 report. The Phase 1 report provides a baseline for ensuring GDPR compliance as it pertains to the processing of Registration Data. The views of the GAC and the ALAC are aligned overall as it pertains to our outstanding concerns, as articulated in our respective statements to the Board. The GAC and the ALAC would like to underline the importance of complying with the GDPR, which protects the privacy of natural persons and allows for the processing of and access to data for legitimate purposes. The EPDP Final Report of Phase 1 provides a sufficient basis for the work to progress to the subsequent Phase 2.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC104  
SAC104: ICANN Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process  
12/21/18  
On 21 November 2018, ICANN opened a public comment proceeding to obtain input on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP). The ICANN welcomes this opportunity to provide input. We thank the EPDP team for its hard work in delivering such a substantive report. A new mandatory mechanism for collecting public comment was implemented for the purpose of the EPDP: an online portal that asks respondents specific questions about each recommendation in the report. This was meant to provide easy collection of responses from the public. The SSAC has submitted feedback through the form. However, we have found that the form limited our ability to provide comments. The SSAC therefore asks that the EPDP members consider comments in this document, and we would like your assurance that the below will be taken into account and incorporated into the Final Report as appropriate.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)  
ALAC105  
https://community.icann.org/rac/alac/docs/498c1717e2a88e0f9acb2d0b6e4327a3.rac-alac-joint-statement-alac-gac-en.pdf  
Follow-up to the Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC: Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN  
12/23/18  
At-large Advisory committee (ALAC)  
https://community.icann.org/rac/alac/docs/875c05a95524f12f5bc691a2ba562409.rac-alac-joint-statement-by-alac-gac-en.pdf  
The ALAC and GAC also asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and synopses for all relevant issues, processes and activities — something that could be implemented without delay. In the context of the VAA transition process, ICANN was able to offer timely and comprehensive information by breaking down complex issues into understandable components, which allowed interaction within the entire community. The ALAC and the GAC are now asking from ICANN that the same level of effort be made and the same service provided to the community concerning information on all other relevant issues.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC105v2  
SAC105v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R4)  
12/12/18  
The initiation of charges for RRS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RRS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).

Phase 4  
Deferred  
On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC105v2 and noted advised items 3A and three through seven in SAC101 versions 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration in the EPDP Phase 3 work ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/board/materials-resolutions-2019-06-25-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/board/materials-resolutions-2019-06-25-en.pdf)). In its resolution the Board states “Advisory item four suggests that 'initiation of charges for RRS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RRS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP). As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.”

The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC105 is to make it clear that ICANN has not made any recommendations nor has it solicited any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 June 2019.
The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines: the creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RUDP protocol. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDAP protocol. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.
Recommendation 1: Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DPI Data. RSOs need to decide whether to pursue harmonization of anonymization data that comes from multiple operators, particularly the DPI Data. This decision needs to include consideration of the advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of the RSO, of the users of the DPI data, and of researchers looking at the anonymized data. Harmonization using mixing full addresses or bit by bit will help the research community correlate sources of DNS queries across datasets that are collected from different RSOs. However, full harmonization inherently relies on sharing a secret value that will invalidate the anonymization if it is later revealed. Even if the RSO decide not to harmonize with sharing of secret values, harmonizing the method used can help RSOs choose an anonymization strategy, and simplify understanding the properties of the data for those who use data from multiple RSOs.

Recommendation 2: Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually. Any of the proposals given in Section 4 of this document can be used as the anonymization specification for IP addresses, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 2 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SAC037-008</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC Board recommends the publication of this document to be presented to the DNS Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) for review by 24 July 2018.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-1</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-standing problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SAC recomends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that addresses the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should require that the ICANN Board and ICANN Organization staff ensure that the EPDP process considers the impacts to the EPDP process of any changes to the ICANN Board’s registration data policy and the ongoing process for new gTLDs.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Board and ICANN Organization to consider the following principle into its contracts with gTLD registries and registra and registrar agreements: legitimate users must be able to gain access to the registration data provided by the ICANN Organization.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-4</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: The SSAC endorses recommendation 2 from SAC061: “The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.” These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNO.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-6</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 2 of SAC101. SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The ICANN org understands SAC101 Recommendation 3 is for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 12 September 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSAC033-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSAC037-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-3jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-3jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSAC037, section 5.0.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a new version of the Model for implementation based on RSAC037.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSAC037-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-3jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-3jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom).</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-51-0025-03-00-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-</a> statements/11363</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-51-0025-03-00-00-EN</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: • The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years. In line with principle ii), • Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $15 million in total, in line with principle ii). • A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $36 million, corresponding to the total amount of withdrawals from the Reserve Fund to finance the IANA stewardship transition. • The remaining shortfall of US $117 million ($68.5 million in 2018, $48.5 million in 2019) above could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: i. Contribution from leftover funds from the new TLD program, if any. ii. Additional contribution from ICANN Org. iii. Additional contribution from the Auction Proceeds. The ALAC supports this overall strategy but with the following conditions and additional:</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this statement, the ALAC supports the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) in its efforts to address the issue of Name Collisions as it remains an area of some uncertainty. The ALAC urges the SSAC to proceed with the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) Work Party’s project plan and allocate enough time to do it right. We believe it is important to minimize the unintended consequences for end users. Name Collision occurs when a user, attempting to reach a private domain name, unintentionally reaches a public domain name, as such, to the core end user trust of the internet and could pose potential security issues. The NCAP Work Party’s project plan, as it currently stands, seems adequate without being excessive. We urge the SSAC to stay the course and not expedite the process for the benefit of any subsequent procedures. There is great anticipation, from parts of the community, for new applications but not only is a specific delay unlikely, given other factors, we believe it would be prudent for the SSAC to execute the project plan as submitted to provide the ICANN community with a holistic assessment of the risks.

The ALAC has noted that the Fellowship Program has only successfully integrated a small percentage of its alumni to be actively engaged and participating in At-Large specifically, but also others SO/ACs, to support their policy-related goals and objectives. It has been suggested that changes are required in order to achieve greater effectiveness of the program not only to meet At-Large expectations in the ILS stats but also to ensure the sustainability of the Fellowship. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC’s comment on Recommendations on ICANN’s Office of the CTO and the Global Domains Division on root scaling. This is the RSSAC’s response. The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation. As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ALAC has noted that the fellowship program has only successfully integrated a small percentage of its alumni to be actively engaged and participating in At-Large, specifically, but also other SO/ACs, to support their policy-related goals and objectives. It has been suggested that changes are required in order to achieve greater effectiveness of the program not only to meet At-Large expectations in the ILS stats but also to ensure the sustainability of the Fellowship. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC’s comment on Recommendations to Improve ICANN’s Office of Ombudsman (IOO): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-recs-2017-11-13-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC’s Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report on 27 February 2018, Interisle Consulting Group, the independent examiner performing the second independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report. The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proc-proposed-changes-budget-2018-02-14-en. Caution is required in considering changes to specification 12 of Community generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

This is the ALAC’s statement on At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Assessment Report for RSSAC032: Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report on 27 February 2018, Interisle Consulting Group, the independent examiner performing the second independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report. The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.

This is the ALAC’s comment on Recommendations to Improve ICANN’s Office of Ombudsman (IOO): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proc-proposed-changes-budget-2018-02-14-en. Caution is required in considering changes to specification 12 of Community generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

This is the ALAC’s statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (SKS) Rollover Process and was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proc-proposed-changes-bulk-en. Caution is required in considering changes to specification 12 of Community generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

This is the ALAC’s comment on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-changes-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en. The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.

This is the ALAC’s statement on Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction, submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/recommendations-on-icann-jurisdiction-2017-11-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

This is the ALAC’s statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (SKS) Rollover Process and was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proc-proposed-changes-bulk-en. Caution is required in considering changes to specification 12 of Community generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.
### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC000v3
- **Title:** RSSAC Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes
- **Issue Date:** 12/22/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes of the RSSAC workshop held by the University of Maryland in early October.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC029: Root Domain Nameservers (DNS) Root Source
- **Title:** A simple and efficient document management system that allows non-experts to easily and quickly access and identify documents, starting with defining minimal requirements that ensure that every document has a title and a date or reference number, identifies the author and indicates intended recipients makes reference to the process it belongs to and explains the acronyms used in the document; and!
- **Issue Date:** 12/22/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server information contained in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organization responsible for the operation of the DNS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC030: ISAC Statement on Entries in the DNS Root Sources
- **Title:** A joint statement from ALAC and GAC
- **Issue Date:** 11/4/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is a joint statement from the ALAC and the GAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC032: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop
- **Title:** This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes of the fifth RSSAC workshop held by the University of Maryland in early October.
- **Issue Date:** 10/24/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC033: ISAC Statement on Entries in the DNS Root Sources
- **Title:** A joint statement from ALAC and GAC
- **Issue Date:** 11/2/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is a joint statement from the ALAC and the GAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

#### RSSAC035: ISAC Statement on Entries in the DNS Root Sources
- **Title:** A joint statement from ALAC and GAC
- **Issue Date:** 11/2/17
- **Action:** Implemented

This is a joint statement from the ALAC and the GAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 29 February 2020

Advice Item | Number | Date | Advice Item Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Servers R-3 Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8-4 | EN | 8/3/17 | Recommendation: 4. Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response size, under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.6 generated the smallest possible size, as expected. However, some implementations would become brittle if this naming scheme was adopted. Future work in this area could include modeling and proposing protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefits. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DDIX. Research to reduce the response size might consider: • Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name • Testing the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set • Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using EDNS0 to support apriming specific single signature over the entire priming set (XG, A, AAAA, DNSKEY, etc.) Further, more speculative studies about how to reduce the response size might include: • Using different cryptographic algorithms • Advertising what is expected in the Additional section (this would require modifying the DNS protocol) • Having a single key for the root zone instead of the current KEX / ZKE scheme • Effects of leaving the Additional section in priming responses empty SSAC recommendation: The ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community should take immediate action to temporarily halt the DDIX review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work. | Phase 3 | Close Request

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 means that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 1/1/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8-4 | EN | 8/3/17 | The fundamental recommendation of the SSAC is to not change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC Caucus Root Server Naming Work Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. The root server addresses should be signed in a way that reduces the probability of a DNSSEC-based attack. • The root server IP addresses information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. This can be done using delegation or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root servers’ AAAA RRs and the root zone should be hosted on the root servers. • Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (5.1), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (5.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice. | Phase 3 | Understand Request

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC has also provided an additional speculative recommendation, which states that if node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following should also be considered: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. As the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (5.1), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (5.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 2/21/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8-4 | EN | 8/3/17 | No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. | Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 2/21/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8-4 | EN | 8/3/17 | Contact studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviours. | Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as the DDIX bit are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/21/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8-4 | EN | 8/3/17 | Contact a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks. | Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that proof-of-concept code for testing these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 2/21/18.

All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-LAC-SG | 7/12/17 | This is the ALAC Statement on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. The All-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although All-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the comments of our members as well as others looking for a truly implementable solution were adequately taken into consideration by the IAG and the ICANN Staff in the final draft now under public consultation. | Phase 5 | Close Request

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) treats respecting Human Rights a very important topic. The ALAC understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. This statement will be included in the report of public comments, which will be published on 26 August 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-hr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ALAC does not have any comment to make on the changes to the content of the contract overall as we believe that much of it has been predetermined by agreement. However, the increasing cost of .NET domains is a concern as it would make them unaffordable and thus an accessibility issue for end-users, especially for those in already underserved regions. The proposed $10 increase is also out of scope of an ICANN Registry Agreement. A query was raised as to whether or how .NET funds are returned to serve the Internet community in line with the redistribution of .org funds into the community by the Internet Society, to ensure that the ICANN community.

The ICANN Board Status Advice Report as of 29 February 2020

[Advice Item]

**Phase**

**Issue Date**

**Reference Number**

**Reference Identifier**

**Title**

[Issue]

[Description]

[Discussion]

[Action(s) Taken]

**URL**

**URL**
The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability Wk3 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 26 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-2017-05-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

---

On 21 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the gNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDN2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, reliability and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat Materi/Idn-Resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis. (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGR is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN-variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN64 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Further the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/recommendations-1-2-14may19-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take up further work once the ccNSO and ccTLD have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

---

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the GNSO Community Comment 2 (CC2) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-comment-period-closed-2017-05-22-en). There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN org’s GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN.org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/en - which is being disseminated by the GSE team.

---

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the gNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDN2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, reliability and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/Idn-Resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDN2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs are not permitted emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN.org’s GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN.org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/en - which is being disseminated by the GSE team.

---

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the CCWG-Accountability Wk3 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 26 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-2017-05-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

---

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the gNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDN2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, reliability and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/Idn-Resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDN2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs are not permitted emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN.org’s GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN.org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/en - which is being disseminated by the GSE team.

---

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the GNSO Community Comment 2 (CC2) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-comment-period-closed-2017-05-22-en). There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN.org’s GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN.org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/en - which is being disseminated by the GSE team.

---

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the gNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDN2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, reliability and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/Idn-Resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDN2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs are not permitted emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN.org’s GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN.org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/en - which is being disseminated by the GSE team.

---

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Deferral of Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. The ALAC supports the cNSO’s request to defer their review. ICANN is overwhelmed with reviews of all kinds at the moment. If the cNSO believes that a deferral will be beneficial to their use of volunteer resources and will result in a better outcome of the review when it is performed, this is a win-win situation.
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<table>
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<th>Action Taken</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0517-03-00-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs</td>
<td>28 Apr 2017</td>
<td>This is the ALAC’s statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. ItОбласть применения это определено в проекте, который направляется в Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. It focuses on the preliminary options that are open to the ICANN Board. The ALAC anticipates that the specific options will be considered by the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-rt-comment-period-2017-05-27-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-rt-comment-period-2017-05-27-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0517-04-00-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee</td>
<td>28 Apr 2017</td>
<td>This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes the effort made to carry on this work. The proposed Reconsideration of the Fundamentals Bylaws changes by the Board Governance Committee is an important step forward for the ICANN organization.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. This comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/</a> fundamentals-bylaws-change-comment-period-2017-05-27-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee</td>
<td>28 Apr 2017</td>
<td>This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes the effort made to carry on this work. The proposed Reconsideration of the Fundamentals Bylaws changes by the Board Governance Committee is an important step forward for the ICANN organization.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. This comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/</a> fundamentals-bylaws-change-comment-period-2017-05-27-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0517-06-00-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee</td>
<td>28 Apr 2017</td>
<td>This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes the effort made to carry on this work. The proposed Reconsideration of the Fundamentals Bylaws changes by the Board Governance Committee is an important step forward for the ICANN organization.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. This comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/</a> fundamentals-bylaws-change-comment-period-2017-05-27-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

3/3/17

[Public Comment Statement] This paper sets out the ALAC’s response to the various recommendations proposed by the ITESM Review of the At-Large Community. Those recommendations include steps ITESM has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the independent review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-30apr17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC026: RSSAC Locomion

1/21/17

The pecking technical language often found in RFCs, while often providing consistency and clarity to technical communities, can sometimes be incomprehensible or misleading when used in a non-technical setting. The purpose of this document is to increase the understanding of terms used commonly when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community. It is not to redefine or provide guidance on any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be helpful to anyone discussing the DNS-root server system. This includes RSSAC members, RSSAC Caucus members, ICANN staff, and the larger ICANN community. It will be updated by the RSSAC as the vocabulary used to discuss the root server system evolves.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC’s documentation of the terms commonly used when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org received confirmation of this understanding on 1/21/17.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC038: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights

3/2/17

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) as a chartering organization of The Cross Community Working Group On Enhancing ICANN Accountability (EICANN Accountability), wishes to ensure that discussions concerning human rights are scoped within the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN) remit during discussions on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Stewardship Transition. ICANN’s remit is limited to coordinating the allocation and assignment of Domain names, Internet Protocol (IP) addresses, Autonomous System (AS) numbers, and protocol port and parameter numbers.

The ICANN organization understands SSAC038 is the SSAC’s comment on the Charter. ICANN receives the comment and in response to a Call for Public Comments “on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers”. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

SSAC039: SSAC Comment on Identifier Technology Health Indicators Definition

3/2/17

The ICANN has reviewed the presentation on Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) and provides this response to the Call for Public Comments on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers.

The ICANN organization understands SSAC039 is the SSAC’s comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators Definition. There is no action for the Call for Public Comments. The ICANN Board received this understanding on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report

3/3/17

[Public Comment Statement] This paper sets out the ALAC’s comments regarding the ITESM Review of the At-Large Community. Those recommendations include steps ITESM has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the independent review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-30apr17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment

The respective public comment period closed on 1 December 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-10may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights

SAC092: SAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (EICANN Accountability), wishes to ensure that discussions concerning human rights are scoped within the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN) remit during discussions on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Stewardship Transition. ICANN’s remit is limited to coordinating the allocation and assignment of Domain names, Internet Protocol (IP) addresses, Autonomous System (AS) numbers, and protocol port and parameter numbers.

The ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the Call for Public Comments.

The ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP)

3/2/17

[Public Comment Statement] 1. The ALAC recognizes the continued effort to maintain an up-to-date set of rules and procedures that will enable ICANN to “day to day operations in a ‘bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus driven process. 2. The ALAC appreciates that details have been carefully addressed to avoid any clashing situations between the IRP Supplementary Procedures being updated and those proposed as new IRP Supplementary Procedures. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC017 is the ALAC’s statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 1 December 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-10may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC017 is the ALAC’s statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 1 December 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-10may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment

The respective public comment period closed on 1 December 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-10may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights

12/26/16

[Public Comment Statement] The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy. On the whole, the document is well written, although there are several instances where the extensive listing of details could cause counter production, as it makes the list look line an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list is, in actuality acceptable… Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN acknowledges the diversity of our global community and the acceptance or otherwise of what are socially accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of the invalid queries which we believe should pose a concern.

The ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the Call for Public Comments.

The ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the Call for Public Comments.

The ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the Call for Public Comments.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment

The respective public comment period closed on 1 December 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-alac-rev-draft-report-10may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights
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The ICANN Board understands AS-ALAC-ST-1126-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The respective public comment period closed on 17 November 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 21 December 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/raports/comments-effective-assessment-21dec16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN Board understands AS-ALAC-ST-1126-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 30 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 21 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/report-comments-draft-fy18-op-plan-budget-23jan17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-03-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-04-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-05-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-06-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
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<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
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<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC085</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/atlas-atlas-06oct16-en.pdf">https://atlas.icann.org/atlas-atlas-06oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC085: ICANN ATLAS II Recommendations Implementation Report</td>
<td>5/19/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system.</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>RSSAC022 is RSSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC’s report on its third workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO’s request for input on the organization’s role in the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
### RSSAC020: RSSAC Statement on Client Side Dotless Domains

#### Date: 08/06/2016

The RSSAC's answer to whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the security, stability and resiliency of the root server system. Based on information available as of the statement, loss of a single root server would not cause immediate instability for the root server system and the Internet that depends upon it.

**Trust/Accuracy of WHOIS Records:**

Rather than as a pie chart, a line/bar graphic showing the overall performance of the WHOIS service for each TLD over the past year would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per TLD basis. A line/bar graph, rather than a pie chart, would be more helpful for the percentage of UDRP and URS Decisions against gTLD Registrants. Furthermore, it would be interesting to note why registries are, voluntarily or involuntarily, deaccredited. Was that due to high ICANN fines, noncompliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc? The ALAC absolutely supports the further development of metrics on page 14 and page 15 of the report.

**ICANN Board.** This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

**ICANN organization understands RSSAC020 is RSSAC's statement confirming that operators of root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace and that there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

### ALAC-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN

**Issue:** Public Comment Statement - The ALAC welcomes the publication of this first set of gTLD Marketplace Health Indexes. This is a natural progression based on the work of ICANN Community into Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Confidence in new gTLDs. The ALAC proposes a number of additions/improvements. Competition: All in all, consumers (registrants) are the factors that move the market - if the ones who pay for services want to get more insight on their needs and behaviors. This should be taken into account for future developments. Marketplace Stability: The metric presented are very useful. However, as seen in the "Competition" section, it is not just how many new players do we have (registrars and registrants) but the market share of each one, for different TLDs or families of TLDs. And symmetrically, the count of the number of TLDs that should include their market share too. In addition, statistics per country/region would be very useful if in Figure 10. Trust/Accuracy of WHOIS Records: Rather than as a pie chart, then a line/bar graph showing the ongoing accuracy on a quarterly/yearly basis would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per TLD basis. A line/bar graph, rather than a pie chart, would be more helpful for the percentage of UDRP and URS Decisions against gTLD Registrants. Furthermore, it would be interesting to note why registries are, voluntarily or involuntarily, deaccredited. Was that due to high ICANN fines, noncompliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc? The ALAC absolutely supports the further development of metrics on page 14 and page 15 of the report.

**Secondly, it sets out why end users should care about the specific policy issues. Issues:** WHOIS/Registrations Directory Services - UNA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDN - New gTLD - Public Interest - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency - ICANN Operations/Finances - Reviews at ICANN - Engagement & Outreach

**ICANN Board.** This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

**ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 20 July 2016. ICANN staff understands SAC083 provides SSAC's comments on draft proposed amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

### ALAC-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN

**Issue:** Public Comment Statement - The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 20 July 2016. ICANN and the Working Group established by the Registries Stakeholder Group are considering the comments received, and plan to submit a proposed final version of the amendments for review by the ICANN Board.

**AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN**

**Issue:** Public Comment Statement - This is the ALAC's Statement on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review. The respective public comment period closed on 20 July 2016, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-fellowship-application-process-26aug16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), in its capacity as a Chartering Organization of the ICANN Board, understands that the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) agrees that the geographic regions are needed to ensure geographic diversity within the ICANN Board and improve the geographic diversity in the ICANN Board composition. The ALAC agrees that the geographic regions should be planned ahead of time. We especially appreciate the planning process that has evolved year over year. We do hope that for the upcoming year, there will be more interaction with the community at all steps of the operating plan and budget development. That being said, the ALAC has identified a number of areas that need further clarification.

The ICANN organization understands SAC081 is SSAC’s response to the proposal for the multi-year planning of the At-large, consisting of the ICANN Board composition and the budget and five-year operating plan. The ICANN organization understands this is SAC081 is SSAC’s response to the proposal for the multi-year planning of the At-large, consisting of the ICANN Board composition and the budget and five-year operating plan. The ICANN organization understands this is SAC081 is SSAC’s response to the proposal for the multi-year planning of the At-large, consisting of the ICANN Board composition and the budget and five-year operating plan. The ICANN organization understands that the ALAC agrees with the SSAC’s statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The ICANN organization understands that the ALAC agrees with the SSAC’s statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is SSAC’s response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Cycle Procedures and the Request for Input on New gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.

The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC083 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC083 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC083 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC083 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC084 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC084 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC084 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC084 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC084 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC085 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC085 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC085 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC085 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC086 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC086 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC086 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC086 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC087 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC087 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC087 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC087 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC088 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC088 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC088 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC088 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC088 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.

The ICANN organization understands SAC089 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC089 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC089 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC089 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. SAC089 is SSAC’s response to the request for input on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisor Item Status**

As of 29 February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0010-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/SSAC076">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/SSAC076</a></td>
<td>SAC 057 Advisory on the Proposed Implementation of GROO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois Output for All gTLDs Follow Updates)</td>
<td>3/20/16</td>
<td>SSAC 057 with 31 corrections and comments on the proposed Implementations of GROO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois Output for All gTLDs Follow Updates)</td>
<td>SAC 057</td>
<td>The ICANN Board considered this advice at SSAC057, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the GNSO staff presented this advice at ICANN 68 Beijing (with the recommendation for the Board to ask the GNSO to implement the advice). This advice was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the ALAC on 21 April 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**RSSAC015** RSSAC Workshop 2015 Report

The ICANN Board understands RSSAC015 is RSSAC's report on its first workshop in which it discussed the evolution of the Root Server System as well as accountability, continuity and evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**R-3 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates**

The ICANN organization understands R-3 Advisory is RSSAC's report on its first workshop in which it discussed the evolution of the Root Server System as well as accountability, continuity and evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdap-profile-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Advice Item: AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN

**ALAC Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG - Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 3 February 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdnsec-09mar16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1115-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 30 November 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 2 December 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prelim-issue-06dec15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report

ALAC Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D

ALAC Statement on the Planned Implementation of the New Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)

ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs

[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. We received many comments by email from the community concerning the ICANN's role in the implementation of the New gTLD Program. The review provides a comprehensive overview of lessons learned from the implementation process which will not only inform the formal Review Team's assessment of the implementation process but also provide solutions for creating improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of this process based on staff assessment of this first round of implementation. Of concern to our community was the life-cycle of the application and evaluation process relating to this first batch of applications and that the remaining applications will still not be completed until the end of 2017 which is far beyond original project timeframes. Among the reasons for the delays include some effectiveness and efficiency issues relating to the time spent on some requirements of the application process that may not have been completely necessary for all applications as there was no contractual requirement attached. It was also of concern that if any of the processes or the application may benefit from further community discussion based on staff lessons learned. We encourage the Review Team to support the recommendations made by staff, and at the same time give full consideration for more practical support to ensure that the remaining and future batches of applications are expedited as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC recognizes the need to review Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) as they relate to Intellectual Property rights and domain names. 2. The ALAC is concerned that these RPMs seem to be mainly focused on protecting Intellectual Property rights of corporations, as they can easily afford the fees (see: http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/). The current structures of RPMs create serious barriers to access for end users, especially the ones from developing regions. 3. The issue of registering a trademark may already be a burden to many end users. The additional cost of protecting that trademark against unlawful or abusive registration in the DNS may render end users unable to access the RPMs. 4. The ALAC supports the suggested list of potential issues included in the Preliminary Issue Report and the ALAC further recommends to add the following questions and remarks to the potential issues concerning Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution (UDRP), Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS), Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH), Trademark Claims and Sunrise Period: A. Are there any barriers that can prevent an end user to access any or all RPMs? B. How can costs be lowered so end users can easily access RPMs? C. Should there be a review on accessibility to TMCH for individuals, private trademark holders and trademark agents in developing countries? 5. The ALAC is concerned that, so far, the TMCH has not achieved its goal of protecting a large number of trademarks in the DNS. This concern is based on the fact that "Between March 2013 and May 2015, the Clearinghouse verified and accepted for inclusion 52,667 nationally or regionally registered trademarks; 2,355 trademarks protected by statute or treaty, and 279 trademark claims that are unidentified in the URS database for resolution by a court or other tribunal in trademark disputes.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-program-implementation-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC074</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4</td>
<td>11/3/15</td>
<td>Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrants based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable partners to learn practical operational practices for preserving security and stability of the credential management lifecycle. SSAC welcomes the opportunity to advise training staff in the creation of a curriculum.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2015-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-rdcorrespondence/statement-ccwg-uctn-07dec15-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-rdcorrespondence/statement-ccwg-uctn-07dec15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains</td>
<td>10/24/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) The ALAC submits the comments with regards to issues identified, section by section. In cases where a section is not mentioned, the ALAC endorses the Issue Report recommendation as presented. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-01-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains. This statement is in response to an input request from the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, they have charted a Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains (CWG-UCTN). The progress of the CWG-UCTN can be followed within its Community Wiki (<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/CWG/UCTN/OutreachAndOutreachDocuments">https://community.icann.org/display/CWG/UCTN/OutreachAndOutreachDocuments</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC074</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4</td>
<td>10/16/15</td>
<td>Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrants based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable partners to learn practical operational practices for preserving security and stability of the credential management lifecycle. SSAC welcomes the opportunity to advise training staff in the creation of a curriculum.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advisory Item Status**

- **ICANN Board Status Advice Report**
  - **0915-04-01-AL-ALAC-ST-EN**
  - **1015-04-00-AL-ALAC-ST-SAC074**
  - **SAC074**
  - **SAC074**
  - **SAC074**
  - **SAC074**
  - **SAC074**

**Reference**


**Action(s) Taken**

- 23 of 48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9700">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9700</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper</td>
<td>3/15/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) - We recommend that the drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons partnering SECAN and with representation from all ALCs that indicate an interest. - Any charter reported (broadly) 1) affirms the principles of openness and transparency; 2) envisions the concept that the use in line with the ICANN Strategic Plan; and 3) must favour extending the global public interest in concrete ways and endorsing the information of CoRAS. The RSSAC solicited comments [<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gold-auction-proceeds-07feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gold-auction-proceeds-07feb15-en.pdf</a>] and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report. The respective public comment period closed on 06 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Oct 2015 [<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf</a>] and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9883">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9883</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making</td>
<td>3/9/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) ALAC provides community input into the Initial Report of the GNSO’s Working Group with regards to possible recommendations for the use of Data and Metrics for Policy Making. The ALAC supports the possible need to employ an independent third party in order to address any concerns relating to the collection, anonymization, and aggregation of data. - The ALAC supports the introduction of a “pilot” where working groups will be able to submit proposals or ideas whereby the collection and assessment of fact-based data and metrics can become the basis for the initial identification and analysis of issues and/or problems. - Support the view that any funding required to implement the pilot should be considered an investment in the improvement of the policy process rather than a cost against budget. - The ALAC supports the revision of the templates for the Issue Report, Charter and Final Report to update earlier WG guidelines and also the development of a decision tree. Report of Public Comments: [<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf</a>]</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-01-EN is ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Privacy &amp; Data Security Assessment Issues Working Group Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 06 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 27 Aug 2015 [<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gsso-review-draft-26aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gsso-review-draft-26aug15-en.pdf</a>] and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/2015-03-root-zone-7tls.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/2015-03-root-zone-7tls.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC003: RSDAC Report on Root Zone TLS</td>
<td>8/22/15</td>
<td>To address the DNSSEC problems identified in Section 6.8, the RSDAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners: for signature periods for signature generated by both the ECA and the ZSK. ECA signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 13 days.</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands RSSAC003 is RSDAC’s comment detailing support for the “Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions…” and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSDAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/archive/0087">https://atlas.icann.org/archive/0087</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for ALAC and Organizational Reviews</td>
<td>7/16/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for ALAC and Organizational Reviews</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC013</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-root-servers-work-statement-001215-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-root-servers-work-statement-001215-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for &quot;History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers&quot;</td>
<td>7/9/15</td>
<td>The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers. The document will: 1) Document the historical names of assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular whether the names assigned to individual root servers be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-SERVICES.NS zone; 3) Consider the impact on the punycode extension of including DNSSEC's signatures over root server address records; 4) Perform a risk analysis; and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root zone management partners, and ICANN on whether changes should be.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC Motion 26 Jun 2015</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/archive/9731">https://atlas.icann.org/archive/9731</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)</td>
<td>6/2/15</td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). Approves Final Proposal - PTI Board Members should attempt to address geo diversity – Success of PTI contingent on adequate funding. - Affirms its commitment to continue to support the CWG-Stewardship</td>
<td>Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC072</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-072-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-072-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC072: SAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>SAC072: SAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0615-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/archive/9701">https://atlas.icann.org/archive/9701</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CWG-Accountability)- Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1)</td>
<td>6/11/15</td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CWG-Accountability)- Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1). The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0615-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CWG-Accountability) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1), the respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-19aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-19aug15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC071</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC071: SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Enhancements</td>
<td>6/8/15</td>
<td>SAC071: SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Enhancements</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC012</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-cowg-accountability-work-stream-1-draft-report-03aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-cowg-accountability-work-stream-1-draft-report-03aug15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC012: RSSAC Public Comment on CWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Draft Report</td>
<td>6/8/15</td>
<td>RSSAC Comments on the Accountability Draft Proposal</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>SAC070: SAC Comment on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-3)</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>To close the knowledge gap between registries and popular PSL maintainers, ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation should collaboratively create informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 4 Implementation
- The ICANN organization understands this recommendation to mean that ICANN, in concert with the Mozilla Foundation, prepare educational materials on the Mozilla PSL covering the meaning of the resource and the impact of the resource. ICANN has hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of December 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the ICANN considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/downloads/attachments/659880/659880-2017-06-24-en#2.b.pdf).

### Phase 1 Close Request
- The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the IAOG to explicitly include the use of a PSL and actions related to a PSL as part of their work. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, ICANN staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-11jun15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

### Action(s) Taken
- The ICANN organization understands SAC070 R-6a in that ICANN should request that the IAOG fund the development of software resources enabling or enhancing the effective use of the Mozilla PSL, with attention towards software developers. As part of this initiative, ICANN should provide funding for this initiative and monitor whether the IAOG's effort is successful. ICANN notes that more specific description of this audience (beyond merely including open source) would further the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the promotion effort. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the ICANN considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/downloads/attachments/659880/659880-2017-06-24-en#2.b.pdf).
- The ICANN organization understands SAC070 R-6b in that ICANN should request that the IAOG support a PSL containing information about the domains within all registries with which IANA has direct communication. Such a PSL would be authoritative for those domains. Such a list should include, at a minimum, all TLDs in the IANA root zone. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-11jun15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
- The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing IANA to host an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone (https://community.icann.org/downloads/attachments/659880/659880-2017-06-24-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

### Action(s) Taken
- The ICANN organization understands recommendation 4a of SAC070 as encouraging the development of software resources enabling or enhancing the effective use of the Mozilla PSL, with attention towards software developers. As part of this initiative, ICANN should provide funding for this initiative and monitor whether the IAOG's effort is successful. ICANN notes that more specific description of this audience (beyond merely including open source) would further the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the promotion effort. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the ICANN considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/downloads/attachments/659880/659880-2017-06-24-en#2.b.pdf).

### Action(s) Taken
- The ICANN organization understands SAC070 R-6b in that ICANN should request that the IAOG support a PSL containing information about the domains within all registries with which IANA has direct communication. Such a PSL would be authoritative for those domains. Such a list should include, at a minimum, all TLDs in the IANA root zone. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-11jun15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

### Action(s) Taken
- The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing IANA to host an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone (https://community.icann.org/downloads/attachments/659880/659880-2017-06-24-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/6511">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/6511</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the GNSO Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report</td>
<td>3/25/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) - General Comments: ALAC Generally supports the proposed principles - wording definitions (Section 5); No Comment - Policy &amp; Implementation Principles (Section 6); Note concerns when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process. Public interest issues should be referred back to Chartering Organization. When policy issues involve public interest issues, involve all impacted stakeholders. - Proposed Additional New GNSO Process (Section 5); Generally supports the introduction of new processes that may be able to deal with some matters in a more appropriate way. Suggest stress testing to understand effect of changes and changes should be reviewed within reasonably short periods to ensure they achieved goal. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-piwg-14apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-piwg-14apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/6541">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/6541</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2</td>
<td>4/14/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) - The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is important to benefit several million end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs are reserved and others have been less active or inactive. - It is important that the ICANN program is harmonized (in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and outreach) with the UN. The ALAC also recommends that the UN be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program. - MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7.0, but is limited to the Unicode 6.3 subset. Given the fact that Unicode 8.0 is scheduled for release in 2016, there may be questions from the community on the stability of the contents of MSR-2, particularly if the Generation Panels are to immediately commence their work based on MSR-2. The ALAC recommends that ICANN clarifies the likely impact, if any, of changes to the underlying Unicode standard on MSR-2. - Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of ULR-1, and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once-registered names or add more UALIDs to the MSF without causing serious erosion of trust in the global Internet in general and IDNs in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term implications. - The ALAC assumes its support to the IDN team in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint activities that involve At-Large Structures in relevant geographical regions. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ig-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ig-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC031</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-latest-rsac-10Feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-latest-rsac-10Feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC031: 148 liaison to the RSAC</td>
<td>2/26/15</td>
<td>Historically, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has provided a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). With the recent re-establishment of the RSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC030</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rsac-003-scope-11Feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rsac-003-scope-11Feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC030: RSAC Statement of Scope for &quot;Root Zone TLDs&quot;</td>
<td>3/21/15</td>
<td>This statement refers back to RSSAC03 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone Fill work party to produce RSSAC030 7 RSSAC Advisory on root zone TLDs, with adherence to RSAC 422 procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 March 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 Apr 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-nso-insurance-08apr15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-nso-insurance-08apr15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. | |

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 16 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Apr 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ig-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ig-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. | |

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the IDN TLDs - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 13 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 Apr 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-nso-insurance-08apr15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-nso-insurance-08apr15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. | |
The ICANN organization understands AL-009 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone”. Per the Statement: "Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays. RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. RSSAC’s understanding of the request was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC Board in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and VeriSign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA’s administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c). The proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and VeriSign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA’s administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c). The proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and VeriSign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA’s administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c). The proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
The ALAC has adopted the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without a corresponding increase in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles:

1. While increasing DNI penetration, the standards of accuracy, service availability, service capability, operational security, diversity of implementation, monitoring and measurement, and communication (both inter-operator and public communication) should be maintained.

2. The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC001 provides an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server activities. The RSSAC recommends each root server operator to implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of these measurements.

3. ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server activities. The ICANN organization has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its compliance at https://www.icann.org/rssac008-response/index.html.

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The RSSAC has recommended each root server operator to implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of these measurements.

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server activities. The RSSAC recommends each root server operator to implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of these measurements.

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server activities. The RSSAC recommends each root server operator to implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of these measurements.

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advice Item: The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DI programs should adhere to the following principles:

1. The second new gTLD round should give preference to applicants from developing economies and undertake an outreach program to ensure a better understanding of the benefits of gTLDs.

2. ICANN should ensure that its Beginner Guides are easily accessible.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System" (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Service Expectations of Root Servers" (RSSAC001) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "The Globalization of ICANN" and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System" (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System" (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System" (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-10)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.10. ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (K-10)</td>
<td>6/24/14</td>
<td>0.11. ICANN should open regular offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This is part of day-to-day work of ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Several ICANN offices have been opened over the past years, most recently the Engagement office in Nairobi. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+9">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+9</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-26)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.20. Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SO/ACs, in order to: enhance knowledge management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activity, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multilingual engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This is part of ICANN’s ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-27)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.21. The Board should implement ART2 Rec 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is underway in the ART2 recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ART2+implementation+Program+and+here">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ART2+implementation+Program+and+here</a>: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Rec+9.1">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Rec+9.1</a>. In addition, this work is part of CCWG Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG- Accountability wiki page: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/tdrg/Rec+9+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home">https://community.icann.org/display/tdrg/Rec+9+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-28)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.22. The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-29)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.23. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The ICANN website has been redesigned and was rolled out 24 February 2016, meeting this recommendation. See here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Rec+15">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Rec+15</a>). In addition, this work is part of CCWG Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG- Accountability wiki page: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/tdrg/Rec+9+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home">https://community.icann.org/display/tdrg/Rec+9+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-32)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simpler terms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-33)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Webinars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-34)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC should initiate the discussion between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (K-35)</td>
<td>6/22/14</td>
<td>0.35. The ICANN Board should host a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> There has been significant increase of communications between the ALAC and the ICANN Board since the conclusion of the 2nd At-Large Summit. Board members attend meetings/teleconferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+5">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+5</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN [R-37]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.37. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large website.</td>
<td>Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to reward the website and WIKI to ensure that our &quot;Policy Advice&quot; pages are accurate and understandable. This will continue as volunteer and staff resources allow. We will also ensure that as documents are published, the classification of the document is clear. The goal is to address two issues: • Confusion about the type of document (e.g. &quot;Advice&quot; vs. &quot;Comment&quot;) • The &quot;End user&quot; justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff together with At-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (so advice, public comment, correspondence, etc.) in a more granular fashion and provided enhanced tools with which to filter search results based on these categories. Furthermore, staff will create a new field in the database for &quot;End User Issue&quot; and At-Large leadership will populate this field both in current documents and those generated going forward. The following items have been created to satisfy these goals: • An Executive Summaries: ALAC Policy Comments &amp; Advice resource page has been created to address &quot;type&quot; of document (e.g.) • The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) meets weekly to discuss &quot;end user&quot; justification for intervention (e2). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a WIKI visitor to pursue the work of the At-Large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN [R-40]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.40. ICANN should offer a program similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROP), but applicable to short-term/low-budget requests not related to travel.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> On an annual basis, the CROP program is reviewed and adjustments are made based on community input. Annual community special budget request process is also used to address these types of requests. This recommendation has led to greater collaboration between ALAC leadership and ICANN staff regional engagement teams. See the CROP page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/blogs/43025050">https://community.icann.org/blogs/43025050</a>. See ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al/ALATLAS-44-Recommendation-40">https://community.icann.org/display/al/ALATLAS-44-Recommendation-40</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN [R-41]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget (<a href="https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-55mar16-eng.pdf">https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-55mar16-eng.pdf</a>). The FY17 budget was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board Finance committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on top priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN [R-42]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.42. ALAC should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices in concert with regional events.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B. There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al/ALATLAS-44-Recommendation-40">https://community.icann.org/display/al/ALATLAS-44-Recommendation-40</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models [R-3]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.43. RALOs should encourage their inactive ADS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> Work has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN56. The Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al/AFAFRL-DraftEventProgram">https://community.icann.org/display/al/AFAFRL-DraftEventProgram</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ALATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models [R-2]</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.44. The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider (ALAC)</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-36</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>A.3. ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model reaching not only Board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-37</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>A.5. ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of liaisons between different Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (AC/SCOs) to do away with the /At-Large culture.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-38</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>A.5. ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end-users remain at the heart of the accountability process in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-39</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>A.6. ICANN’s M&amp;D should serve as a reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts-of-interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-40</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>A.7. A periodic review of ICANN’s M&amp;D should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN’s constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirements in the Corporation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-41</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B.8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-42</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B.17. ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries and, in conjunction with technical bodies, promote credible alternatives.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-45</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B.20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-46</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/s3-2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-21)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>C.2. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be written in clear and non-technical language.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the First ATLAS Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#2. The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was considered and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home#WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home:Implementation is called for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

The recommendation was included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home#WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home:Implementation is called for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

The recommendation was included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is called for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.
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The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.
The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. Particularly its conclusion that the "multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced." The diagram on Governance, grouped into the Logical layer and Infrastructure Layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel's discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN's new role in: Globalize not internationalize, Consolidation and simplification of root-zone management, and a web of affirmation of responsibility. The ALAC is surprised that the recommendations of the Panel do not include any acknowledgment or recommendations about the threats to the DNS. A key missing recommendation should have been made that there should be a coordinated risk management program concerning the DNS itself.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the "usual suspects" with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement. However, we are concerned that some of the suggestions, such as crowdsourcing, for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as alternatives to existing methods of reaching consensus on issues. New techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy processes of collaboration and dialogue. Crowdsourcing for policy input risks breaching the truly bottom-up policy development. We suggest the development and use of tools to assist participation for those whose voice should be heard but do not communicate, or do not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be enabled at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top level.

The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities. The ALAC appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meeting site. The ALAC supports the recommendations of the Meeting Strategy Working Group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase and value-added policy work, engage with local Internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meetings venue. The ALAC suggests that 1) local availability of an open Internet be added to the selection criteria, 2) venues without facilities for the disabled communities shouldn't be considered, and 3) video coverage of meetings uses camera and camera work (pan and zoom) instead of a stationary Webcam. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities.

The ALAC welcomes the announcement recently made by the National Telecommunications and Information Authority (NTIA) and celebrates the designation of ICANN as the organization in charge of convening the multistakeholder process. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities. The ALAC appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meeting site. The ALAC supports the recommendations of the Meeting Strategy Working Group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase and value-added policy work, engage with local Internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meetings venue. The ALAC suggests that 1) local availability of an open Internet be added to the selection criteria, 2) venues without facilities for the disabled communities shouldn't be considered, and 3) video coverage of meetings uses camera and camera work (pan and zoom) instead of a stationary Webcam. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. Particularly its conclusion that the "multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced." The diagram on Governance, grouped into the Logical layer and Infrastructure Layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel's discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN's new role in: Globalize not internationalize, Consolidation and simplification of root-zone management, and a web of affirmation of responsibility. The ALAC is surprised that the recommendations of the Panel do not include any acknowledgment or recommendations about the threats to the DNS. A key missing recommendation should have been made that there should be a coordinated risk management program concerning the DNS itself.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the "usual suspects" with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement. However, we are concerned that some of the suggestions, such as crowdsourcing, for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as alternatives to existing methods of reaching consensus on issues. New techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy processes of collaboration and dialogue. Crowdsourcing for policy input risks breaching the truly bottom-up policy development. We suggest the development and use of tools to assist participation for those whose voice should be heard but do not communicate, or do not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be enabled at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top level.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the "usual suspects" with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement. However, we are concerned that some of the suggestions, such as crowdsourcing, for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as alternatives to existing methods of reaching consensus on issues. New techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy processes of collaboration and dialogue. Crowdsourcing for policy input risks breaching the truly bottom-up policy development. We suggest the development and use of tools to assist participation for those whose voice should be heard but do not communicate, or do not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be enabled at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top level.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. Particularly its conclusion that the "multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced." The diagram on Governance, grouped into the Logical layer and Infrastructure Layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel's discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN's new role in: Globalize not internationalize, Consolidation and simplification of root-zone management, and a web of affirmation of responsibility. The ALAC is surprised that the recommendations of the Panel do not include any acknowledgment or recommendations about the threats to the DNS. A key missing recommendation should have been made that there should be a coordinated risk management program concerning the DNS itself.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the "usual suspects" with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement. However, we are concerned that some of the suggestions, such as crowdsourcing, for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as alternatives to existing methods of reaching consensus on issues. New techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy processes of collaboration and dialogue. Crowdsourcing for policy input risks breaching the truly bottom-up policy development. We suggest the development and use of tools to assist participation for those whose voice should be heard but do not communicate, or do not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be enabled at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top level.

The ICANN organization understands RISAC004 provides RISAC's comments on the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Function", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RISAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RISAC004 provides RISAC's comments on the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Function", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RISAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RISAC004 provides RISAC's comments on the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Function", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RISAC in May 2017.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.
The ALAC welcomes the publication of the “Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions” study report by ICANN Global Advisor on this issue. This report is comprehensive. The ALAC notes the assumptions on page 3 that “The modalties, risks, and stigologies of the inevitable DNS namespace collisions in the new TLD namespaces will re-mold the collisions that already occur routinely in other parts of the DNS.” The ALAC supports Recommendation 1 which proposes that the TLDs corp. home and will be permanently reserved for internal use, but considers that there are other potential TLD strings in high use in internal networks that should also be considered for reservation. The ALAC considers that Recommendation 1 sets too high a barrier for the application of emergency response options. In deeming that these responses be limited to situations where a user “sees a threat and can see the danger to human life”, this ignores a broad range of scenarios which may have much greater detrimental impact. The ALAC reaffirms its view that security and stability should be paramount in the ongoing introduction of new TLDs and that the interests of Internet users, whether they be registrants of domain names in the new TLDs or users who are impacted by the smooth operation of internal networks, should be safeguarded.

The ALAC is responding to the ICANN Board resolution regarding “Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions” and its accompanying rationale dated 7 February 2014. The ALAC had submitted a Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding the Technical Liaison Group (RFC, 2314R) on 16 December 2013. The ALAC has two concerns: 1) The removal of the Technical Liaison Group (TLG) delegate to the Nominating Committee (NomCom) and 2) the rationale of removing volunteer positions to save ICANN money: Removing the TLG delegate from the Nominating Committee (NomCom) weakens the coverage and undermines the inclusion of the Internet community in ICANN’s governance processes. Having a person of technical expertise (such as the TLG delegate) on the NomCom aids the NomCom to: 1) recruit persons with technical expertise for positions in ICANN’s structures; 2) evaluate candidates’ technical expertise being considered for positions in ICANN’s structures; and 3) select the best candidates for positions in ICANN’s structures. The ALAC is very disappointed with the ICANN Board’s rationale that the removal of the TLG liaison to the ICANN Board and the TLG delegate to the NomCom “is anticipated to have a positive fiscal impact on ICANN” and “will provide a financial savings to ICANN.” It contradicts the rationale given by the ICANN Board in its September 28 2013 Board resolution which stated “This action is not anticipated to have a fiscal impact on ICANN.” It disparages the volunteers, not only those that have served on the TLG as liaisons to the Board or as delegates to the NomCom, but the multi-stakeholder volunteers (especially those not financed by industry players) in ICANN.

The ALAC supports the details of the process described, but recommends that it be widened to include cases such as the various shop objections where the objected-to-strings were not identical, but the results were just as inconsistent. Moreover, the ALAC notes that it has previously made statements to this effect just as inconsistent. Moreover, the ALAC notes that it has previously made statements to this effect (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/2261148/AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-01-EN.pdf?api=v2) and deeply regrets that it has taken ICANN so long to react to the overall situation that it must now choose to accept many of the other seemingly illogical results. One of the ALAC’s prime responsibilities in ICANN is to protect the interests of individual Internet users, and the delegation of confusingly similar TLDs does not meet the needs of these users.

ICANN Contractual Compliance (CC) accepts complaints either on a one-by-one basis using web-based submission tools, or for selected partners, using a bulk-submission process. The ALAC understands that regardless of the submission vehicle, each complaint is reviewed on its merits and processed individually. However, this methodology is not suitable when the subject of a complaint is not an individual occurrence, but a more wide-spread problem. Just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations, just as the UDRP allows multiple gTLD registrations. This methodology is not suitable when the subject of a complaint is not an individual occurrence, but a more wide-spread problem.

This topic was addressed at ICANN 49 in Singapore during the ALAC session. The Contractual Compliance Complaints system does not allow for multiple filing in the same single complaints. This is not an issue presented to bring more efficiency to the process and effective resolution. ICANN engages in proactive monitoring of media and industry blogs to identify community concerns that may be ripe for compliance review or audit. For wide-spread problems that affect multiple gTLDs or multiple problems by a gTLD, ICANN Contractual Compliance staff pulls data across all areas while collaborating with the contracted partners to bring more efficiency to the process and effective resolution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: Recursive DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure open recursive DNS servers. This involves: a. Identify unmanaged open recursive DNS servers operating in the network and take immediate steps to restrict access to these servers to prevent abuse. b. Follow SAC065 Recommendation 3 to (1) disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and (2) only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to avoid in inflating amplification vectors for DNS DDoS attacks. c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abusive use of open resolvers so that they are not targeted of abuse. This would include continuous monitoring for anomalous behavior, limiting or blocking known abuse queries (e.g., rip.net ANS), (3) tracking likely target victim IP (attacks reported or addresses of frequently targeted servers) and restricting or disabling of responses to those IPs; and sharing information with similar operators to coordinate efforts to quell such attacks.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-3 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Authoritative DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response rate limiting. This involves: a. Investigating mechanisms to deter DNS amplification attacks (e.g., Response Rate Limiting (RRL) in DNS server software), and implement those that are appropriate for their environment; b. Encouraging DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; and c. Frequently review the state of the art in such mechanisms and update their environment as necessary.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-4 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software regularly updated and communicate with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational processes as necessary to ensure that a process is in place to systematically perform DNS software updates on both an on-going and an emergency basis; and b. Encouraging DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities and a reasonable cost in system resources.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-5 is directed towards DNS operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurations of customer premise networking equipment, including home networking equipment, should take immediate steps to secure these devices and ensure that they are field upgradable when new software is available to fix security vulnerabilities, and aggressively replace the installed base of non-upgradable with upgradeable devices. This minimally involves: a. Ensuring that the default configuration on these devices does not implement an unmanaged open recursive DNS resolver; b. Providing updates and patches for their equipment to keep the installed base of networking equipment up-to-date to address current security threats, or as a necessary alternative replacing non-upgradeable equipment with appropriately configured devices; and c. Ensuring that large-scale participants in purchasing of customer premise networking equipment (e.g., ISPs, government procurement, large enterprises) insist that networking equipment meet the standards discussed in this document.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurations of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-055-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SACSS: SAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-1</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing - R-1</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The SSAC advises the ICANN supporting organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF and the DNS operations community to consider the following proposed behavior for search list processing and comment on its correctness, completeness, utility and feasibility. Administrators (including DHCP server administrators) should configure the search list explicitly, and must not rely on or use implicit search lists. Where DNS parameters such as the domain search list has been manually configured, these parameters should not be overritten by DHCP. b. When a user enters a single label name, that name may be subject to search list processing if a search list is specified, but must never be queried in the DNS in its original single-label form. c. When a user queries a hostname that contain two or more labels separated by dots, such as <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a>, applications and resolvers must query the DNS directly. Search lists must not be applied even if such names do not resolve to an address (A/AAAA). Therefore <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a> is always a TLDN.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC065 Recommendations 2-5. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%B0%D0%BB/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#24">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#24</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing - R-2</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The SSAC advises the ICANN supporting organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF and the DNS operations community to consider the following proposed behavior for search list processing and comment on its correctness, completeness, utility and feasibility. Administrators (including DHCP server administrators) should configure the search list explicitly, and must not rely on or use implicit search lists. Where DNS parameters such as the domain search list has been manually configured, these parameters should not be overritten by DHCP. b. When a user enters a single label name, that name may be subject to search list processing if a search list is specified, but must never be queried in the DNS in its original single-label form. c. When a user queries a hostname that contain two or more labels separated by dots, such as <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a>, applications and resolvers must query the DNS directly. Search lists must not be applied even if such names do not resolve to an address (A/AAAA). Therefore <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a> is always a TLDN.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC065 Recommendations 2-5. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%B0%D0%BB/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#24">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#24</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of changing name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. In the context of changing name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with names provisioned under the newly deployed top level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.

### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

#### ALAC-Statement on the Thick Whois Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC recommends that ICANN be better prepared organizationally to support future reviews and that the ATRT be provided with a full year (12 months) for its review work, even if review commencement is delayed.</td>
<td>1113-02-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-11nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-11nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Thick Whois Policy</td>
<td>ALAC recommends that ICANN be better prepared organizationally to support future reviews and that the ATRT be provided with a full year (12 months) for its review work, even if review commencement is delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC appreciates the publication of the ATRT2 Draft Recommendations for Public Comment. The ALAC views the Affirmation of Commitments mandate for periodic organizational review and the work of the ATRT2 are crucial for enhancing, on a continuous basis, the culture and practice of accountability and transparency throughout ICANN. We agree with the ATRT2’s general Recommendations that, in moving forward, ICANN needs to: Establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability and transparency can be measured; Communicate clearly and consistently about its progress forward, ICANN needs to: Establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability and transparency can be measured; Communicate clearly and consistently about its progress.</td>
<td>1113-03-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team</td>
<td>ALAC appreciates the publication of the ATRT2 Draft Recommendations for Public Comment. The ALAC views the Affirmation of Commitments mandate for periodic organizational review and the work of the ATRT2 are crucial for enhancing, on a continuous basis, the culture and practice of accountability and transparency throughout ICANN. We agree with the ATRT2’s general Recommendations that, in moving forward, ICANN needs to: Establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability and transparency can be measured; Communicate clearly and consistently about its progress forward, ICANN needs to: Establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability and transparency can be measured; Communicate clearly and consistently about its progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC strongly supports the recommendation of the final report on the Thin Whois Policy development process for all gTLDs to use the ‘Thin’ Whois model. It is a position that the ALAC has supported, beginning with its response to the Preliminary Report and reflected in the ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on ‘Thin Whois extreme disappointment’ that Venizelos was not required to use a ‘Thin’ Whois model for .com when that ICANN-registry agreement was up for renewal. The ALAC would note that similar privacy issues are addressed by most existing registries and all registries are divided. This question is one of the reasons that the ALAC believes that this should have been a Board-led initiative, but the fact that it isn’t does not remove the importance of the question.</td>
<td>1113-04-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team</td>
<td>ALAC strongly supports the recommendation of the final report on the Thin Whois Policy development process for all gTLDs to use the ‘Thin’ Whois model. It is a position that the ALAC has supported, beginning with its response to the Preliminary Report and reflected in the ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on ‘Thin Whois extreme disappointment’ that Venizelos was not required to use a ‘Thin’ Whois model for .com when that ICANN-registry agreement was up for renewal. The ALAC would note that similar privacy issues are addressed by most existing registries and all registries are divided. This question is one of the reasons that the ALAC believes that this should have been a Board-led initiative, but the fact that it isn’t does not remove the importance of the question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption Taken:**

- This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution: http://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериалы/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.d Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt2/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
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As of 29 February 2020

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

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

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC063 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.d). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

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

Phase 1 Close Request

4-24 June 2013, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/files/files/report-comments-dns-rmf-final-18oct13-en.pdf). In November 2013, this statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2013-12-16-en. The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

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

Phase 1 Close Request

4-24 June 2013, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/files/files/report-comments-dns-rmf-final-18oct13-en.pdf). In November 2013, this statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2013-12-16-en. The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

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

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC063 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.d). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of clear and objective metrics for acceptable levels of “breakage” resulting from a key rollover.

This is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the development of rollback procedures to be executed when a rollover has affected operational stability beyond a reasonable boundary.

This is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative testbed for the purpose of analyzing behaviors of various validating operations, their versions, and their network environments (e.g., middle boxes) that may affect or be affected by a root KSK rollover, such that potential problem areas can be identified, communicated, and addressed.

Phase 1 Close Request

4-25 October 2013 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2013-10-15-en). The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify to what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., all TLD level only or any additional lower level).
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Phase 1 Close Request
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Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

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

Phase 1 Close Request

4-25 October 2013 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2013-10-15-en). The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

Advice Item: SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

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

Phase 1 Close Request

4-25 October 2013 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2013-10-15-en). The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/ksk-rollover
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**Adviser Item Status**

As of 29 February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/16/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to review the outcome of new TLD strings, which are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are virtually certain to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>In February 2014, the ICANN Board directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing plural inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objectives process: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...</a>. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO's discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/16/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to review the objection decision system with multiple panels that leads to inconsistency and not only review the obvious case of camp/ com where conflicting objection decisions have forced such review;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/sac-061-16sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/16/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to determine a stable way forward which will not create unwanted contentions set nor delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure user confusion and implicit loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-09sep13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-09sep13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>The ALAC welcomes the proposal of “Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Guidelines” prepared by The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). The ALAC notes with satisfaction that the EIU has transposed the Applicant Guidelines into Evaluation Guidelines for what is intended to be an evidence-based evaluation process. The ALAC supports the need for comprehensive community assessment to ensure the legitimacy of applicants and the long-term sustainability of their value proposals. Without re-opening the debate on the Applicant Guidelines there is a need for recommendations and observations to make based on the document within this Statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-09sep13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-09sep13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN’s remit) directed at finding a solution to ‘the WHOIS problem’ until the registration data policy has been developed and accepted in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resources/resolutions-2018-06-23-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resources/resolutions-2018-06-23-en.pdf</a>). Subsequently, on 2 August 2018 the ICANN Board confirmed the ICANN organization to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN organization change SAC061 Recommendation 2’s status to “Closed - Open.” Upon review of SAC061 and SAC062, the ICANN organization has returned SAC061 to Phase 2 (Understand). SAC061 Recommendation 2 will be considered in conjunction with SAC062. On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC061 and noted advice items 1A and 3 through 7 in SAC061 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-16sep13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/documents/sac-061-16sep13-en.pdf</a>). In its rationale the Board states: “Advice item note reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that the ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.” The advice further suggests that “These assessments should be incorporated into FDP plans and the GNSO should manage FDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposal to Mitigate Name Collision Risks</td>
<td>8/27/13</td>
<td>The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the &quot;Name Collisions in the DNS&quot; (PDF, 3.08 MB) study report by Interisle Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN in &quot;New gTLD Collision Risk Management Proposal&quot; (PDF, 166 KB). The ALAC wishes to reiterate its previous Advice to the Board that in pursuing mitigation actions to minimize residual risk, especially for those strings in the &quot;uncalculated risk&quot; category, ICANN must assure that such residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers and individual end users. In particular, the direct and indirect costs associated with proposed mitigation actions should not have to be borne by registrants, consumers and individual end users. The ALAC remains concerned that this matter is being dealt with at such a late stage of the New gTLD Process. The ALAC urges the Board to investigate how and why this crucial issue could have been ignored for so long and how similar occurrences may be prevented in the future.</td>
<td>On 30 July 2014, the NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework. <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtlds-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtlds-2014-07-30-en</a>. Implementation and general information about the Name Collision efforts can be found at: <a href="https://www.icann.org">https://www.icann.org</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on community expertise in community priority evaluation</td>
<td>8/9/13</td>
<td>ALAC recommends additional community-related expertise in the Community Priority Evaluation Panel and stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors.</td>
<td>On 28 September 2013, the Chair of the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) responded to some of the concerns raised by ALAC (<a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/27aug13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/27aug13-en.htm</a>). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: &quot;The NGPC appreciates the offer made by the ALAC to provide community volunteers to serve as Panel members or advisors. However, the NGPC determined that it would not be appropriate to introduce external parties to the ICANN evaluation process.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/docs/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention</td>
<td>8/9/13</td>
<td>The ALAC call on ICANN to review all 688 applications currently in contention and provide preferential treatment to applications that meet the characteristics of community applications.</td>
<td>On 9 September 2013, the Chair of the NGPC responded to the ALAC (<a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/27aug13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/27aug13-en.htm</a>). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: &quot;Implementing the ALAC's advice would represent a change to the policies and procedures established in the Applicant Guidebook. In the interest of fairness to all applicants, it would not be appropriate to re-evaluate applications that chose not to self-designate as community-based applications. As such, all applications will be considered based on their current designations.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The TMCN must add support for IDN variant TLDs. Particularly during the TLD Claims service, a name registered under a TLD that has allocated variant TLDs should trigger trademark holder notifications for the registration of the name in all of its allocated variant TLDs.</td>
<td>CANS responded to the SAC6 most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of DNS variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources - General information on TMCH <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse</a> Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registers: <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/register-registers">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/register-registers</a> - Trademark Clearinghouse &amp; Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idn-29jan13-en/pdf">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idn-29jan13-en/pdf</a> IDN Variant Resources - IDN Implementation Guidelines: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en</a> - IDN Variant Program Information: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-04-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-04-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/24/14</td>
<td>CANS should assure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>CANS agrees with this recommendation and the number of strings that may be activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC68 Recommendation 5, the IDN GRR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.</td>
<td>CANS agrees with this recommendation and the IDN GRR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The GRR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a GRR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the GRR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existsent) activations.</td>
<td>CANS agrees with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the most considered areas. Integration Panel has to take into account in each release of the IDN GRR. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Should ICANN decide to implement safeguards, it should distinguish two types of failure modes when a user expects a variant to work, but it is not implemented: denial of service versus misconnection.</td>
<td>This specific advice item is part of project 2.1 GRR Procedure. Information on Project 2.1 of the GRR can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/VP/Phx.1">https://community.icann.org/display/VP/Phx.1</a>. Label Generation/Renew/Process-for-the-Renewable Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found at the links listed below: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en</a> - IDN Variant Program Information: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-04-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-04-en</a> - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: <a href="https://features.icann.org/dn-variant-idn-08-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations/lang=en">https://features.icann.org/dn-variant-idn-08-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations/lang=en</a> - Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf</a> – – – Procedure on Comment on Label Generation Ruleset for Root Zone Version 1 (LGR-1): <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en</a> - Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/rootzoneprocedure/Root+Zone+lGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/rootzoneprocedure/Root+Zone+lGR+Project</a></td>
<td>A detailed analysis has been published as part of recommendations for managing IDN variant TLDs, which has been approved by ICANN Board at ICANN64. The analysis has been forwarded to the GNSO and ccNSO for further consideration of the ICANN Board. See report at <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/rootzoneprocedure/Root+Zone+lGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/rootzoneprocedure/Root+Zone+lGR+Project</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>A process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.</td>
<td>CANS org recently developed the Recommendations for Managing IDN Variant TLDs, published at <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ltr-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ltr-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-25-en</a>. These have been adopted by ICANN Board at their meeting at KANN64, where the Board asked the GNSO and ccNSO to consider these in their policy and procedures. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBRO) providers support variant TLDs, and that parties exist for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.</td>
<td>CANS org recently developed the Recommendations for Managing IDN Variant TLDs, published at <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ltr-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ltr-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-25-en</a>. These have been adopted by ICANN Board at their meeting at KANN64, where the Board asked the GNSO and ccNSO to consider these in their policy and procedures. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll-over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include:
- Scaling the Root Report on the Impact on DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Variability of the Root Zone
- Impact on Root Server Operations and Operationally-Maintained DNS zones

As the ICANN community discusses validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered:

1. How much is the ICANN community willing to pay to gain a particular level of security and stability?
2. What is the minimum level of security and stability that the ICANN community requires?
3. How much cost can the ICANN community bear without compromising the security and stability of the DNS?

4. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domains increases?

5. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain labels increases?

6. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain names increases?

7. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain authorities increases?

8. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain zones increases?

9. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain servers increases?

10. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain names increases?

11. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain labels increases?

12. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain authorities increases?

13. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain zones increases?

14. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain servers increases?

15. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain names increases?

16. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain labels increases?

17. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain authorities increases?

18. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain zones increases?

19. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain servers increases?

20. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain names increases?

21. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain labels increases?

22. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain authorities increases?

23. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain zones increases?

24. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain servers increases?

25. How will the ICANN community ensure that the security and stability of the DNS are maintained as the number of registered domain names increases?
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC053

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC053
- **Issued Date**: 1/31/12
- **Advice Document Recommendation**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-053-2012-02-11-en

**Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-053-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The Board should direct the CEO to create a registration data policy committee that includes the highest levels of executive engagement to develop a registration data policy which defines the purpose of domain name registration data, as described elsewhere in this document.

#### SAC054

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC054
- **Issued Date**: 2/23/12
- **Advice Document Recommendation**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-054-2012-02-11-en

**Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-054-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The Board should explicitly defer any other policy activity (including ICANN's policy directed at finding a solution) to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.

#### SAC055

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC055
- **Issued Date**: 6/11/12
- **Advice Document Recommendation**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-055-2012-02-11-en

**Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-055-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC064

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC064
- **Phase**: This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

**Action(s) Taken**:

The SSAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.

#### SAC065

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC065
- **Phase**: This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

**Action(s) Taken**:

The Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN’s remit) directed at finding a solution to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC072

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC072
- **Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-072-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The SSAC advisory team met on 13 August 2011, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) adopted a resolution affirming that “dotted domain names” are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/en/dns-problem-domain-names-prohibited-2011-08-13-en.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC080

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC080
- **Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-080-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC092

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **Reference Number**: SAC092
- **Phase**: This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/sac-sac-092-2012-02-11-en

**Action(s) Taken**:

The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reference Number:** SAC048  

**Advisory Item:** SAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan and Management of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System

**Issue Date:** 5/12/11

**Description:**

The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records:

1. **Orphaned glue** is an ambiguous term for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has prepared a proposed definition.

2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of "abuse prevention and mitigation" and we suggest that it be removed.

**SSAC Comments:**

- Acted upon Request
- This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

---

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reference Number:** SAC051  

**Advisory Item:** SAC051: SAC Report on WHS Termination and Structure

**Issue Date:** 6/14/11

**Description:**

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

---

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reference Number:** SAC054  

**Advisory Item:** SAC054: SAC Report on WHOIS Data Access Protocol (WHOIS-AP)

**Issue Date:** 6/14/11

**Description:**

- The SSAC recommends that registrars consider implementing WHOIS-AP in their systems; this protocol provides a mechanism for requesting resolution of WHOIS data that can be used to support the implementation of security policies. The WHOIS-AP protocol may also provide a mechanism for implementing security policies at the protocol level. The SSAC recommends that registrars consider implementing WHOIS-AP in their systems.

**SSAC Comments:**

- Acted upon Request
- This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

---

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reference Number:** SAC058  

**Advisory Item:** SAC058: SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicability Guidebook

**Issue Date:** 6/14/11

**Description:**

- The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records:

  1. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of "abuse prevention and mitigation" and we suggest that it be removed.

**SSAC Comments:**

- Acted upon Request
- This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

---

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reference Number:** SAC059  

**Advisory Item:** SAC059: SAC Report on WHOIS Risk Assessment and Management

**Issue Date:** 6/14/11

**Description:**

- The SSAC recommends that registrars consider implementing WHOIS-AP in their systems; this protocol provides a mechanism for requesting resolution of WHOIS data that can be used to support the implementation of security policies. The WHOIS-AP protocol may also provide a mechanism for implementing security policies at the protocol level. The SSAC recommends that registrars consider implementing WHOIS-AP in their systems.

**SSAC Comments:**

- Acted upon Request
- This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)</td>
<td>3/2/21</td>
<td>1. Finally, to mitigate the actual abuse of orphaned glue, registry operators should take action to remove these records when provided with evidence that the glue is indeed present to alert malicious conduct.</td>
<td>ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf</a>) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Specification 6, Section 4.2, which references the SSAC Advisory directly: &quot;Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records as defined at (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/security/security/sac-046.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/security/security/sac-046.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.&quot; (See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf</a>.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 5)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>The SSAC notes that in certain operating circumstances, registry functions, especially critical services such as DNS resolution and DNS security (DNSSEC), may be separable from other functions (registry database maintenance). The SSAC asks whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/notifications/falstrom-07jul17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/notifications/falstrom-07jul17-en.pdf</a>). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC048: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that simulates a full failure scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria.</td>
<td>SAC048 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition process, including the requirement for an emergency back-end registry operator (EBERO) to conduct failure testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en</a>. A process for EBEROs was implemented into the New gTLD Program and accounted for in GNSO Policy (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/sys/2013/new-gtlds/draft-dolo-f-panicfilter-09deb8b7.html">http://www.icann.org/en/sys/2013/new-gtlds/draft-dolo-f-panicfilter-09deb8b7.html</a>), the Applicant Guidebook (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf</a>), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (<a href="https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC049: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>The SSAC emphasizes that in many if not most circumstances, restoring domain name system (DNS) resolution services will be the number one priority for registrants and gTLD users. This requires DNS zone files for gTLDs be escrowed separately.</td>
<td>A process for Registry Data Escrow was implemented into the New gTLD Program in the Applicant Guidebook (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf</a>), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (<a href="https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan17-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC050: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (4 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrar retains its registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have to lack domain ownership during a transition.</td>
<td>ICANN sent a letter in response to the Explanatory Memorandum on Registry Transition Process as part of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook development process. ICANN considered this advice item, but ultimately this recommendation was not implemented as part of the Registry Transition process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC051: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (6 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>With respect to registration fees, the SSAC also notes that certain registrant information is not associated with or collected for the purpose of the public directory service, but is instead part of the administrative data that might be split between the registry and the registrar: 1) the registry replaces, one of two conditions might exist: 1) the current registry operator has information on the payment cycle. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the billing and payment cycle to the successor registry along with each registrant registration information. 2) The registrar has payment information. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the sponsoring registrar information for each domain that is registered to the successor registry.</td>
<td>The payment cycle information is reflected by the expiration date of the domain name, which is included as part of the data escrow that the successor registry receives. Each gTLD Registry is required to escrow their registration data with an ICANN approved data escrow agent on a daily basis and this activity is monitored by ICANN contractual compliance and Technical Services. Additionally in the event of a transition the DNS Zone files continue to be escrowed daily. Registry Data Escrow requirements are noted here: Applicant Guidebook, Attachment to Module 2: Evaluation Questions and Criteria (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/pdf/applicant-guidebook-full-04june12-en.pdf</a>), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Spec 2: Data Escrow Requirements (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-05jan14-en.pdf</a>). More information regarding New gTLD Registry Data Escrow Requirements and Process can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/default/files/data-escrow">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/default/files/data-escrow</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC052: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>Lastly, the SSAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Explanatory Memorandum: 1) should be footnoted with references to the AG. 2) It should reference and use defined terms from the Applicant Guidebook rather than crafting its own definitions. 3) It imposes requirements on various parties, but it is unclear if these have the stature of requirements stated in the Applicant Guidebook. Since its function is to be explanatory, the text should truly be explanatory as opposed to normative.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/notifications/falstrom-07jul17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/notifications/falstrom-07jul17-en.pdf</a>). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC053</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-053-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-053-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC053: SAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>In response to this advice, the SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrar retains its registration of a domain name during transition. Availability of such data will ensure that the transition process can be studied and improved, improved.</td>
<td>SAC053 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition process. See: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)</td>
<td>12/8/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): ICANN, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and Verisign should publish statements, or a joint statement, that they are actively prepared for the proposed changes.</td>
<td>The Board recommended the CSS to direct staff to work with NTIA and Verisign to explore publication of one or more statements regarding preparation for the proposed changes. <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/transition/s132slip-12-09-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/transition/s132slip-12-09-13-en.pdf</a> ICANN staff worked with NTIA and Verisign and the parties released a joint statement on 5 November 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td>11/15/20</td>
<td>The plan will be updated to include current measurements, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td>11/15/20</td>
<td>The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected growth rates of TLDs. [https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-03-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-03-en.pdf) as part of the implementation of the new gTLD Program. ICANN regularly published the expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs. For example, ICANN's estimates were published as part of a plan to utilize a drawing method to promote new gTLD applications ([https://newgtld.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-25jun12-en.pdf](https://newgtld.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-25jun12-en.pdf), as well as in other regular new gTLD updates. After submission of a letter to the SSAC from the ICANN Chairman on 25 September 2012 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/processordirects/crocker-to-faltstrom-25sep12-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/processordirects/crocker-to-faltstrom-25sep12-en.pdf)). The SSAC formed a working group to provide a response to the ICANN Board. On 16 April 2013, the SSAC submitted SAC 155: SAC Letter to the ICANN Board Regarding Interdisciplinary Studies to the ICANN Board. ICANN commissioned internal study to test the namespace issue raised in SAC05 and further to justify to provide a report on mitigating namespace collisions. 

At the根 level of the Domain Name System (4) 

If the SSAC recommends that ICANN promote a general awareness of the potential problems that may occur when a query for a TLD string has historically resulted in a negative response begins to resolve to a new TLD, it should be noted, however, that invalid TLD query data has not yet been studied and such a study would be required for future "subsequent procedures" for new gTLDs. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: [https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-resources.html](https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-resources.html). These materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf). 

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) 

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include current measurements, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |

The plan will be updated to include data sharing, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 4 | Deferred |