ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ICANN64 Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on EPDP	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13255	Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP	3/25/19	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 report. 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its rationale for its action in the Board Resolution on the EPDP Recommendations. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 7 May 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC104	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-104-en.pdf	SAC104: SSAC 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 SSAC 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 this EPDP: an online poll that asks respondents specific questions about each recommendation in the report. This was meant to provide easy collation 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 comment. 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Follow-Up to the Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+Workspace%3A+Follow-Up+to+the+Joint+Statement+by+ALAC+and+GAC%3A+Enabling+Inclusive%2C+Informed+and+Meaningful+Participation+at+ICANN	Follow-Up to the Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC: Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN	12/12/18	The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement ?Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN?, issued at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the 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 IANA transition process, ICANN was able to offer timely and comprehensible 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 be provided to the community concerning information on all other relevant issues.	Closed	On 27 January 2019 the Board addressed this advice in their Barcelona Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf). Additionally, Cherine Chalaby included a response in his 6 February 2019 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf). On 23 April 2019 the ICANN org notified the ALAC this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1)	12/11/18	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 RDAP protocol. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. 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.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN Board should oversee the creation and execution of a plan by the ICANN Board, ICANN org and ICANN community that accomplishes the following tasks in a coordinated way and with timely deadlines: A. A domain registration data policy that includes 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 RDAP protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining thin gTLD registries to move to thick status per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. 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. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: A) develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements and B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 2 to mean that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN org work with the ICANN Community to: A) develop policy with defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements and B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-4)	12/11/18	The initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS 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 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 4 to mean the initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS 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. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-5)	12/11/18	The SSAC reiterates 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 GNSO.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 5 to mean that the SSAC is reiterating its advice from SAC061 Recommendation 2, which states: "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 ICANN org also understands that the SSAC is recommending that these security risk assessments of registration data policy be incorporated into PDP plans by the GNSO. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)	12/11/18	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.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 6 to mean that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN org to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)	12/11/18	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.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC101v2 Recommendation 7 to mean that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN org to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC on 20 March 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should, with sufficient detail, define an ICANN organizational review. This definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be crisp and tight in order to ensure complete clarity of scope.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN org should define the ICANN organizational review. The definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be straightforward and unambiguous in order to ensure complete clarity of scope. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 29 March 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should document the intent of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 2 to mean that the ICANN org should document the intent of each organizational review, what information ICANN org hopes to obtain, and how the information from the review will be used. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 29 March 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should continue to use its RFP process to select the IE. The process should be modified to ensure that the IE are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN org should continue to use its Request for Proposal process to select the Independent Examiner for reviews. The process should be modified to ensure that the Independent Examiners are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 29 March 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)	10/5/18	When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that the organizational review is meeting contractual obligations. Depending on the outcome of each checkpoint, the ICANN organization should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 4 to mean that the ICANN org should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that an organizational review is meeting its contractual obligations throughout the review process. The ICANN org should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance at each checkpoint. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 29 March 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)	10/5/18	At the conclusion of any organizational review, the ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. If there are any lessons learned from the organizational review, the ICANN organization should demonstrate how the process will be modified.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	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. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 29 March 2019.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC103	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf	SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report	10/3/18	This is an advisory to the ICANN Board, the ICANN Organization staff, the ICANN community, and, more broadly, the Internet community from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report is organized by subject matter and includes regular references to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations given in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Initial Report. Each section begins with a listing of relevant questions and/or preliminary recommendations from the Initial Report then follows with the SSAC's comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 1 November 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC102	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-102-en.pdf	SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover	8/20/18	On 13 May 2018, the ICANN Board requested the SSAC to provide advice to the Board on the "Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover." This comment represents the SSAC?s response to that request.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN org understands SAC102 is the SSAC's response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN org understands the SSAC has not identified any reason within the SSAC?s scope why the rollover should not proceed as currently planned. The SSAC suggests that ICANN establish a framework for scheduling further rolls of the root KSK based on analysis of the outcomes of this initial roll of the KSK. The ICANN org also understands five members of SSAC provided a dissent in SAC102 in which they believe that the risks of rolling in accordance with the current schedule are larger than the risks of postponing and focusing heavily on additional research and outreach, and in particular leveraging newly developed techniques that provide better signal and fidelity into potentially impacted parties. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 7 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC039	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-039-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1	8/7/18	RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.	Closed	The ICANN org understands the RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. ICANN org also understands the RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase and that the RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC039	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-039-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-2	8/7/18	The KSK rollover back out plan was written in July of 2016, updated in April of 2018, and may become a critical procedure that needs to be invoked immediately in case of KSK rollover failure. This document, its procedures and triggers should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. RSSAC pledges that all of the RSOs will be prepared to participate in monitoring and measuring to ensure adequate data is available upon which a rollback decision can be made.	Closed	ICANN org understands the RSSAC advises the KSK rollover back out plan should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-1	8/7/18	Recommendation 1: Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. RSOs need to decide whether to pursue harmonization of anonymization data that comes from multiple operators, particularly the DITL data. That decision needs to include consideration of the advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of the RSO, of the users of the RSS, 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 RSOs 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 1 is for the Root Server Operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-2	8/7/18	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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 2 is for each RSO to consider anonymization procedures in RSSAC040 individually. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-3	8/7/18	Recommendation 3: 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. It should be possible for an operator to publish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the AS of the original data. Such a table should have a timestamp for when the mapping was made due to AS values changing over time.	Closed	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 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 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC036	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-036-14jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC	6/14/18	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report as part of its ongoing organizational review. This response builds on RSSAC032 and the feedback on the draft recommendations from the RSSAC Review Work Party (RWP) to the independent examiners.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 19 July 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System	6/14/18	The ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root Server System (RSS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). The Model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RSS.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this is a detailed proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board for RSSAC037 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-1	6/14/18	Recommendation 1: 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 Board and the ICANN Organization staff. 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 RDAP protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining thin gTLD registries to move to thick status per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. 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. E. The ICANN Board should arrange updates to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and registry contracts as necessary to ensure compliance with A through D above.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2	6/14/18	Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to incorporate the following principle into its contracts with gTLD RDDS service providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain operational access to the registration data that policy says they are authorized to access, and must not be rate-limited unless the user poses a demonstrable threat to a properly resourced system. This recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3	6/14/18	Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-4	6/14/18	Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RDDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5	6/14/18	Recommendation 5: The SSAC reiterates 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 GNSO.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-6	6/14/18	Recommendation 6. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to clarify that if a data field is required to be published, the registry or registrar must publish it in RDDS server output, not just in Web-based output.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-7	6/14/18	Recommendation 7: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.	Closed	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of 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."
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 1 is for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.5.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root Server System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The ICANN Board should refer to RSSAC037 section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3	6/14/18	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.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0605-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11607	Release for Registration one .COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: O.COM	6/5/18	Given the lack of both stability and competition concerns, the ALAC believes the introduction of O.com represents no downside to end users. The ALAC further suggests that the proceeds of the auction be used to make concrete progress on universal acceptance, one of the primary frustrations of end users with regards to the introduction of new top level domains.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC statement regarding Release for Registration one .COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: O.COM. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment and there is no action for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC035	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-035-11may18-en.pdf	RSSAC035: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee	5/11/18	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).	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee submitted during the public comment period to the independent examiner. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 May 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC034	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-034-09may18-en.pdf	RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop	5/9/18	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Verisign in early May.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 1 May 2018 to 3 May 2018. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 16 May 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC033	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf	RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops	4/24/18	RSSAC and Root-Ops are names for two separate communities that relate to the Internet?s DNS Root Server System. They have different missions and scopes. RSSAC provides this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that RSSAC033 is the RSSAC's statement on the distinction between RSSAC and Root-Ops. The RSSAC is providing this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted. The document is informational only and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 5 June 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0425-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11363	ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy	4/20/18	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 (i). ? 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 $17 million ($68m less $15m and less $36m above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: I. Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD 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 additions:	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/reserve-fund-replenishment-2018-03-06-en). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0418-01-00-EN	https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=79438448&preview=/79438448/84217342/AL-ALAC-ST-0418-01-01-EN.pdf	ALAC Statement on Draft Project Plan for the Proposed Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP)	4/18/18	As the principle voice of end users within the ICANN community, the At-large Advisory Committee (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 and, as such, cut to the core of 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Draft Project Plan for the Proposed Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ncap-project-plan-2018-03-02-en). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0404-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11233	ALAC Statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN-proposed Interim Model	4/10/18	Following discussions over the last months, in an attempt to address the upcoming European Union?s General Data Protection Regulation?s impact on ICANN?s contracts and particularly on the collection, retention and display of registration data in the WHOIS services, ICANN published an ?Interim Model for Compliance with ICANN Agreements and Policies in Relation to the European Union?s General Data Protection Regulation? on the 8th of March 2018[1]. The ALAC wishes to thank the ICANN CEO for the opportunity to reflect on the model proposed.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN-proposed Interim Model. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-privacy-issues-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model). As this will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0402-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11231	ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation	4/10/18	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 policy goals relating to the DNS. Metrics are needed to monitor effectiveness. The Fellowship has been more effective in recruiting people to be active in At-Large administrative activities and outreach.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation and was submitted as part of a public comment/consultation (https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation). As this statement will be handled via the public comment/consultation process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0402-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11235	ALAC Statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (KSK) Rollover Process	4/10/18	The ALAC and At-Large Community understand the need to roll the KSK but parts of the community have strong concerns for the potential impact on users world-wide. We believe that a holistic review is needed including a risk assessment of the alternatives, in time for further discussion at ICANN62. The assessment should include then current information related to the RFC 8145 trust anchor reports, the prognosis for availability of the in-development IETF ?sentinel? mechanism and the potential for using the sentinel mechanism to create a greater level of comfort prior to the KSK rollover.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (KSK) Rollover Process and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+Workspace%3A+Plan+to+Restart+the+Root+Key+Signing+Key+%28KSK%29+Rollover+Process). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0406-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11365	ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests	4/2/18	The ALAC thanks the ICANN organization for the extended opportunity to provide comments to the the Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure") for ICANN to consider 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	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/community-gtld-change-procedure-2018-02-14-en). As this will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC032	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-en.pdf	RSSAC032: Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation	3/28/18	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.1 The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation. The RSSAC requests that the independent examiner reviews their stated concerns and applies them in the formulation of independent examiner's recommendations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 24 April 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0318-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/11229	ALAC Statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five- Year Operating Plan Update	3/15/18	This is the ALAC's statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.	Closed	The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement 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/fy19-budget-2018-01-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0218-01-01-EN	https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+Workspace%3A+Proposed+Incremental+Changes+to+the+ICANN+Meetings+Strategy?preview=/74587520/79434246/AL-ALAC-ST-0218-01-01-EN.pdf	ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy	2/8/18	This is the ALAC statement 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC statement 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. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC031	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf	RSSAC031: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures	2/2/18	On 14 September 2017, the co-chairs of the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures requested inputnfrom RSSAC, SSAC, the Office of the CTO and the Global Domains Division on root scaling. This is the RSSAC's response.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures request for input on root scaling. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0118-04-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10515	Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction	1/21/18	This is the ALAC 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.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC's comment on Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/recommendations-on-icann-jurisdiction-2017-11-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0118-03-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10497	Recommendations to Improve ICANN's Office of Ombudsman (IOO)	1/21/18	This statement is the ALAC's comment on Recommendations to Improve ICANN's Office of Ombudsman (IOO): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ioo-recs-2017-11-10-en	Closed	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/ioo-recs-2017-11-10-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0118-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10507	Recommendations to Improve ICANN Staff Accountability	1/19/18	This statement is the ALAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 (WS2) draft recommendations on ICANN Staff Accountability: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-recs-2017-11-13-en.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 (WS2) draft recommendations on ICANN Staff Accountability: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-recs-2017-11-13-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0118-05-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10599	Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team ? New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations	1/15/18	This statement is the ALAC's comment on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team ? New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-recs-2017-11-27-en.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC's comment on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team ? New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-recs-2017-11-27-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC100	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-100-en.pdf	SAC100: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling	12/22/17	The SSAC welcomes this opportunity to provide input on the issues related to root scaling. The SSAC understands the working group?s request on 14 September 2017 to be: 1. whether the limitations on delegations per annum (1000 / year) could be revisited given the results of the Continuous Data-driven Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) study and if so, what guidance can the SSAC provide to maintain the security and stability of the root; 2. suggestions on ways that might mitigate potential issues in the event the working group recommends to increase the maximum annual delegation rate; and 3. inputs on the total number of TLDs that could be delegated without negative impact to root server performance.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that SAC100 is the SSAC's response to the 14 September 2017 request from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group regarding root scaling. The SSAC's response contains four recommendations to the Working Group based on the review of past SSAC advisories on root scaling (SAC042, SAC046), reports on root scaling (Root Scaling Study Team Report, TNO?s Root Scaling Study, ICANN?s Summary Report) and the CDAR study. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 3 January 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 18 January 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC099	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf	SAC099: SSAC Response to the ICANN Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) Guidelines Working Group	11/17/17	Response from the SSAC to the IDN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter that raised a question around ?not-authoritative? records constrained to comply with IDNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The SSAC recommends that for normal infrastructure records and other records identifying hosts: It should be either: 1) a traditional label, ASCII letters, digits, and the hyphen with the further restrictions that a hyphen cannot appear at the beginning or end of the string or adjacent to another hyphen, or 2) a valid A-label complying with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 (also known as IDNA2008) and their successors, and not in any way dependent on mapping These records should be used without delegated variants, other variations, and, insofar as one can control it, any infrastructure records that create a referral, such as CNAME or DNAME records pointing into or out of the Fully Qualified Domain Name, even if the DNS protocol or other procedures allows those mechanisms.	Closed	The ICANN org understands that SAC099 is a response from the SSAC to the IDN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter that raised a question around ?not-authoritative? records constrained to comply with IDNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The IDN Implementations Guidelines WG has opened a second public comment to get general feedback as well as the response to some specific queries: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-10-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 1 December 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 18 January 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC030	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-030-04nov17-en.pdf	RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Sources	11/4/17	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.	Closed	ICANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions operator necessary for identifying the DNS root servers. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R1)	11/2/17	I. Develop 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	Phase 4 | Implement	The Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team previewed new Announcements and Blog pages on feedback.icann.org in October 2018. Work on the authoring and content model in the document management system has begun and several content types have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R2)	11/2/17	II. Produce easily understandable executive summaries, key points and synopses (using e.g. infographs, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information) for all relevant issues, processes and activities, so that also non-expert stakeholders will be able to (a) quickly determine if a particular issue is of concern to them and (b) if yes, to participate in the policy process easily and effectively, on equal footing with other stakeholders. This should be done at least, but not only, before putting issues up for public comment. Attention should be paid to using plain English (and if possible translations into other languages) in order to allow non-English native speakers to understand the issues;	Phase 4 | Implement	On 9 February 2018, the ICANN Board sent a letter to Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC, regarding this joint ALAC-GAC advice. Please see the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-greenberg-09feb18-en.pdf. The letter also refers to the GAC scorecard, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-abudhabi60-gac-advice-scorecard-04feb18-en.pdf.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC029	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17-en.pdf	RSSAC029: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop	10/24/17	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fifth RSSAC workshop held hosted by the University of Maryland in early October.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is a brief discussion on each of the apolitical mind map components developed in the previous workshop, and a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) fifth workshop held from October 10th to 12th. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 10 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC000v3	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf	RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures	10/23/17	These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.	Closed	ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This documents how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 10 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC098	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf	SAC098: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2)	10/4/17	The SSAC sent a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/diaz-to-atallah-03oct17-en.pdf) to the ICANN Board on 3 October 2017, regarding the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted advice to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The SSAC has serious concerns that the SSR2 effort may fail bringing a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The SSAC believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. SSAC recommendation: The ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community should take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSR2 Review Team instructing the team to pause all work related to the review, excepting only planned engagement meetings at ICANN 60 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-ssr2-28oct17-en.pdf). On 7 June 2018 ICANN Org announced the formal restart of the SSR2 Review with four additional Review Team members (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2018-06-07-en).
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-4	8/3/17	Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response 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 benefit. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DO=1. 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 a priming specific single signature over the entire priming set (NS, A, AAAA, DNSKEYs). 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 KSK + ZSK scheme ? Effects of leaving the Additional section in priming responses empty	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean 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 protocol 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 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-1	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	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-2	8/3/17	Conduct 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 org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to 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 DO bit are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-3	8/3/17	Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org 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 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-5	8/3/17	The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC 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 a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. The root server addresses should be signed in a way that reduces the potential for operational breakage. ? Because 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. This can be done using delegation or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root-servers? A/AAAA RRsets 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 (5.3), 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 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org 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 a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. ? Because 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 (5.3), 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 1/17/18.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0717-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9983	Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps	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 At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the comments of our members as well of 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.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this the ALAC Statement on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. The respective public comment period closed on 7 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/whois-privacy-law-2017-05-03-en). This statement was included in the report of public comments, which was published on 28 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-whois-privacy-law-28jul17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0617-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9985	ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights	6/21/17	As the primary organizational home within ICANN for the voice and concerns of the individual Internet user, the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) treats respecting Human Rights a very important topic. The ALAC therefore commends the Subgroup?s participants and rapporteur on the work done regarding the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights? Core Value that is now part of ICANN?s bylaws. Some of its members have provided earlier input, and the ALAC is very pleased to see the high-quality draft FoI that has been submitted by the Subgroup. The ALAC hereby wants to state publicly that, when looking at the draft FoI, it has no concerns when it comes to the interests of Internet end-users. Obviously the ALAC will have to review and decide whether to formally approve the final version of the FoI for Human Rights when it is delivered.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands 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 16 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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC027	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-027-16jun17-en.pdf	RSSAC027: May 2017 Workshop Report	6/16/17	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop will soon yield advice and a statement on this theme. It is evident that a future model is evolving. The content generated during this workshop will inform future RSSAC advice to the ICANN community.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability and that this workshop will soon yield advice and a statement on this theme. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding approved by the RSSAC on 23 June 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to consider revising the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default, for example by allowing subscriptions to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber?s access at any time.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zone files. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product road map for future system enhancements. A target completion date is not yet available, but a more substantive update should be available in 1QFY2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-2	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to adjust the zone file access subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate the implementation of Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org is targeting to send necessary notification to the Subsequent Procedures WG in Q1 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN?s expectations with respect to zone file access (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). During CZDS platform migration, a new feature was added to provide an option to the registry operators to automatically approve a request as soon as it is received. Adoption rate of 38% percent of TLDs helped reduce the number of complaints due to delays.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-4	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the public reporting for Webbased WHOIS query statistics (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org is targeting publication of educational materials to help registry operators report zone file access and web-based WHOIS query statistics more accurately, according to well-defined standards by the end of Q2 2019.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-06-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9977	ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability	6/1/17	This is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The ALAC supports the general direction of the recommendations, but does offer the following specific comments. 1. The "best practices", one by one, each make sense. However, together the ALAC has concerns about the impact on groups remembering that these are all volunteers with often relatively minimal staff support. Accountability is important, but a fully accountable group that does nothing other than be accountable has no value within ICANN. 2. The ALAC supported the original position of the SOAC-Accountability Working Group to not pursue the accountability roundtable. That was overruled by the CCWG. As currently proposed there is a high likelihood that it will become a meaningless exercise taking up valuable time at ICANN meetings with little benefit. That notwithstanding, if the decision is made that it should be kept, further thought needs to be given to exactly what it will do and what its aims are. 3. The ALAC does not support the explicit incorporation of AC/SO best practices reviews into the ATRT scope. The periodic organizational reviews are a more appropriate opportunity to do such reviews. If a future ATRT chooses to do such a review, it is already wholly within its scope and prerogative.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 26 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 July 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-04-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-07-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9979	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of .NET Registry Agreement	5/30/17	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 support Internet development.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of .NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 13 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC096	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf	SAC096: SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights	5/30/17	This is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC wishes to thank the Human Rights Sub-Group for its enormous effort over a significant period of time and for this excellent report. The SSAC provided previous input to the Human Rights Sub-Group in SAC092: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights3 and thanks the CCWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are no associated security and stability aspects, the SSAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC notes that, as a Chartering Organization of the CCWG-Accountability, formal SSAC approval of the final version of the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 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-hr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-1	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN Organization understands recommendation 1 of SAC095 to mean that the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji. This understanding was confirmed by the SSAC on 18 August 2017. The ICANN Board considered this item at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e. The Board directed the ICANN to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-2	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN Organization understands recommendation 2 of SAC095 to mean that the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The ICANN Organization also understands recommendation 2 to mean that the SSAC advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected. This understanding was confirmed by the SSAC on 18 August 2017. The ICANN Board considered this item at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e. The Board directed the ICANN to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-04-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9967	ALAC Statement on the GNSO Community Comment 2 (CC2) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process	5/23/17	[Public Comment Statement] The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reviewed and provided its statement on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the GNSO's Policy Development Process Working Group that is evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations. The statement is organized by Work Track [1 - 4] Questions. Work Track 1 Brief: ALAC sees few benefits to further new gTLD expansion. It believes there may be some benefits to an RSP programme. Support for new gTLD round contingent on improved Applicant Support Programme. Guidebook should be improved from lessons learned. Work Track 2 Brief: ALAC largely supports proposals of Track 2. Support for Registry Agreement for level playing field and understanding of requirements for all gTLDs. Support for inclusion of commitments made by applicants to be enforceable via Registry Agreement. Guidebook should include all restrictions on names and of strings. Work Track 3 Brief: ALAC notes string confusion, singular/plural, community applications and objections and independent objector need to be reviewed. Support for preferential pricing. CPE is reasonable process if properly implemented Work Track 4 Brief: Support for single character IDN TLDs but consideration of additional safeguards. Universal Acceptance is important to promotion of equal and consistent domain name acceptance.	Closed	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. The Working Group will review and integrate public comments received in developing its recommendations for inclusion in its Initial Report. (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-03-22-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC094	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf	SAC094: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2	5/22/17	This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. On 22 March 2017, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) opened a public comment forum to obtain input on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the GNSO's Policy Development Process Working Group that is evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. 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-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-03-22-en). This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9973	ALAC Statement on the Deferral of Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review	5/19/17	This is the ALAC Statement on the Deferral of Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. The ALAC supports the ccNSO request to defer their review. ICANN is overwhelmed with reviews of all kinds at the moment. If the ccNSO 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.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Deferral of Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 02 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccnso-review-deferral-2017-04-06-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9959	ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs	5/18/17	This is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has clearly gone into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT)'s analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focussed on the interests of end users of the Internet. Specifically, while increased competition may be considered as an important outcome of the new TLDs, the ALAC is focussed on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC 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 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-rt-draft-report-2017-03-07-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC093	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf	SAC093: SSAC Comments on the Draft Recommendations of the CCWGAccountability-WS2 on SO/AC Accountability	5/18/17	[Public Comment Statement] Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) provides its statement on the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 (WS2) draft recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability). It is organized by Track 1-3. Track 1: Review and develop recommendations to improve SO and AC processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture. SSAC agrees it would be beneficial to determine and implement best practices which are applicable to SSAC's structure and purpose. SSAC does not believe appropriate to incorporate a review of the extent SO/AC/Groups have implemented best practices in accountability, transparency, participation, and outreach into the scope of future ATRTs Track 2: Evaluate the proposed ?Mutual Accountability Roundtable? to assess its viability. The SSAC considers a more informal approach be adopted: exchange of views, experiences and best practices during regularly scheduled meetings between SO/AC chairs only. Track 3:Assess whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) should be applied to SO/AC activities. The SSAC agrees, IRP should not be made applicable to activities of SO/AC/Groups	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Comments on the Draft Recommendations of the CCWGAccountability-WS2 on SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A report of public comments will be published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-04-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9971	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee's Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee	5/17/17	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 out this first use of the Empowered Community powers in an open and inclusive manner by calling for input from the different Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees that form ICANN; 2. Recognizing the power the Board has to establish Committees as it believes will best suit the Board?s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee's Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 17 May 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ALAC Chair ST 28 Apr 2017	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9981	ALAC Chair Statement on the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update	4/28/17	[Public Comment Statement] In addition to the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement regarding the draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget Public Comment, the ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the document, AL-ALAC-ST-0417-03-00-EN, on behalf of the ALAC. -ALAC requests an additional travel slot for its Liaison to the GAC and that additional travel support slots to ICANN meetings be allocated to At-Large active contributors. The ALAC submission of AL-ALAC-ST-0417-03-00-EN: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9961	Closed	The ICANN organization understands the ALAC Chair submitted additional comments on behalf of the ALAC in response on the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0417-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9961	ALAC Statement on the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update	4/28/17	[Public Comment Statement] -The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reviewed the draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget and is satisfied with the ALAC and RALO Development Sessions, Cross Regional Outreach Pilot Program, and Captioning Pilot Project in the ICANN core budget. -It supports the request to extend budget for Work Street 2 in FY18 to help CCWG complete mandate -It is disappointed Document Development Pilot Project is not included in the FY18 budget - Additional comments on monthly costs for Root Zone Maintainer Agreement is not explained as well as labels for specific expenses related to IT decisions In addition, the ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the document, https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9981	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response on the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0517-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9965	ALAC Statement on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study	4/26/17	This is the ALAC's Statement on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study. The ALAC welcome the AFRICAN DNS study under ICANN strategy for Africa. It is key to understand the domain name industry issues in the region.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study. The respective public comment period closed on 7 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 May 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/africa-dns-market-study-2017-03-11-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0417-02-00	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9953	ALAC Statement on the Interim Paper Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains	4/26/17	[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC's Statement on the Interim Paper Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC appreciates the difficulties experienced by the Cross-Community Working on the Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains (CWG-UCTN) in attempting to fulfil its objective to "develop a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SOs and ACs". We make the following comments with regards to the recommendations posed in the CWG-UCTN report. The ALAC supports Recommendations 1, 2 and 4. With regard to Recommendation 3, the ALAC supports option 3(c). Any work going forward must be both inclusive and will require a process which accommodates both the ccNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) as well as the GNSO PDP governed by the ICANN Bylaws Appendix A coupled with the GNSO PDP Manual. Whether this will include a CWG or some other form of group(s) will need to be decided jointly by the ccNSO and the GNSO prior to work proceeding.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Interim Paper Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 21 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0417-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951	ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve ICANN's Transparency	4/25/17	[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC's statement on the Recommendations from the Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability) Work Stream 2 Subgroup on ICANN Transparency. ALAC and At-Large Members participated in the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 Subgroup on ICANN Transparency and the ALAC supports the recommendations in their entirety. The ALAC also provided three additional comments for consideration.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Recommendations to Improve ICANN's Transparency Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 10 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0317-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9949	ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment	3/31/17	[Public Comment Statement] This paper sets out the ALAC response to the various recommendations proposed by the ITEMS Review of the At-Large Community. Those recommendations include steps ITEMS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).	Closed	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 10 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-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	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-026-14mar17-en.pdf	RSSAC026: RSSAC Lexicon	3/13/17	The precise 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 to any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be useful 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.	Closed	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 3/22/17.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC092	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-092-en.pdf	SAC092: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights	3/12/17	The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), as a chartering organization of The Cross Community Working Group On Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWGAccountability), 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	Closed	The ICANN Organization understands that 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)	AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9933	ALAC Statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition	1/20/17	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC's input to ICANN on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers. The initiative to define and measure indicators of the technological health of all ICANN-coordinated identifiers (Identifier Technology Health Indicators - ITHI) should not be confused with the other current ?health? project that focuses on the condition of the gTLD marketplace. Nevertheless, there is a relationship between the two. The ALAC would recommend simplifying and ?de-Latinizing? the document. We fully support the basic approach rooted in SAC077, as applied to the ITHI.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 Feb 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ithi-definition-16feb17-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC091	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-091-en.pdf	SAC091: SSAC Comment on Identifier Technology Health Indicators	1/20/17	The SSAC 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.?	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC091 is the SSAC's comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators and is a response to a Call for Public Comments "on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of a name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers". There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0117-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9931	ALAC Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP)	1/10/17	[Public Comment Statement] 1. The ALAC recognizes the continued effort to maintain an up-to-date set of rules and procedures applicable to the ICANN?s 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. 3. The ALAC specifically recognizes the effort put in drafting an updated set of IRP Supplementary Procedures that address the delicate balance between due process and expedited resolution times that will help provide, both, certainty and celerity to applicants in IRP processes. 4. The ALAC recommends that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvement.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0117-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 1 February 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments is due on 29 March 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irp-supp-procedures-2016-11-28-en) 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9919	ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy	12/23/16	[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 be counter-productive, as it makes the list look like an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list, is actually 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 crosscommunity interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but to also emphasise that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behaviour or not. The other main concern is that this policy could be misused as a weapon against someone. This policy is best produced by professional HR persons who are familiar with the language and legal implications.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1216-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9913	ALAC Statement on the Continuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report	12/22/16	[Public Comment Statement] We concur with the report?s recommendations including gradual delegation of new gTLDs, continuous monitoring of the impact of new gTLDs, and continuous monitoring of the identified risk parameters as well as its recommendations regarding areas of potential risk. Additionally, special note should be taken of the report?s warning about the impact on stability of removing new gTLDs from the root. This may be an area of future research. Finally, the report notes that the report was unable to identify causes for a number of related phenomena such as the growth in the total number of queries that are sent to the root, specifically in the growth of the invalid queries which we believe should pose a concern. While acknowledging the complexity of the DNS root system, nevertheless these problems merit further research including but not limited to referral to SSAC and RSSAC as appropriate. We would recommend to explore possible provisioning of a dedicated space on the ICANN website that tracks the performance status/health of the root going forward.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the PContinuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 15 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 February 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cdar-draft-09feb17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9909	ALAC Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget	12/22/16	[Public Comment Statement] The overall budget estimates are reasonable increment figures of PTI FY17 budget, and there are no major changes on the FY18 budget when compared to the FY17 budget. Although the overall travel and meetings budget line items have increased by 42.3% from $0.4 million to $0.6 million, we think that the sub-item ?community engagement? which is proposed as $0.1 million could be increased to ensure PTI can engage with its customers and non-customers stakeholders communities. Some examples of such community engagement could be the participation in major Internet and ICT regional forums and the publication of PTI materials in multiple languages (e.g UN languages). It would be useful in the future to provide a detailed breakdown of the ICANN support functions provided to the PTI. For example, it will be useful to know the figures allocated for PTI?s Communications activities which are conducted by ICANN support functions. The total proposed figure for ICANN provided professional services to PTI is $0.3 million. We think ICANN communications could provide more support to PTI on its outreach and awareness efforts which are required.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 10 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-pti-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1	12/22/16	Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.	Phase 5 | Close Request	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2	12/22/16	Recommendation 2: The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications, ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied-for new gTLD names, such as the ?reserved names? listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the ?ineligible strings? listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. As described in RFC 6761, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined ?special? way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN?s direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of ?special use? names. What should ICANN?s response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called ?private use? names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS?until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of ?private use? names? If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?	Phase 5 | Close Request	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-3	12/22/16	Recommendation 3: Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	Phase 5 | Close Request	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-4	12/22/16	Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.	Phase 5 | Close Request	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC089	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-089-en.pdf	SAC089: SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084	12/12/16	SAC089 is the second SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC089 is the SSAC's follow up to SAC088 and is a response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1216-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9901	ALAC Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program	12/6/16	[Public Comment Statement] The outcomes of Assessment are, at best, equivocal. While there has been some expansion in registry numbers and new market entrants, only 15% of the new domains have the characteristics of primary registration. From an end user perspective, most of the resultant new registrations are speculative, defensive, unused or parked ? adding little of value to end users. And from an industry, there is no clear evidence of lower prices or more choice. Based on this Assessment, there is little evidence of benefit to end users with the introduction of new gTLDs.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-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. The respective public comment period closed on 5 December 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/files/report-comments-competitive-effects-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.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9915	ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy	11/22/16	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC recommends that concrete steps be taken for ICANN to implement a concerted outreach campaign to each government in the region, with bilateral discussions to convince governments of ICANN's willingness to work in partnership. This should be carefully timed and coordinated to precede efforts involving other stakeholders. Additionally, we suggest a greater emphasis on academia in the region. Cultivating credentialed local expertise is an important step towards building trust with governments which rely on them for advice on technical issues. Faculty at universities enjoy a level of trust and are frequently called upon to support policymakers? decisions.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-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 25 November 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-meac-strategy-25nov16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ATLAS II Report	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9917	The ATLAS II Recommendations Implementation Report	11/7/16	Endorsed by the ALAC by consensus, this ATLAS II Recommendation Implementation Report is the final deliverable of the Taskforce, which serves as a conclusion to the two-year endeavors post ATLAS II. The completion of the ATLAS II Recommendation implementation and the submission of this Report does not imply the end of their relevance. Quite the contrary, ATLAS II Recommendations have been deeply ingrained in the mission of the AtLarge Community and incorporated in its ongoing activities to further the aforementioned goals in the Declaration. There is also a growing recognition that ICANN is behooved to move in the direction pointed by the ATLAS II output. Such recognition has been reflected in ICANN Staff departments? efforts and commitments in collaborating with the At-Large Community, fulfilling the requirements in the Recommendations, and ensuring that they have a lasting impact.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this ATLAS II Report is ALAC's Implementation Report. The report was provided to the ICANN Board on 7 November 2016, at ICANN57 (https://icann572016.sched.com/event/8cym). There is no further action required of the 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC088	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf	SAC088: SSAC Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084	11/6/16	SAC088 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC088 is the SSAC's response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. The SSAC states it will continue to study the ccNSO document and provide complete feedback within four weeks. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC023	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC023: History of the Root Server System	11/4/16	A report to the Internet community from the RSSAC. The RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023 is RSSAC's report to the community on the organization history of the root server system and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC024	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC024: Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators	11/4/16	An Advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. RSSAC001 and RFC 7720 are considered as starting points; alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethos, etc) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not address herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC025	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC025: RSSAC October 2016 Workshop Report	11/4/16	Overview of RSSAC's third workshop (October 11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the mind map constructed during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.	Closed	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, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC085	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-085-en.pdf	SAC085: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC086	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf	SAC086: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures -- Seeking Community Comments	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures -- Seeking Community Comments	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC087	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-087-en.pdf	SAC087: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services ? Second Outreach	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services ? Second Outreach	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC022	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-newgtld-06oct16-en.pdf	RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures	10/6/16	Response to 9 June 2016 input request from PDP Working Group on the new gTLDs Subsequent Procedures regarding overarching questions (as part of the Group?s first Community Comment process). RSSAC does not have any input on those overarching questions. RSSAC does not foresee any technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. If the approach to future TLD expansion significantly changes, the RSSAC would like to be consulted. RSSAC advises root zone management partners and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service. Similarly, ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registries so that it can delay their addition to the root zone in case of root name service instabilities.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, for which the RSSAC does not have any input and does not foresee technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9867	ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta)	9/10/16	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC welcomes the publication of this first set of gTLD Marketplace Health Index. 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 ? the ones who pay ? so we should find ways to get more insight on their needs and behaviours. 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 (registries and registrars) but the market share of each one, for different TLDs or families of TLDs. And symmetrically, the count of the number of TLDs should include their market share too. In addition, statistics per country/region would be welcome in Figure 19. Trust/Accuracy of WHOIS Records: Rather than as a pie chart, a line/bar graphic showing the ongoing accuracy on a quarter by quarter basis would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per top level domain 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 registrars are, voluntarily or involuntarily, deaccredited. Was that due to high ICANN fees, noncompliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc? The ALAC absolutely supports the further proposals of metrics on page 14 and 15 of the report.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-beta-23sep16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ALAC Policy Issue Report	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9895	At-Large Community Policy Issues - Why End Users Should Care	9/10/16	The purpose of this document is twofold. Firstly, it outlines the key policy issues of the At-Large community. Secondly, it sets out why end users should care about the specific policy issues. Issues: - WHOIS/Registration Directory Services - IANA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDNs - New gTLDs - Public Interest - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency - ICANN Operations/Finances - Reviews at ICANN - Engagement & Outreach	Closed	The ICANN organization understands the ALAC Policy Issue Report is ALAC's report on the At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalia Abdul Rahim on 10 September 2016 (https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+At-Large+Community+Policy+Issues+-+Why+End+Users+Should+Care+Workspace). There is no further action required of the 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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC021	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-021-statement-unavailability-single-root-server-08sep16-en.pdf	RSSAC021: RSSAC Statement Concerning The Impact of the Unavailability of a Single Root Server	9/8/16	The RSSAC?s answer of whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system. Based on information available as of the statement, loss of a single root server would not cause immediate stability issues for the root server system and the Internet that depends upon it.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 is RSSAC's statement regarding the question of whether the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC084	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf	SAC084: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process	8/31/16	SSAC Comments on Guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9869	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process	8/24/16	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC strongly supports the Working Group?s specified observations on the process around confusing similarity of IDN ccTLDs. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group?s ?suggested way forward?. The ALAC congratulates the EPSRP Working Group for making significant, positive impact on the overall ICANN policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. The ALAC believes that the proposed guidelines will help promote linguistic diversity, mitigate the risk of user confusion, and preserve and ensure the security, stability, and interoperability of the DNS.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 July 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-epsrp-guidelines-08sep16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9829	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review	8/6/16	[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC's Statement on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review. The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review. The ALAC believes that the Fellowship Program is one of the best methods for attracting and integrating dedicated younger generation participants into the ICANN Community. The At-Large Community, in particular, has greatly benefited from the contributions of Fellowship alumni.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review. The respective public comment period closed on 29 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 on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC083	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-083-en.pdf	SAC083: SSAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement	7/15/16	Dotless Domains: The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) provides a brief comment on the Proposed Amendments to Base New Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreement. Specifically, Section 1.2 of Exhibit A (Approved Services) introduces new text relating to the potential provision of non-delegation records in a TLD's apex, thereby introducing unnecessary ambiguity regarding the permissibility of dotless domains.	Closed	ICANN staff understands SAC083 provides SSAC's comments on draft proposed amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The Public Comment period for the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-amend-new-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en) 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 approval of the Registries Stakeholder Group (according to the process defined in Section 7.6 of the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement) and the ICANN Board of Directors. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9815	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement	6/30/16	[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC's statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.	Closed	The 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 25 June 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 July 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-expected-standards-revisions-11jul16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC020	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-client-reliability-root-dns-28jun16-en.pdf	RSSAC020: RSSAC Statement on Client Side Reliability of Root DNS Data	6/28/16	RSSAC confirms that the operators of the root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace The RSSAC fully supports the IAB's viewpoints expressed in RFC 2826. The RSSAC reiterates its support for integrity protecting protocols such as DNSSEC.	Closed	The 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 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC019	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-workshop-26jun16-en.pdf	RSSAC019: RSSAC Workshop 2 Report	6/26/16	Overview of RSSAC's second workshop (May 11-12, 2016). The RSSAC continued upon its previous workshops and deliberated theses, including accountability, continuity, operational and organizational evolution. The work was framed around Architecture, Evolution and Reinveting RSSAC. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted during the two day effort.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC019 is RSSAC's report on its second workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and operational and organization 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0616-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9817	ALAC Statement on the Request for Input - Next-Generation RDS to replace WHOIS PDP	6/10/16	[Public Comment Statement] Without taking away from the importance of the documents, we suggest that the Working Group focus on more critical documents, including: - The latest WHOIS Policy Review Team Final Report 2012 - SAC Reports 054, 055 and 058: - 2013 RAA and 2014 New gTLD Registry Agreement - Relevant RFCs - The latest documents from the EU on data protection, particularly the latest Directive/Regulation - The EWG Final Report, together with additional statements by EWG members The WG must, at a minimum and by Full Consensus, address the following question: - Should the domain name ecosystem capture, collect and curate personal data elements for a valid domain name registration transaction? - Should ICANN compel the capture, collection and the curation of certain specific personal data elements of the domain name registration transaction? Specifically, the Working Group should identify all data that ICANN requires to be collected. This data, together with other data, can potentially be of concern to individual users. With the increasing use of data analytics, a great deal of information about people can be gained by analysing data from a variety of sources in combination with other data.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0616-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Request for Input - Next-Generation RDS to replace WHOIS PDP. The input was provided to the GNSO on 10 June 2016 for consideration (https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Outreach+request+%231+-+input+received). 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC082	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-082-en.pdf	SAC082: SSAC Response to the Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round	6/3/16	On 13 May 2016, the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures requested input from the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituencies seeking assistance in building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. Several SSAC reports and advisories consider topics or issues related to new TLDs, such as SAC045, SAC062, and SAC066 in relation to domain collision issues. You can review a list of our publications here as an indexed list and also by category. The SSAC is looking forward to reviewing Working Group documents as the work progresses and also is prepared to answer specific questions as needed for the Working Group?s deliberations.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is SSAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input on building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC081	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-081-en.pdf	SAC081: SSAC Response to Request for Input on Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP)	5/25/16	SSAC response to the working group request for input to better inform the policy development process	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC081 is SSAC's response to a call for input by the GNSO Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP Working Group. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ALAC Statement New Bylaws	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9797	ALAC Statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws	5/21/16	[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 21 May 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 25 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0416-03-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9787	ALAC Statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update	4/30/16	[Public Comment Statement] The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reviewed the draft FY17 Operating Plan & Budget, and found it generally well done, with more clarity compared to the ones in previous years. We especially appreciate the planning process that has evolved year over year. We do hope that for the upcoming years, 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.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-03-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-06jun16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Multi-Year F2F Meetings	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9799	Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings	4/30/16	[Public Comment Statement] Although the funding process has evolved as has general ICANN budgeting, the GAs have been funded through the Community Special Budget Request Process, and the Summits through special requests to the Board Finance Committee. The pattern of GAs and Summits is now well established and there is a general appreciation of their benefits among the ICANN Community. The ALAC is proposing that ICANN integrate these meetings into its normal planning and budgeting processes and do so in such a way as to allow these meetings to be scheduled and planned over multiple years, much as ICANN meetings themselves are planned ahead of time.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-06jun16-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 1	4/25/16	Item 1: The ICANN Compliance Department should publish data about the security breaches that registrars have reported in accordance with the 2013 RAA.	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 2	4/25/16	Item 2: A provision similar to 2013 RAA paragraph 3.20 should be incorporated into all future registry contracts, with similar statistics published.	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 3	4/25/16	Item 3: Future RAA deliberations should encourage stronger authentication practices, specifically the use of multi-factor authentication.	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4	4/25/16	Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registries based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable parties 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.	Phase 4 | Implement	A training session for Credential Management Lifecycle has been scheduled for GDD Industry Summit in May 2019 (https://www.icann.org/gddsummit). A community volunteer team with expertise in credential management has drafted an introductory material. The team is soliciting feedback on the draft from the technical community including SSAC.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0416-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9769	ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group	4/23/16	[Public Comment Statement] The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) appreciates the excellent work done by the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The improvement this final report brings is appreciated. The origin of the ICANN Geographic Regions was the need to ensure a geographic diversity within the ICANN Board. We strongly believe that the Geographic Regions review should address that very aspect to preserve and improve the geographic diversity in the ICANN Board composition. The ALAC agrees that the general principle of geographic diversity is valuable and should be preserved and that its application must be more rigorous, clear and consistent.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-02-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The respective public comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC080	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-080-en.pdf	SAC 080: SSAC Approval of CCWG-Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations	4/21/16	The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), in its capacity as a Chartering Organization of the ICANN Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability, received an invitation on 23 February 2016 to consider and approve the Working Group?s Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations.1	Closed	SAC080 is informational and there are no actionable items for the Board within that document.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0416-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9779	ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups	4/16/16	[Public Comment Statement] For many years, the ALAC has been a supporter of the need to remove barriers that result in silos within ICANN's communities. The ALAC has supported the creation of Cross Community Working Groups (interchangeably referenced as CCWGs or CWGs) for this very reason. Historically, the ALAC has taken part in many such initiatives: ? Cross Community Working Group on Morality and Public Order (Rec 6) ? Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs ? Joint SO-AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS-WG) ? Joint DNS Security and Stability Working Group (DSSA-WG) ? Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance ? Cross Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition ? Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Having been a co-Chartering Organization of several of these Cross Community Working Groups, the ALAC is well aware of the diverse requirements and the current lack of unity regarding the chartering process and framework by which those groups operate. The Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups, as proposed by the ?CCWGPrinciples? is therefore welcomed to increase efficiency in the process of chartering these working groups and to reduce the potential for ambiguity and time lost in finding a consensus on internal processes. The ALAC must however call attention to a number of important points that warrant further discussions.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-framework-principles-draft-06may16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-CO-0216-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9783	ALAC Advice regarding the Long-Standing Issue of the Sensitive TLDs Classified as Category 1, Safeguard 1-8 in the GAC Beijing Communique	3/18/16	ALAC believes that the Board has all of the requisite authority to call on the community to establish the said ?Review Committee? based upon the fact that this is a specific PICs implementation issue that was called for by the GAC in their ICANN 46 Beijing Communiqué, as well as in every related Communiqué since then.	Closed	The ICANN Board considered this advice at ICANN55, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT-RT) and the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group (GNSO PDP WG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2012 application round of the New gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked the CCT-RT and the GNSO PDP WG to review the concerns of the ALAC in the course of their work (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-zuck-et-al-21mar16-en.pdf).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC079	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-079-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Changing Nature of IPv4 Address Semantics	3/17/16	The SSAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4) addresses caused by the increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPv4 addresses.	Closed	SAC079 is primarily information and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: ? Network operators should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. ? Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. are not directed at the Board, thus there are no actionable items in SAC079 for the ICANN Board or staff.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC018	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-icg-ccwg-accountability-10mar16-en.pdf	RSSAC018: RSSAC Statement on the Transmission of the ICG and CCWG-Accountability Proposals	3/10/16	The RSSAC congratulates the Internet stakeholder community for the transmission of the proposals, from the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group and the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, to the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration via the ICANN Board of Directors	Closed	The ICANN Organization understands RSSAC018 is RSSAC's statement congratulating the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group and the CCWG on the Transmission of the ICG and CCWG-Accountability proposals to the NTIA and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC078	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-078-en.pdf	Advisory on Uses of the Shared Global Domain Name Space	3/7/16	SSAC has formed a work party to investigate the implications of this work as it pertains to the security and stability of the DNS. This work party will study the security and stability issues associated with multiple uses of the domain name space.	Closed	ICANN staff understands SAC078 is informational. There are no actionable items in SAC078 for the ICANN Board or staff.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC076	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-076-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability 3rd Draft Proposal	2/8/16	SSAC comments on the CCWG?A Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations in the Public Comment Forum that opened on 30 November 2015 and is scheduled to close on 21 December 2015, specifically on those aspects that are related either to security and stability or to the manner in which SSAC functions as an Advisory Committee of ICANN.	Closed	SAC 076 provides SSAC's comments on on the third draft proposal from the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC017	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-scope-04feb16-en.pdf	RSSAC017: RSSAC Statement of Work and Scope for RSSAC002 v3	2/4/16	The RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC002 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC002v2 was published on 26 January 2016.1 While working on the v2 updates, a number of more substantial issues came to light, but were postponed. At this time the RSSAC wishes to address these other issues and again update RSSAC002. It requests Duane Wessels to lead a caucus work party to produce version 3 of RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC caucus procedures.	Closed	The ICANN Organization understands RSSAC017 describes RSSAC's scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0116-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9757	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow Updates	1/31/16	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC would like to register its extreme dismay and dissatisfaction with the current state of this project. Specifically: 1.The prime rational for the PDP and prime recommendation of the PDP was the move to a Thick Whois (now RDDS); 2.The Implementation Review Team acknowledges that this, now identified as ?Phase 3?, has an independent timeline from the other phases. 3.The current proposal includes no plan and no target date for this prime requirement, but rather has focused on ancillary PDP recommendations.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0116-02-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow Updates. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC077	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal	1/28/16	The (SSAC) comments on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal in the 17 November 2015 Public Comment Forum support SSAC member Greg Aaron, in his personal capacity, and expands on some of his comments and offer others.	Closed	These comments are provided by SSAC as part of the normal public comment period on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal and that SSAC intends for those comments to be folded into a staff action report or staff briefing. If Board action is required, then that action will happen only in accordance with the normal public comment process from various stakeholders.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-1 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	Outreach to the CA/B forum7 and CAs, requesting that they treat applied for new gTLDs as if they were delegated TLDs as soon as possible, as well as discussing the broader implications and mitigation steps. (conducted confidentially)	Closed	This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-2 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A Disclosure Policy as informed by industry best practices for vulnerability disclosure (e.g. CERT / CC vulnerability disclosure.8 Such a policy should take into consideration that once the disclosure is public, it is trivial to exploit the vulnerability.	Closed	This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-3 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A communication plan on informing affected parties as determined by the disclosure policy.	Closed	This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines .

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-4 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A contingency plan to be executed if the vulnerability is leaked to the public prematurely, as well as a proactive vulnerability disclosure plan.	Closed	This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines .
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0116-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9755	ALAC Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars	1/23/16	[Public Comment Statement] The SSAC in its 2011 report on Domain Name Whois Terminology and Structure (SAC 051) recommended the development of replacement protocol that would provide a uniform and standard framework for accessing Domain Name Registration Data (DNRD). That framework would ?define and implement verification methods, credential services and access control capabilities?. The Board accepted SSAC recommendations and established the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG) to begin implementation of the recommendations. In its Final Report, the EWG recommended a paradigm shift whereby gTLD registration data is collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only, with some data elements being accessible only to authenticated requestors that are then held accountable for appropriate use. Therefore, while existing ICANN policies do not now require differentiated access to DNRD, it is clear from Board decisions and EWG recommendations that future ICANN policies will likely have that requirement. The Operational Profile of RDAP, therefore, should include an obligation on all gTLD registries and registrars that the basic functionality will support an authentication and authorisation framework. Specifically, the features to allow differentiated access must be required now, as part of this protocol ? even if at this stage all access seekers will be in one class - the public. In that way, when differentiated access requirements are imposed, protocol features will already be deployed to provide such access.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0116-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC016	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-workshop-07jan16-en.pdf	RSSAC016: RSSAC Workshop 2015 Report	1/7/16	During September 23?24, 2015, the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) conducted its first workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on a foundation for the future evolution of the root server system (RSS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RSS.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC016 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9747	ALAC Statement on the CCWG-Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations	12/28/15	[Public Comment Statement] Alan Greenberg's input on behalf of ALAC regarding the CCWG-Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendation.	Closed	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-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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC015	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-ccwg-accountability-ws1-draft-22dec15-en.pdf	RSSAC015: RSSAC Statement on CCWG-Accountabiltiy Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1	12/22/15	The RSSAC, composed of the root server operators and others closely involved in the operations of the DNS root services, has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1) [1] and observed the ICANN community process.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC015 is RSSAC's comment detailing that the RSSAC has no position on the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9745	ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal	12/21/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC is pleased to see the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index and has suggested further concepts that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace. However, the ALAC notes that this Health Index is restricted to the market purchasing, sale and resale of domain names under the new gTLD extensions. The ALAC reminds ICANN that users of the DNS are not solely restricted to "Consumers" as "domain name buyers and sellers". Users of the DNS total the 3.6Bn people using the Internet. They vastly outnumber domain name registrants. As a result, the ALAC Advises ICANN that the gTLD Marketplace Health Index falls short of satisfying the need for a wider DNS Health Index that would produce a set of KPIs about Internet End Users, the stability of the Name System itself and its perception by Internet End Users. ICANN should not consider that the creation of a Marketplace Health Index completely satisfies the requirements laid out in the relevant sections of the Affirmation of Commitments. The gTLD Marketplace Health Index is a step in the right direction but does not go far enough.	Closed	The ICANN organization understandsL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9725	ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report	12/10/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the New gTLD Programme Implementation Review Draft Report. We recognise that the review has been a self-assessment by ICANN staff of their execution of the processes involved at each stage of the implementation of the New gTLD Programme. The review provides a pragmatic 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 originally projected 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 noted that some areas of 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.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-ENis 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-draft-review-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC075	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf	SSAC Comments to ITU-D on Establishing New Certification Authorities	12/9/15	As it relates to webPKI, the SSAC has been following and encouraging the evolution and deployment of the DNS, DNSSEC, and DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE). The SSAC believes standards based on DANE, possibly in combination with independent industry-developed solutions such as Certificate Transparency, are the future. As such, we encourage interested parties to cooperate closely with the CA/Browser (CAB) Forum and Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).	Closed	This advice is that is not directed at the ICANN Board, but that it the SSAC's response to the 11 September 2015 liaison statement from ITU-D Study Group 2 Question 3/2. We note that the SSAC encourages interested parties to cooperate with the CAB Forum and IETF on their work related to DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE). As such, we do not believe that there are any actionable items for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9741	ALAC Statement on the Proposed implementation of GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D	12/7/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC supports the Report of the Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations of the IRTP-D. However, in discussions in the original WG and the Implementation WG, the ALAC stressed the need for clear and accessible information on both the transfer process itself and the dispute resolution mechanisms for non-compliant transfers.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-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-irtp-d-implementation-03feb16-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1115-01-00-EN	http://tinyurl.com/alacrdapadvice	ALAC Statement on the Planned Implementation of the New Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)	11/30/15	The ALAC is very concerned that the planned implementation of the new Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) may not support enhanced privacy protections proposed by the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG)... The ALAC is strongly arguing against ?voluntary? adoption of the RDAP features that allow differentiated access to registration data. While those features are not now required under existing WHOIS policies, they will most likely be required under new RDS consensus policies as recommended by the EWG. On these facts, the ALAC strongly argues that the RDAP implementation profile must include the feature set that will support differentiated access. This will ensure that when the future policies, which follow the EWG recommendations, on differentiated access to data are finalized, the protocols will be in place to ensure that these may be readily switched on and implemented.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands that this is ALAC's Statement on the Planned Implementation of the New Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP). The statement was sent to the ICANN Board on 28 November 2015. The ALAC strongly argues that the RDAP implementation profile must include the feature set that will support differentiated access. The Board responded on 21 December 2015 that the Statement would be considered via the Public Comment process. The ALAC re-submitted its comment (https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-rdap-profile-03dec15/pdfhcwKdtVLoy.pdf), which was included in the Report of Public Comments (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdap-profile-25apr16-en.pdf). There is no further action required of the Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1115-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9723	ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs	11/30/15	[Public Comment Statement] 1. 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 more focused on protecting the 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 cost 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 DisputeResolution (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. There should 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 32,667 nationally or regionally registered trademarks, 42 trademarks protected by stature or treaty, and two court-validated trademarks." These numbers amount to a little over 10% of the 2015 Year-to-date registered trademarks only in the United States Patent and Trademark Office. This, of course, is a clear signal that although the reasons are not as clear. One of the possible reasons may be the fact that there is only one provider of the service. In that sense, the ALAC recommends that the TMCH services be open to more providers so that competition will drive prices down and lower the barriers to entry for end users to this specific RPM. A single provider for the TMCH services harms the market and the end users? rights insofar its monopoly constitutes a serious barrier to access its services.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1115-02-01-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-rpm-prelim-issue-02dec15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1015-04-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9715	ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures	10/22/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC congratulates Staff in the drafting of this Preliminary Issues Report. 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 Issues Report recommendation as presented. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1015-04-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. The respective public comment period closed on 30 Oct 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9733	ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains	10/22/15	This is an input request from the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, they have chartered a Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as top-level domains (CWG-UCTN). Arguments for and against the reservation of 3-letter ccTLDs with the potential for creating much confusion amongst the user community, there was very strong agreement among the At-Large respondents that there is a need for a moratorium where a full evaluation should be made of the potential impacts of the current expansion of the existing new gTLD programme. It has also been recommended, in order to increase user confidence in navigating the enlarged domain space, that along with a time-framed moratorium, promotional and educational resources and activities related to the introduction of the new gTLDs be developed in areas (geographical, political, social, economic, etc) that were not served well in the first run.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-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 chartered 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 (https://community.icann.org/display/CWGOUCNT/Output+and+Draft+Documents) 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1015-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9711	ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules	10/16/15	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC congratulates the Task Force on Arabic Script IDNs (TF-AIDN) in developing the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules (LGR). Appreciates proposal?s focus on variant issues in Arabic to address user confusion. They encourages TF-AIDN to continue to make efforts in stimulating participation from the end user communities in supporting the IDN program. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposal-arabic-lgr-16oct15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1015-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules. The respective public comment period closed on 06 Oct 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposal-arabic-lgr-16oct15-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC073	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf	SAC073: SSAC Comments on Root Zone Key Signing Key Rollover Plan	9/30/15	In this Advisory the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) addresses the following topics: - Terminology and definitions relating to DNSSEC key rollover in the root zone; - Key management in the root zone; - Motivations for root zone KSK rollover; - Risks associated with root zone KSK rollover; - Available mechanisms for root zone KSK rollover; - Quantifying the risk of failed trust anchor update; and - DNS response size considerations.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 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-2018-10-15-en). See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0915-05-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/statement-ccwg-accountability-17sep15-en.pdf	ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Bylaws Amendments - GNSO Policy & Implementation Recommendations	9/19/15	Advises the Board to carefully monitor both issues set forth in the statement to ensure that user and public interests are appropriately considered and that the implementation of complex policy can be accomplished in reasonable time-frames.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period on the CCWG Accountability's Second Draft Report (Work Stream 1): https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-13oct15-en.pdf). The public comments were considered in the finalization of the CCWG - Accountability's Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. On 10 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 report: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#2.c
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0915-04-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9700	ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability 2nd Draft Report (Work Stream 1)	9/17/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC preference was to have less ?enforceability? and a lighter-weight proposal than preferred by some other groups in ICANN, we believe that the overall direction now being taken is acceptable. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-13oct15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-04-01-EN is ALAC's statement on Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability 2nd Draft Report (Work Stream 1) . The respective public comment period closed on 12 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-13oct15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1015-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9719	ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper	9/15/15	[Public Comment Statement] - We recommend that the drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons per chartering SO/AC and with representation from all SO/ACs that indicate an interest. - Any charter reported broadly: 1) affirms the principles of openness and transparency , 2) embraces the concept that the use be in tune with the ICANN Strategic Plan; and 3) must favour extending the global public interest in concrete ways and endowing the Affirmation of Commitments Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1015-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper . The respective public comment period closed on 08 Nov 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9683	ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making	9/9/15	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC provide community input into the Initial Report from 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: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making. The respective public comment period closed on 07 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-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.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9729	ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal	9/8/15	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC response to IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. Answers questions concerning the Proposal as a Whole, the NTIA Criteria, and the ICG Report and Executive Summary List of Public Comments: https://www.ianacg.org/calls-for-input/iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-public-archive-of-submitted-comments/ including ICANN Board Comment on the ICG Proposal: https://comments.ianacg.org/pdf/submission/submission121.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal . The respective public comment period closed on 08 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department?s National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community was released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/IANA-transition-proposal-v9.pdf). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Recieved during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 30 Nov 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/Public-Comment-Summary-final.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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9682	ALAC Statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report	9/6/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC strongly supports the research and recommendations in the Preliminary Issue Report. We are particularly impressed by the report?s clear, coherent summary of the milestone policy development activities, studies, and implementation efforts pertaining to WHOIS. Report of Public Comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rds-pdp-07oct15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization 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 07 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rds-pdp-07oct15-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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC014	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-iana-stewardship-04sep15-en.pdf	RSSAC014: Comment to "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..."	9/4/15	The Root Server System Advisory Committee, composed of the root server operators and others closely involved in the operations of the DNS root, has reviewed the ICG plan and observed the ICANN community process that has led to it.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC014 is RSSAC'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 RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC003	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-003-root-zone-ttls-21aug15-en.pdf	RSSAC003: RSSAC Report on Root Zone TTLs	8/21/15	To address the DNSSEC problems identified in Section 6.4, the RSSAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners to increase the signature validity periods for signatures generated by both the KSK and the ZSK. KSK signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 13 days.	Closed	Letter sent to Board on 23 April re: close (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/davies-to-chalaby-23apr18-en.pdf). RSSAC notified via ARR Tool as well.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9686	ALAC Statement on the Draft Report: Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization	8/10/15	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC response to on the Draft Report published by Westlake Governance, the independent examiner appointed by the Structural Improvements Committee of the ICANN Board for the review of the Generic Names Support Organization (GNSO). The statement outlines ALACs response to 36 proposed recommendations. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gnso-review-draft-26aug15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Draft Report: Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization . The respective public comment period closed on 31 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 27 Aug 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gnso-review-draft-26aug15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9689	ALAC Statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report	7/16/15	[Public Comment Statement] Response to the following questions of the Initial Report of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Report: - When must contact requests to the customer be forwarded to the P/P customer? - Should or must the provider forward a further request(s), at whose costs and should there be a limit on the number of requests? - Should it be mandatory for accredited P/P service providers to comply with express requests from LEA in the provider?s jurisdiction not to notify a customer? - Should there be mandatory publication for certain types of activity e.g. malware/viruses or violation of terms of service relating to illegal activity? - What (if any) should the remedies be for unwarranted Publication? - Should requestors be allowed to escalate every request to a 3rd party forum or should the WG develop standards and thresholds? Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ppsai-initial-11sep15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report . The respective public comment period closed on 07 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 Sep 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ppsai-initial-11sep15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9687	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews	7/16/15	[Public Comment Statement] ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-aoc-org-reviews-05aug15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 Jul 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-aoc-org-reviews-05aug15-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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC013	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-root-servers-work-statement-09jul15-en.pdf	RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for "History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers"	7/9/15	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers. The document will: 1) Document the technical history of the names 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 should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-SERVERS.NET zone; 3) Consider the impact on the priming response of including DNSSEC 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 made, and what those changes should be.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC013 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers 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 RSSAC in May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ALAC Motion 25 Jun 2015	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9731	ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)	6/25/15	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	Closed	The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). A Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) was released on 11 June 2015 (https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53779816) and there is no further 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC072	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-072-en.pdf	SAC072: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Relating Functions Proposal	6/24/15	This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the ICANN community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands SAC072 is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG Naming Relating Functions Proposal confirming that the proposal satisfies the recommendations in SAC069. There is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0615-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9621	ALAC Statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1)	6/11/15	[Public Comment Statement] In general the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CCWG and will provide guidance on a number of issues, some of which the CCWG is explicitly seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-19aug15-en.pdf	Closed	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 (CCWG-Accountability) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1) . The respective public comment period closed on 12 Jun 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 Aug 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-19aug15-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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC071	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf	SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements	6/8/15	Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems". SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 10 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#2.c.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC012	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-ccwg-accountability-ws1-draft-05jun15-en.pdf	RSSAC012: RSSAC Public Comment on CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Draft Report	6/5/15	RSSAC Comments on the Accountability Draft Proposal	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC012 is RSSAC's comment on the Accountability Draft Proposal and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and a report was released on 19 August 2015 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-2015-05-04-en). ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-1 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 1: Recoginizing alternatives to the PSL have been discussed (see Appendix A), the SSAC recommends the IETF and the applications community consider them for further specifications and possible standardization through the IETF process	Closed	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 2: The IETF should develop a consensus definition of "public suffix" and other associated terminology (e.g. ?"private suffix").	Closed	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-4b Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4b: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication protocols as specifications to this work.	Closed	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-4c Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mozilla PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 5).	Closed	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4a: The Internet community should standardize the current approach to PSLs. Specifically: Recommendation 4a: ICANN, as part of its initiatives on universal acceptance, should encourage the software development community (including the open source community) to develop and distribute programming and operating system libraries implementing robust (i.e. authenticated, timely, secure, accountable) distribution mechanisms for PSLs. These libraries should be written across all common platforms and operating systems in a way as to ensure consistent and standard interpretation of a given PSL across all platforms.	Closed	The ICANN organization understanding of SAC070 R-04a is that ICANN should request that the UASG encourage 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 UASG'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 per 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 4a is now closed, as the UASG considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: R-6 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the UASG 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 per 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 UASG considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)	5/28/15	IANA should host a PSL containing information about the domains within the 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.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing IANA staff 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. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD/Suffix Lists (R-3)	5/28/15	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.	Phase 4 | Implement	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. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6491	ALAC Statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions	5/22/15	[Public Comment Statement] - As noted within the General Comments: The ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft Proposal. That being said, the ALAC does have a number of critical concerns that will need to be addressed to allow us to fully support the final CWG proposal. As detailed under the comment on section III.A.i.a, the ALAC would prefer an IANA wholly integrated into ICANN, but is willing to accept a compromise of a separate legal entity if the details of its organization and governance are satisfactory. - one very major concern that we believe must be addressed by the CWG, specifically the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight involvement and we will offer guidance as to how this might be addressed; - one area where the ALAC had not yet reached consensus, but we have some concerns over the current direction of the CWG, specifically the Board (or other controlling entity) of the Post-Transition IANA (PTI); and - a number of lesser concerns and requests for clarification. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-11jun15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 Jun 2015 (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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6501	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget	5/1/15	[Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC is satisfied with the Budget proposal as a whole, but has one specific item of concern, related to the evolution of support for ICANN Policy Development. - Both the GNSO and the ALAC?s activities are essentially funded under the ICANN Policy budget. Policy Development is a Core activity at ICANN. It is this Multistakeholder Policy Development that differentiates ICANN from any other organisation. The overall budget allocated to Policy Development and supporting the SO/ACs, including constituency travel support, is about 11.4 million US Dollars, which is surprisingly less than 10% of total budget for a Core Activity and Key differentiation factor. - The ALAC believes the growth of this budget to be too low. This concern translates directly to concerns about staffing levels. The budget indicates that 16 new staff hires are expected for FY16, yet, none of the hires seem to be in Policy Support. The ALAC forecasts a number of new PDPs, review processes, as well as a potential next round of gTLDs which will only serve to increase the demand on already busy Staff. Its Community of At-Large Structures will soon reach the 200 mark ? translating to a need for increased support of its increased activity. The ALAC is concerned that this need to increase FTEs supporting Policy both in the GNSO and in the ALAC is not currently reflected in the budget and may lead to Staff overwork, Community frustration, and a reduction in Community involvement that risks making long-term evolution of the Multistakeholder model unsustainable. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget . The respective public comment period closed on 01 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 05 Jun 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6511	ALAC Statement on the GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report	3/17/15	[Public Comment Statement] - General Comments: ALAC Generally supports the proposed principles - Working definitions (Section 3): No Comment - Policy & Implementation Principles (Section 4): Note concern when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process. Public Interest Issues should Issues should be referred back to Chartering Organisation. When policy issues involve public interest issues, involve all impacted stakeholder all impacted stakeholders. - Proposed Additional New GNSO Processes (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: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-piwg-14apr15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 Apr 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-piwg-14apr15-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.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6541	ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2	3/16/15	[Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit several million end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs are seated and active, others have been less active or inactive. - It is important that the IDN program is harmonized (in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and outreach) with the UAI. The ALAC also recommends that the UAI be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program. - MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7, but is limited to the Unicode 6.3 subset. Given the fact that Unicode 8.0 is scheduled for release in 2015, 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 LGR-1, and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once-registered names (or add more PVALID codepoints to the MSR) 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 ramifications. - The ALAC assures 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 geographies. Report of Public Comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. 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-lgr-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6521	ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement	3/12/15	[Public Comment Statement] - The evolvement of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: Registrant and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNI penetration; education at all levels is key to increasing demand and local suppliers; requirements placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints; the insurance required for registrars is a real concern for underserved regions; the second round of the new gTLD program should give preference, if not exclusivity, to applicants from underserved regions, with adequate outreach efforts. - In response to the five questions posted in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrant rights must be secured through the CGL insurance or any other mechanism(s); 2) No opinion; 3) If ICANN determines that a permanent fund reserved by ICANN and provided by the registrars based on their transaction volumes for covering any harm caused to registrants is a "best practice," registrants using registrars that do not follow the practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) If the CGL requirement is maintained, the $500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrar can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) If ICANN decides to eliminate the CGL requirement, it should be applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrant and user rights. - The elimination of the CGL requirement could be the best way to support underserved regions to participate in the DNI. Registrant rights must be secured by another mechanism Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement. 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-raa-insurance-03apr15-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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC011	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iab-liaison-rssac-16feb15-en.pdf	RSSAC011: IAB Liaison to the RSSAC	2/12/15	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 RSSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC010	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-003-scope-11feb15-en.pdf	RSSAC010: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Root Zone TTLs"	2/11/15	This statement refers back to RSSAC003 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone TTL work party to produce RSSAC003 ? RSSAC Advisory on Root zone TTLs, with adherence to RSSAC caucus procedures.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Root Zone TTLs" (RSSAC003) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0115-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6531	ALAC Statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report	1/30/15	[Public Comment Statement] As proposed in the Preliminary Recommendation #1, transformation of contact information does not have to be mandatory. However, there should be a provision for it to be maintained in two forms: a mandatory 'canonical' form in the original language, and an optional 'transformed' form after transliteration/translation. The latter should be a close approximation to the original that can be parsed, understood and used by other communities. - All ICANN databases, forms and documents should provide for capturing, displaying, storing and maintaining both the forms. - Registrars should provide Registrants with the option of entering both forms while creating new entries or editing existing entries. - In the intermediate term, transformation & validation of contact information should be taken up through collaborative efforts of Registrars and the larger ICANN community. In order to minimize costs, such transformation should be done using a combination of automated tools, crowd-sourced community efforts where possible, and encouraging Registrants to enhance their own credibility by providing information in English as well. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0115-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report. The respective public comment/reply period closed on 01 Feb 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 Feb 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0115-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6581	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20)	1/12/15	[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC proposes the following revision recommendations to the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20): - Include an assessment of the possible impact that the IANA stewardship transition may have in ICANN?s operations. - Change the wording to reflect the vision that stakeholder engagement is to be encouraged by the wide ICANN community, not just by the staff. - Include SMART implementation metrics in strategic objectives or goals where fit. - Encourage underrepresented stakeholder groups to engage with ICANN at local, regional, and international levels and to establish metrics that reflect the scope of action. - Change the wording ?most? to ?all? in the sentence ?Comprehensive regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf	Closed	The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0115-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). The respective public comment period closed on 04 Jan 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Feb 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC009	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-dnssec-validity-root-zone-17dec14-en.pdf	RSSAC009: RSSAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone	12/17/14	In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009 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. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 1: The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have been invited to submit proposals should determine 1) whether or not the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and if so which ones; 2) whether or not additional external controls are necessary for requirements that should be retained; and 3) if additional external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 5: Noting the stability and efficiency of existing structures, processes, and mechanisms for the management of the root zone, the SSAC recommends that any proposal to replace NTIA?Äôs final authorization of root zone changes with an alternative be at least as reliable, resilient, and efficient as the current process.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 4: As part of the transition process, each of the affected communities should consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of the IANA Functions might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 2a: Each of the communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms outside of the IANA Functions Contract are sufficiently robust to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable to the affected communities for the proper performance of the IANA Functions after the IANA Functions Contract expires; and if they are not, the communities should determine what additional accountability mechanisms will be needed.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 7: NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer after transition.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 3: Each of the communities should investigate and clarify the process for handling the possibility of governmental sanctions and restrictions (e.g., the protocol for obtaining OFAC2 licenses where U.S. sanctions might interfere with the ability to execute proper instructions to IANA) following the stewardship transition.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 2b: Each of the communities should review and (if necessary) enhance its policy development process to ensure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA Functions Operator are clear and implementable.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 6: Effective arrangements should be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the root zone management process post-transition, including inter-organization coordination if the post-transition RZM process involves more than one root zone management partner.	Closed	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign 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).
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC001	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-001-draft-20nov14-en.pdf	RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers	11/20/14	A defined set of service expectations that root server operators must satisfy including Infrastructure, Service Accuracy, Service Availability, Service Capability, Operational Security, Diversity of Implementation, Monitoring and Measurement, and Communication (both Inter-Operator and Public Communication).	Closed	ICANN, as operator of L-Root, has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its compliance at https://www.dns.icann.org/rssac001-response/index.html.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC002	https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rssac-publications-2014-05-12-en	RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System	11/20/14	A an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server system. 1: The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. 2: The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3: Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.	Closed	ICANN, as operator of L-Root, has implemented the advice from v1- v3 and has advised RSSAC on the implementation. RSSAC002 data has been published at: http://stats.dns.icann.org/rssac/.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC068	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-068-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the IANA Functions Contract	10/10/14	No recommendations	Closed	There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0914-01-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-12sep14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding Consideration of GAC Advice	9/12/14	The ALAC salutes the Board's continued effort on the implementation of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2. Notwithstanding, the ALAC is concerned that the proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice by the Board may derive in an unbalanced weight to the GAC's advice compared to that of the other ACs or the policies proposed by each of the SOs. Moreover, the ALAC observes a trend in the Internet Governance ecosystem that tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI has already designed a "Process for consultations between the [Board] and the [GAC]," the ALAC calls the Board to reconsider the proposed bylaws changes and continue to foster equal footing among all participants of the ICANN community. If the Board is to implement this Bylaw change, the ALAC advises the Board to fully implement recommendation 9.1 of ATRT2 in the same round of Bylaw changes. This would preserve the delicate balance of advice coming from the ALAC, SSAC and RSSAC alongside the GAC. The ALAC is confident that the Board will continue to implement the recommendations of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 in a way that safeguards the principles of the multi-stakeholder model, more specifically those that help bring balance among participants.	Closed	Considerable work has been completed on the ICANN Bylaws related to the ICANN Stewardship Transition. This work and progress can be tracked here: https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability. In addition, implementation work is underway on the ATRT2 recommendations. General information and information on progress of the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC008	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-igf-icann-accountability-02sep14-en.pdf	RSSAC008: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall During IGF 2014	9/2/14	RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | Istanbul, Turkey	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's "Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum" in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC067	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf	SSAC Overview and History of the IANA Functions	8/15/14	No reccomendations	Closed	There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (1 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases 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 suppliers should not be lowered	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (2 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 2) education at all levels is key;	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (3 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 3) the processes to become a registrar should be clarified and simplified with training and support;	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (4 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 4) the demands placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (5 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 5) the second new gTLD round should give preference to applicants from developing economies and undertake an outreach program to ensure a better understanding	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0714-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (6 of 6)	7/31/14	The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 6) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC005	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-stewardship-coordination-guidance-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC005: RSSAC Guidance to Representatives on the "NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group"	7/10/14	The RSSAC give guidance requested by its representatives on the "NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group"	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC's guidance to the Representatives on the ?NTIA IANA Functions? Stewardship Transition Coordination Group? and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC006	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-001-scope-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC006: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Service Expectations of Root Servers"	7/10/14	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Service Expectations of Root Servers"	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006 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. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC007	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-scope-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Measurements of the Root Server System"	7/10/14	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System.?	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 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. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	'The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-38)	6/26/14	R-38. ICANN should ensure that its Beginner Guides are easily accessible.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Beginner Guides are available for download on icann.org here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/beginners-guides-2012-03-06-en. ICANN is continually working to update the guides. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-10)	6/26/14	R-10. The next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of live scribing for all meetings and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes and make translation available in a timely manner.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e ICANN's Language Services team has worked to extend the interpretation and translation processes and services. See the ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+10
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)	6/26/14	R-11. ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender; cultural diversity) and user needs (disabilities, etc).	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The At-Large Accessibility Taskforce conducted a survey on accessibility to senior ICANN staff in 2015, the results of which were discussed at ICANN53 in Buenos Aires (June 2015). The implementation of a range of services is part of ICANN's strategic objectives: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10oct14-en.pdf. This is part of the Global Stakeholder Engagement team's ongoing work.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-12)	6/26/14	R-12. In collaboration with At-Large Structures, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend education programmes across underrepresented regions.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+12
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-13)	6/26/14	R-13. ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and relevance.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board?material/resolutions?2014?09?09?en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+? +Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-14)	6/26/14	R-14. ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-15)	6/26/14	R-15. ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure befitting a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-16)	6/26/14	R-16. ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+16
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-9)	6/26/14	R-9. ICANN should open regional 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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e 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: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+9
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-26)	6/26/14	R-26. 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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of ICANN's ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-27)	6/26/14	R-27. The Board must implement ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation work is underway on the ATRT2 recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program and here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/Rec+%239). In addition, this work is part of CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-28)	6/26/14	R-28. 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.	Closed	There are no actionable items for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-29)	6/26/14	R-29. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC website has been redesigned and was rolled out 24 February 2016, meeting this recommendation. This site is automatically fed with new public comment procedures, and provides a forum for ALAC members to collaborate and if desired draft statements in response to the public comment proceedings. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-30)	6/26/14	R-30. For each Public Comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-31)	6/26/14	R-31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See the ALAC Workspace for more information: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-32)	6/26/14	R-32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simpler terms.	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)	6/26/14	R-33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Webinars.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+3
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)	6/26/14	R-34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest. (R-34)	Closed	There are no actionable items for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)	6/26/14	R-35. The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e 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: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-36)	6/26/14	R-36. The At-Large Community should envisage conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en This specific advice item is in the remit of the ALAC. No action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which began on 9 Jan 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. See the meetings page here: https://community.icann.org/display/soaceinputfeedback/Event+Calendar. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+36
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-39)	6/26/14	R-39. ICANN should encourage open data? best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TTF.pdf?api=v2
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)	6/26/14	R-40. ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP), but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e On an annual basis, the CROPP 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 CROPP Page here: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=41900609. See ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+40
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)	6/26/14	R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget (https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-05mar16/msg00013.html), which 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 this topic.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)	6/26/14	R-42. ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e 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 & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)	6/26/14	R-43. RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.	Closed	There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+43

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-1)	6/26/14	R-1. ICANN should continue to support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e 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 ICANN55. The Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/Marrakech+AFRALO+NGO+Program
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-2)	6/26/14	R-2. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programmes having brought valuable members to the community.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e 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 & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)	6/26/14	R-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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2; WS1 proposal has been provided to the NTIA. WS2 still in progress: https://features.icann.org/proposal-ccwg-enhancing-icann-accountability
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)	6/26/14	R-4. ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of Liaisons between its different Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (AC/SOs) to do away with the ?Áúsilo culture?Áù.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Work specific to this advice item is complete. There is ongoing work being conducted by task forces, and there are ongoing discussions about establishing a liaison to the GAC. For updates, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+4
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-5)	6/26/14	R-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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-6)	6/26/14	R-6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the 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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC has taken steps to establish a practice for declaring conflicts of interest. See the ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+6
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)	6/26/14	R-8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.	Closed	There are no actionable items for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)	6/26/14	R-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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e ICANN's social media universe has expanded to include accounts in multiple languages and region-specific social platforms. ICANN has also revamped monthly and regional newsletters to share content in Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Turkish. Primary platform for content sharing remains icann.org, with parts of the site available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+17
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-18)	6/26/14	R-18. Support end-users to take part in policy development.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-19)	6/26/14	R-19. Eliminate barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Much has been accomplished on this specific advice item and is part of day-to-day operations at ICANN. For example, there is a new ALAC Website, there have been public comment improvements, expanded working group onboarding program, capacity building webinars, as well as RALO webinars. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)	6/26/14	R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-22)	6/26/14	R-22. 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 in clear and non-technical language.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC website has been redesigned and put online, addressing this recommendation (atlarge.icann.org). In addition, ICANN is in the final stages of publishing an updated Style Guide, which formalizes ICANN's commitment to creating content in plain English style. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+22
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-23)	6/26/14	R-23. The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-25)	6/26/14	R-25. To enhance ICANN's community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as 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.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA 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: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability R-24(a)	6/26/14	R-24(a). Both the areas of the (a) Ombudsman and (b) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Updates, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings. ICANN continues to improve the reporting data based on community feedback and mostly based on working group requests to support policy development or policy evaluations. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability R-24(b)	6/26/14	R-24(b). Both the areas of (a) Ombudsman and (b) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.	Closed	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Updates, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings. ICANN continues to improve the reporting data based on community feedback and mostly based on working group requests to support policy development or policy evaluations. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-37)	6/26/14	R-37. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki.	Phase 5 | Close Request	Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to rework the website and Wiki to ensure that our ?Policy Advice? 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 (ie ?Advice? vs ?Comment?) ? The ?End user? justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff together with At-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (as 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 ?End User Issue? 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 & Advice resource page has been created to address ?type? of document (#1). ? The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) meets weekly to discuss ?end user? justification for intervention (#2). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a Wiki visitor to peruse the work of the At-large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-7)	6/26/14	R-7. A periodic review of ICANN's MSM 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.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was discussed by the Board Organization Effectiveness Committee (OEC), which subsequently added the item to the OEC workplan: ?Holistic Assessment of ICANN structures?. The OEC agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2-Accountability should progress further, before the topic of ?holistic assessment of ICANN structures? is to be addressed. Updates on OEC?s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report ? page 8 :https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/oec-activities-19jan18-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC's consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0614-01-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-12jun14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on Board Member Compensation	6/12/14	The ALAC wishes to go on record as strongly supporting the comment submitted by Alan Greenberg - http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-bylaws-amend-compensation-02may14/msg00003.html.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-07-30-en#2.b.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.	Closed	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should in due course publish information about not yet disclosed issues.	Closed	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 1: ICANN should consider not taking any actions solely based on the JAS Phase One Report. If action is planned to be taken before the entire report is published, communications to the community should be provided to indicate this clearly.	Closed	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was not accepted, and the 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 5: ICANN should provide clarity to registries on the rules and the method of allocation of blocked names after the conclusion of the test period	Closed	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 4: ICANN should implement a notification approach that accommodates Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)-only hosts as well as IP Version 4 (IPv4)-only or dual-stack hosts.	Closed	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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 3: ICANN should perform an evaluation of potential notification approaches against at least the requirements provided by the SSAC prior to implementing any notification approach.	Closed	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 2: 'Instead of a single controlled interruption period, ICANN should introduce rolling interruption periods, broken by periods of normal operation, to allow affected end-user systems to continue to function during the 120-day test period with less risk of catastrophic business impact.	Closed	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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 1: 'The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) should expand the range of situations that would trigger an emergency response, for example national security, emergency preparedness, critical infrastructure, key economic processes, commerce, and the preservation of law and order.	Closed	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0514-02-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-16may14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem	5/16/14	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 commitments. Globalizing the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggesting accountability panels is indeed a potential way forward but only if a panel can provide recourse. The ALAC has concerns about the practical workability of this scenario but is ready to assist.	Closed	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0514-05-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-4-16may14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Identifier Technology Innovation	5/16/14	The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Identifier Technology Innovation. Indeed, the report provides valuable insights and recommendations for future identifier technology developments. ALAC is surprised that the recommendations of the Panel do not include any acknowledgement 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.	Closed	This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/identifier-technology-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0514-04-01-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-6-16may14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Multistakeholder Innovation	5/16/14	The ALAC supports the report from the Panel on Multistakeholder Innovation with some reservations. 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 concern 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 breaking 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 not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be targeted at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top level.	Closed	This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/multistakeholder-innovation-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0514-03-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/en/correspondence/statement-prf-16may14-en.pdf	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Public Responsibility Framework	5/16/14	The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a useful reminder of the ways ICANN has started to globalize its activities, but real assistance and support for participation in ICANN is a critical element in the globalization of ICANN and Internet Governance. The issue is additional funding for those unable to self fund real participation in ICANN. There may be other models for funding participation that do not rely on the 'contracted parties' model that can ensure all parties have equal seats at the table.	Closed	This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/public-responsibility-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC004	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-iana-stewardship-transition-08may14-en.pdf	RSSAC004: Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Input on "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 Functions"	5/8/14	RSSAC provides 4 comments regarding the draft proposal	Closed	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC'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 Functions", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0414-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/6891	ALAC Statement on the ICANN Future Meetings Strategy	4/21/14	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 concentrated 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 cameras 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.	Closed	This statement was provided and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution approving the new meetings strategy: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-11-17-en#2.a. The new meetings strategy was implemented in 2016.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0314-06-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27mar14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Announcement Regarding the Transition of the Stewardship of the IANA Functions	3/27/14	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 global stakeholders to develop a proposal to transition the stewardship over the IANA functions by designing a multistakeholder mechanism. We expect that the design process will be open and inclusive allowing the various communities, within and outside of ICANN, to be properly considered and taken into account by adequately incorporating and addressing their concerns and thoughts in the final outcome of this collaborative effort. The ALAC believes that the end user community has a vital role in the Internet governance ecosystem and must be a part of any process going forward. We call on ICANN leadership to ensure that any mechanism that replaces the stewardship over the IANA functions is based on enhancing the multistakeholder model, maintaining the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet's DNS, and several other principles and requirements. We commit to contributing to the process so that any outcome is a result of a bottom-up, consensus driven and multistakeholder effort in which the interests of the end users are properly taken into account.	Closed	This is a statement on the announcement by the NTIA of ending its contract with ICANN. Considerable work has been completed on the transition, which can be tracked here: https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0314-05-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-27mar14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	3/27/14	The ALAC welcomes the publication of the "Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions" study report by JAS Global Advisors but notes that at this stage, this report is incomplete. The ALAC notes the assumption on page 3 that "The modalities, risks, and etiologies of the inevitable DNS namespace collisions in the new TLD namespaces will resemble 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 .mail 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 3 sets too high a barrier for the application of emergency response options. In deeming that these responses be limited to situations which present a "clear and present danger to human life", this ignores a broad range of scenarios which may have huge 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 disruption to the smooth operation of internal networks, should be safeguarded.	Closed	On 30 July 2014, the NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. Implementation and general information about the Name Collision efforts can be found at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0314-03-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-14mar14-en.htm	ALAC Follow-up Statement on the Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions Topic: Bylaws	3/14/14	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 [PDF, 231 KB] 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 by the NomCom 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.	Closed	This is a response to a Board resolution in which the Bylaws were adopted and does not contain actionable advice: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#1.c
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0314-02-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-07mar14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Review Mechanism to Address Perceived Inconsistent Expert Determinations on String Confusion Objections	3/7/14	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 (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.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/sco-framework-principles-2014-02-11-en The NGPC provided a resolution on the expert determinations and proposed review mechanism in October 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-10-12-en#2.b

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0214-03-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-26feb14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Related-Issue Compliance Submission Process	2/26/14	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 understanding is 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 that affects multiple gTLD registrations. Just as the UDRP allows multiple related disputes to be filed in the same single complaints, CC should allow multiple, related issues to be raised in a single complaint. If such a process were created, the workload of CC could be better controlled, and substantive issues could be resolved quicker and earlier than by using today's methodology alone. It is reasonable that, at least at the start, the use of such a "related complaint" submission process be used only by those with whom ICANN can develop a good working relationship, and possibly accreditation for the existing bulk-submission tool could be used to determine who could use the new process. This recommendation is being submitted to CC on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and the ALAC believes that it is to all parties' mutual advantage that we have the opportunity to further investigate such a process with Contractual Compliance.	Closed	This topic was addressed at ICANN 49 in Singapore during the ALAC session. The Contractual Compliance Complaint system does not allow for multiple filing in the same single complaints. However, these types of complaints or issues can be submitted to the Compliance@icann.org email address, which is available for general questions or issues that are not available options on the ICANN website (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints). ICANN Contractual Compliance staff pulls data across all areas while collaborating with the contracted parties 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 team conducts focused reviews to address the issues that are presented to bring more efficiency to the process and effective resolution.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-2	2/18/14	Recommendation 2: All types of network operators should take immediate steps to prevent network address spoofing. This involves: a. Implement network ingress filtering, as described in BCP38 and SAC004, to restrict packet-level forgery to the greatest extent possible; b. Disclose the extent of their implementation of network ingress filtering to the Internet community as a means of encouraging broader and more effective use of ingress filtering.	Closed	SAC065 R-2 is directed towards network 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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3	2/18/14	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 in order to prevent abuse. b. Follow SAC008 Recommendation 3 to (1) disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and (2) only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to assist in reducing amplification vectors for DNS DDoS attacks. c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abusive use of their open resolvers so that they are not targets of abuse. This would include continuous monitoring for anomalous behavior, limiting or blocking known abuse queries (e.g., ripe.net ANY); tracking likely target victim IPs (attacks reported or addresses of heavily targeted servers) and restricting or disallowing responses to those IPs; and sharing information with similar operators to coordinate efforts to quell such attacks.	Closed	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4	2/18/14	Recommendation 4: Authoritative DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response rate limiting. This involves: a. Investigate 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. Encourage DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; and c. Frequently review the state of the art of such mechanisms and update their environment as necessary.	Closed	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5	2/18/14	Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicate with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational practices 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. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities at reasonable cost in system resources.	Closed	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).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6	2/18/14	Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurators 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 replacing the installed base of non-upgradeable devices 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-updatable equipment with appropriately configured devices; 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.	Closed	SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturors and/or configurators 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-1)	2/18/14	ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN organization understands that SAC065 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 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing - R-1	2/13/14	Recommendation 1: The SSAC invites all 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. a. 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 have been manually configured, these parameters should not be overridden 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 www.server, 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 www.server is always a FQDN.	Closed	The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community to consider that behavior and to comment on it. ICANN acknowledges this invitation and will take the proposed behavior into consideration when discussing search list processing and when search lists are used within ICANN's IT systems. Beyond this, we do not believe that there is any action required from ICANN Board or staff to address SAC064 R-1.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-2)	2/13/14	The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-2 means that the SSAC recommends that ICANN organization work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior, beginning with the submission of an Internet-Draft to the IETF and advocating for its standardization within the IETF process. Updates to RFC 1535 and other RFCs related to this topic should be included included within the Internet-Draft. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-3)	2/13/14	In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. a. Commission additional research 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. Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly delegated top-level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. 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 collision with names delegated as new gTLDs from the 2012 application round for the New gTLD Program. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0114-05-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-31jan14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission & Focus Areas for a Five-Year Strategic Plan	1/31/14	The At-Large Advisory Committee considers the submitted "ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan" a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan. The ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated. Nevertheless, as the most important concern today is about the security of Internet and the trust in the Internet, the ALAC would prefer to include those aspects of trust and security in the paragraph describing the ICANN Vision in this way: "to support a single, open, and globally interoperable Internet with a secure and trusted DNS". The same should be done in all focus areas paragraphs each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. The ALAC recommends that it is necessary to add another bold point to the "Developing a world-class public responsibility framework" focus area section: "Engage and develop the End-Users community globally for full involvement in policy development and decision making processes." The ALAC finds the other elements of the focus Areas well expressed and detailed. It appreciates this preliminary work to prepare for a future-oriented and concerted 5 years strategic plan and strongly supports that process.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/strategic-2013-10-29-en On 16 October 2014, the Board took a resolution adopting the Strategic Plan: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.c
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0114-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jan14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Proposal for a Specification 13 to the ICANN Registry Agreement to Contractually Reflect Certain Limited Aspects of ".Brand" New gTLDs	1/31/14	The ALAC has no input on the details of Specification 13, but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point, when earlier decisions were made to not have categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic and other similar classes of gTLD.	Closed	This statement contains no actionable advice for ICANN. On 26 March 2014, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee took a resolution adopting Specification 13 to the Registry Agreement: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-03-26-en
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0114-03-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-15jan14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Request For Written Community Feedback - Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations	1/15/14	The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by re-defining a clear and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must acknowledge the Sovereignty and right of self-determination of States to let them choose their region of allocation and request, if they so desire, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geography, we are speaking about regions, and the ALAC doesn't believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on other consideration than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity are important but can't impact the geographic regions framework. If we want it to be regions plus culture plus language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years period to five.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a request for community feedback on the Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations. The WG provided a Final Report in October 2015: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/geo-regions-wg-31oct15-en.pdf This report was placed for public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en. The ALAC also provided comments as part of this public comment period: https://forum.icann.org/lists/geo-regions-23dec15/msg00003.html ICANN staff produced a summary report of all the community comments submitted in the proceeding regarding the WG recommendations: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0114-02-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-14jan14-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the DNS Security & Stability Analysis	1/14/14	The ALAC adopts the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG, as the Final Report of the DSSA WG in accordance with section 2.4 of its charter; The Chair of the ALAC is requested to inform the ccNSO, GNSO, NRO and SSAC co-chairs of the DSSA WG of adoption of the Report by the ALAC; The Chair of the ALAC is also requested to inform the chairs of the other participating SO's and AC's (GNSO, ccNSO, NRO and SSAC); The ALAC agrees with but notes with significant regret the recommendation to not proceed with phase 2 as noted in the co-chair's letter; and The ALAC thanks and congratulates all, and in particular the co-chairs of the WG: Olivier Cr?©pin-LeBlond (ALAC), Joerg Schweiger (.DE, ccNSO), Mikey O'Connor (GNSO), James Galvin (SSAC) and Mark Kosters (NRO) and all volunteers and staff who helped with this effort.	Closed	This statement is in relation to adoption of the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG and contains no actionable advice for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1213-01-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-16dec13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding the Technical Liaison Group	12/16/13	The ALAC supports the intent of the proposed bylaw changes to increase the availability of technical advice to the Board as well as the effectiveness of the Technical Liaison Group. It is clear that the current modus operandi is not working and that it has not brought any benefit to ICANN in terms of advice. However, the ALAC is concerned that the order in which the changes are presented is out of line with the original recommendations of the Board technical relations WG findings. The ALAC understands that the proposal is not to disband the TLG altogether but to remove the TLG position from the ICANN Board. We call on the ICANN Board to make sure, in the substitution of the TLG position in the Board, that it be structurally replaced by constant access to the necessary technical competence, not only through a structured, distance consultation. The ALAC considers the actual elimination of the position of a technical liaison to the ICANN Board should not occur until, at least, a mechanism to seek regular advice from the Technical Liaison Group (TLG) be founded. This capability should be a permanent one and, provide for the ability of the technical constituencies to provide advice to the Board on an ongoing basis and not merely when requests are made. The ALAC is concerned that the proposed changes in the bylaws removes the TLG from appointing a delegate to the Nominating Committee. Given the concerns of having persons on the Board with sufficient technical expertise, this change should NOT be supported and the TLG should continue to be able to select a delegate to serve on the Nominating Committee.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/bylaws-amend-tlg-2013-10-30-en. On 7 February 2014, the Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaws and provided a resolution adopting the Bylaws: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#1.c
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm	[1 of 4] ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report & Recommendations	11/21/13	We advise the ICANN Board to: (1) Place equal emphasis on recommendations and observations, and address key issues outlined in the observations indicated in Appendix B and C of the report in advance of the next WHOIS and Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR) reviews	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-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/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm	[2 of 4] ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report & Recommendations	11/21/13	We advise the ICANN Board to: (2) Take measures to improve future reviews by ensuring that review processes are accorded sufficient time for a thorough and effective assessment and to ensure that ICANN is better prepared organizationally to support the review process	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-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/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm	[3 of 4] ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report & Recommendations	11/21/13	The Board should examine both Recommendations and Observations in the ATRT2 report with equal diligence. A careful examination of the Observations laid out in Appendix B and C on the reviews of the WHOIS Review Team and the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team implementation reveals serious issues requiring Board attention. We recommend that the issues be addressed now through appropriate mechanisms.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-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/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm	[4 of 4] ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report & Recommendations	11/21/13	ALAC recommends that ICANN be better prepared organizationally to support future reviews and that the ATRT3 be provided with a full year (12 months) for its review work, even if review commencement is delayed.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-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/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-03-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-21nov13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Policy & Implementation Working Group	11/21/13	There must be a methodology to recognize when a decision will impact the community, and such decisions must involve a bottom-up process in addressing those decisions. The processes must be designed to be time-sensitive ?Äì unending debate should not be an option. There must be a way to come to closure when the community is divided, and this should not simply give executive powers to ICANN Staff. One of the key question that must be resolved is what part should the Board play in taking action if the community is 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.	Closed	This statement was directed to the Policy & Implementation Working Group. All comments on the Policy & Implementation Working Group Initial Recommendations were considered in the public comment, for which the ALAC submitted a separate statement: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/policy-implementation-2015-01-19-en. The Final Recommendations Report was published 1 June 2015: http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/policy-implementation-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf). The Final Recommendations were considered by the Board, which passed a resolution on 28 September 2015: https://features.icann.org/gnso-policy-implementation-recommendations.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Draft Report & Recommendations	11/21/13	The 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 accountability and transparency mechanisms and performance; and Improve and prioritize its AoC Review processes.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en The Board has provided a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-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/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-05-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-21nov13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Thick Whois Policy Development Process (PDP) Recommendations for Board Consideration	11/21/13	The ALAC strongly supports the recommendation of the Final Report on the Thick Whois Policy Development Process for all gTLD registries to use the 'Thick' Whois mode. 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 'Thick' Whois expressing 'extreme disappointment' that Verisign was not required to use a 'Thick' 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 registrars including movement of data from one jurisdiction to another.	Closed	This statement was submitted and 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: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.c
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-02-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-13nov13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Revised Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP)	11/13/13	The ALAC appreciates the radical changes made to the PICDRP in response to the comments of the first draft. The process seems far more appropriate for addressing potential harms caused by a registry's failure to honor the Public Interest Commitment aspects of their registry agreements. However, the ALAC still firmly believes that this process does not address the PUBLIC INTEREST aspect of Public Interest Commitments. There must be a provision for allowing reports of PIC violations, and particularly substantive PIC violations without the need to demonstrate harm. A significant aspect of the PIC is to ensure registrant and Internet user trust in the TLD, and to disallow reports of the perceived loss of that trust greatly lessens the benefit of the PIC, and could serve to make them completely ineffective. The ALAC also offers the following more specific comments on the terms within the PICDRP: * The use of the undefined term "good standing" is both vague and inappropriate. If there are criteria under which ICANN will decide to not follow up on a report, they must be clearly stated and subject to appeal. * There should be no requirement for interaction between a Reporter and Registry if the complaint issues identified in the report are factually identifiable; there is no need to negotiate evidence-based issues. * Although perhaps obvious to some, it should be explicit that the Standing Panel will include one or more members with clear understanding of Public Interest issues.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-picdrp-19dec13-en.pdf The Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP) was finalized in December 2013: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-3-19dec13
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk	11/7/13	Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid reversal of the delegation of a TLD	Closed	The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN's President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 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/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk	11/7/13	Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why as part of its decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis: - Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? - Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it? - Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? - Termination of the trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)? What is to be done with the data collected? Who makes the decision on what the next step in the delegation process is?	Closed	The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN's President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 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/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3	11/7/13	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.	Closed	This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4	11/7/13	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.	Closed	This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)	11/7/13	ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1	11/7/13	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) staff, in coordination with the other Root Zone Management Partners (United States Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and Verisign), should immediately undertake a significant, worldwide communications effort to publicize the root zone KSK rollover motivation and process as widely as possible.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 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-2018-10-15-en). The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 2	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative testbed for the purpose of analyzing behaviors of various validating resolver implementations, 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 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 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-2018-10-15-en). The test pass is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of as much information as possible about the impact of a KSK rollover to provide input to planning for future rollovers.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 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-2018-10-15-en). The data collection program is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1113-01-02-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-01nov13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs	11/1/13	The ALAC is particularly concerned that granting blocking-level protections may prohibit other reasonable uses of the same strings and the ALAC is not satisfied that the exception procedures outlined in the report would be effective. This being the case, it may be important to consider the principles that guided the ALAC, in our participation in the activities that led to this report, and that the ALAC believes should guide ICANN in considering any special protections. * ICANN should grant special protection to organizations that further the public interest and in particular, those with a strong track record of humanitarian activities. However, such protections should only be granted where there is a history or reasonable expectation that the lack of protections would lead to the misrepresentation of the organizations, fraud, deliberate confusion, or other malfeasance. * Such protections, when granted, should not unreasonably impinge on the ability of others with a valid right to use the protected string, from registering such names for uses which do not negatively impact the protected organization nor use to the protected name with the intent to deceive users. Formal trademarks should not be necessary to demonstrate such a right. * The procedures used to grant the protection exceptions identified in number 2 must be both inexpensive and fast. * No top level protections are necessary. Existing or new objection processes are sufficient.	Closed	This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-final-2013-09-20-en. Final Report was published on 10 November 2013: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf. Following GNSO adoption of the Final Report, on 7 February 2014, the Board provided a resolution on the GNSO recommendations, directing the NGPC to consider the recommendations and develop a proposal for later consideration by the Board: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-05-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27sep13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the DNS Risk Management Framework Report	9/27/13	The fact that a risk management framework exists and is utilized to force rigor into the consideration of risk would be an important outcome However, the ALAC deplores that the framework that is proposed is the proprietary and business-oriented Risk Management methodology ISO31000 framework whilst the DNS Security and Stability Analysis (DSSA) Working Group had proposed the use of the Open Standard NIST 800-30 methodology. The ALAC also questions the use of a business methodology applied to the DNS. The ALAC deplores that at this point in time, the proposed Framework is far from being detailed at a more granular level The ALAC is disappointed that the Framework as proposed in the Final Report has not built in any substantial way on the work undertaken by the DSSA Working Group apart from mentioning its work.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-dns-rmf-final-18oct13-en.pdf In November 2013, the Board has directed ICANN to implement the DNS Risk Management Framework and report back to the Board Risk Committee as needed on the risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.c).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-16sep13-en.htm	R-1 ALAC Statement on Confusingly Similar gTLDS	9/16/13	The ALAC advises the Board to revisit the issue 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.	Closed	In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.b The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO's discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application around and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-16sep13-en.htm	R-2 ALAC Statement on Confusingly Similar gTLDS	9/16/13	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 .cam/.com where conflicting objection decisions have forced such review;	Closed	In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.b The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO's discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application around and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-16sep13-en.htm	R-3 ALAC Statement on Confusingly Similar gTLDS	9/16/13	The ALAC advises the Board to determine a viable way forward which will not create unwarranted contention sets nor delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure user confusion and implicit loss of faith in the DNS.	Closed	In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.b The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO's discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application around and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0913-01-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-09sep13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Guidelines Update from ICANN	9/9/13	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 Guidebook Criteria 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 Guidebook Guidelines themselves, the ALAC has several recommendations and observations to make based on the document within this Statement.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a request for community review and input to the draft CPE Guidelines for the New gTLD Program: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-4-16aug13-en On 27 September 2013, ICANN published the CPE Guidelines produced by the Economist Intelligence Unit after considering ICANN community feedback on the first draft.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-1 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	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.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-3 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	SSAC recommends that the EWG state more clearly its positions on specific questions of data availability.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-4 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	The SSAC suggests that the EWG address this recommendation from SAC058: "SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation: 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: What data elements need to be added or validated to comply with requirements or expectations of different stakeholders? Is additional registration processing overhead and delay an acceptable cost for improving accuracy and quality of registration data? Is higher cost an acceptable outcome for improving accuracy and quality? Would accuracy improve if the registration process were to provide natural persons with privacy protection upon completion of multi-factored validation?	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	SAC061: R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	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.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). Subsequently, on 2 August 2018 the SSAC contacted the ICANN org to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN org change SAC061 Recommendation 2?s status from ?Closed? to ?Open.? Upon review of SAC061 and SAC101v2, the ICANN org has returned SAC061 to Phase 2 | Understand. SAC061 Recommendation 2 will be considered in conjunction with SAC101v2.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0813-04-00-EN	http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Proposal to Mitigate Name Collision Risks	8/27/13	The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the "Name Collisions in the DNS" [PDF, 3.34 MB] study report by Interisle Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN in "New gTLD Collision Risk Management Proposal [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 "uncalculated risk" 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.	Closed	On 30 July 2014, the NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. Implementation and general information about the Name Collision efforts can be found at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-09aug13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on community expertise in community priority evaluation	8/9/13	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.	Closed	On 28 September 2013, the Chair of the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) responded to some of the concerns raised by ALAC (http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20131002/cebed781/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: ""The NGPC appreciates the offer made by the ALAC to provide community volunteers to serves as Panel members or advisors. However, the NGPC determined that it would not be appropriate to introduce external parties to the EIU?s evaluation process.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0813-02-00-EN	http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-2-09aug13-en.htm	ALAC Statement on the Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention	8/9/13	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.	Closed	On 9 September 2013, the Chair of the NGPC responded to the ALAC (http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/2013/007330.html). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: ""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.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)	7/23/13	Regarding ICANN's Report on Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs, The root zone must use one and only one set of Label Generation Rules (LGR).	Closed	ICANN agrees with this recommendation. The implicit assumption of the current LGR work is that the root zone will use one and only one set of label generation rules. Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found below: IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations?language=es Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf Public Comment on Label Generation Ruleset for Root Zone Version 1 (LGR-1): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)	7/23/13	The current rights protection regime associated with the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) process is susceptible to homographic attacks. The roles of the involved parties, specifically registrars, registries, and TMCH, related to matching must be made clear.	Closed	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)	7/23/13	When registries calculate variant sets for use in validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.	Closed	This specific advice item is directed at Registries and contains no actionable advice for ICANN.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)	7/23/13	The matching algorithm for TMCH must be improved.	Closed	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)	7/23/13	The TMCH must add support for IDN variant TLDs. Particularly during the TM 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.	Closed	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.	Closed	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the number of strings that may become activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the IDN LGR 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: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)	7/23/13	Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.	Closed	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)	7/23/13	Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.	Closed	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the main considerations the Integration Panel has to take into account in each release of the IDN LGR. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)	7/23/13	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.	Closed	This specific advice item is part of project 2.1 LGR Procedure. Information on Project 2.1 of the LGR can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label+Generation+Ruleset+Process+for+the+Root 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: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations?language=es - Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf - - - Public Comment on Label Generation Ruleset for Root Zone Version 1 (LGR-1): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en - Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (3 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should concentrate foremost on the rules for the root zone (versus rules for TLD registry operators).	Closed	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (2 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rules (LGR) calculations.	Phase 4 | Implement	The Study Group on Technical Use of RZ-LGR is currently reviewing, among other issues, this recommendation: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Study+Group+on+Technical+Use+of+RZ-LGR. See also for for the latest information on the Root-Zone LGR and IDN Implementation Guidelines: Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone Version 2 (RZ-LGR-2): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rz-lgr-2-2017-06-06-en IDN Implementation Guidelines (v4.0): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-03-03-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (4 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines; - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second- level domain labels (2LDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions	Phase 4 | Implement	ICANN agrees with these recommendations. Implementation of this specific advice item is in progress, and there is an active working group that is working on the next version of IDN implementation guidelines as well as on second-level label generation rules (LGRs). IDN implementation guidelines update will soon be published and will go to the Board for consideration. See also Public Comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-10-19-en; https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-final-idn-guidelines-18oct17-en.pdf.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)	7/23/13	A process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.	Phase 4 | Implement	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the entire Project 7 of the IDN Variant TLD Program is dedicated to developing the processes to handle variant mechanisms, including the life cycle of a variant label. Implementation of this specific advice item is in progress and is part of project 7. This recommendation is being looked at by the Study Group on Technical Use of RZ-LGR: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Study+Group+on+Technical+Use+of+RZ-LGR.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) providers support variant TLDs, and that parity exists for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.	Phase 4 | Implement	With regard to EBERO and variant TLDs, the discussion is included in the ongoing work on developing recommendations for the implementation of IDN Variant TLDs under the guidance of the Board IDN Working Group. All EBERO providers support variant TLDs; there is parity for variant support in all relevant systems and functions. Please see the following links for more information on both IDN Variants and EBERO, including the EBERO Agreement, which stipulates requirements regarding IDN variants: EBERO Resources: - Resource page: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ebero-2013-04-02-en IDN Resources: - https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en - https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56144675
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0513-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/7301	ALAC Statement to the Board Regarding Security and Stability Implications of New gTLDs	5/31/13	The ALAC urges the Board to take full consideration of relevant SSAC advice and recommendations to ensure that residual risk is minimized and specifically that residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers and individual end users.	Closed	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) considered recommendations by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), public comments, and additional community feedback in its actions regarding Name Collision and Dotless Domains. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution affirming that ""dotless domain names"" are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#1. On 30 July 2014, NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0513-02-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/7301	ALAC Statement to the Board Regarding Security and Stability Implications of New gTLDs	5/31/13	The ALAC urges the Board to closely monitor the work being done by the ICANN Security Team with the CAB (Certificate Authorities and Browsers) Forum and ensure the Board's decisions are informed by the progress of this work to reduce risk.	Closed	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) considered recommendations by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), public comments, and additional community feedback in its actions regarding Name Collision and Dotless Domains. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution affirming that ""dotless domain names"" are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#1. On 30 July 2014, NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-1 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC recommends those issues that previous public comment periods have suggested were inadequately explored as well as issues related to cross-functional interactions of the changes brought about by root zone growth should be examined.	Phase 4 | Implement	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 the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC believes the use of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding stubbornly unresolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.	Phase 4 | Implement	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 the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	R-1 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.	Closed	The adoption of this language is complete and extends beyond the ICANN community in which the ICANN WHOIS Expert Working Group (EWG), the Application Guidebook, the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate terminology used within SAC058.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	R-2 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	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	Closed	Many of these questions were addressed in the Expert Working Group's work and are part of the policy questions posed within a future PDP by the GNSO. The EWG delivered its Final Report: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf. Information on the public comment process can also be found here: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rds-prelim-issue-2015-07-13-en. The GNSO PDP process information can be found here: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	SAC058: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques to be used by registrars and registries for validating registration data. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC056	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-056-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System	10/9/12	SAC 056 concludes that "Governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content	Closed	SAC 056 is an Advisory that contains no recommendations that require Board action. The information in the conclusion of the Advisory has been disseminated through published articles referenced within SAC 056 and has been acted upon in various outreach and engagement with governments to help explain the technical implications of policies.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-1 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	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	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-3 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	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.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	Internationalized Domain Names: Internationalization MUST be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the IRD-WG final report.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a In response to recommendation 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG's) final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and transliteration of contact data, which addresses the submission of internationalized data. Board resolution 2016.03.10.06-7 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and directs staff to incorporate IRD recommendations into Translation & Transliteration policy implementation as consistent with policy (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#1.e).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicate for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data.	Closed	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a Implementation work on WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://whois.icann.org/en/whoisars. The expert working group is evaluating accuracy policies and a policy development process (PDP) on registration data policy by the GNSO will follow the EWG's work. The policy recommendations arising from the GNSO's work will then be sent to the Board for consideration.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC054	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)	6/11/12	The SSAC invites all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and in particular Registry and Registrar Stakeholder groups to (a) consider this data model and comment on its completeness, and (b) comment on the utility of the model in furthering the definition of a directory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SAC033 and SAC051.	Closed	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC054	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)	6/11/12	The SSAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.	Closed	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC053	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-053-en.pdf	SSAC Report on Dotless Domains	2/23/12	Recommendation: Dotless domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use o DNS resource records such as A, AAAA, and MX in the apex of a Top-Level Domain (TLD) be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases.	Closed	On 13 August 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) adopted a resolution affirming that "dotless domain names" are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#1.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC052	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2)	1/31/12	Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on user confusion/string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be disallowed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration ofpotential confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should invite comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN?Âôs advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each applied-for single-character TLD label must be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts. 4. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of singlecharacter TLDs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be relaxed if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a concise specification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs.11 6. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding its consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be PVALID according to IDNA2008. b) The code point is from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard.12 c) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non Lx-class code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. d) The script in which an exception is made and a single character IDN is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Greek/Cyrillic, Lao/Thai, etc.). e) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Denial of a single character TLD application does not imply blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. f) If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is available for single-character TLDs should be required prior to the acceptance of a single-character TLD application. By default all characters are disallowed, even when a script is allowed, and an explicit single-character-TLD-allowed list must be generated for each case.	Closed	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 (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC052	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (2 of 2)	1/31/12	Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD label syntax is currently underway within ICANN, the IETF, and other bodies, ICANN should review the Findings of this report, and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.	Closed	Considerable work has been performed or is ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en A String Similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules (Project 5), but this project was deprioritized based on public comment, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC050	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf	DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms ?Âì An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System	6/14/11	Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain name or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organizations from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate connection to the named host, although circumvention techniques may enable connectivity to the intended system anyway (this includes simply accessing the site via IP address rather than via a Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN)). A DNS resolver or network operator could also rewrite a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether rewriting a Non-Existent Domain (NXDOMAIN) response or rewriting the DNS response for an existing FQDN, with potentially harmful effects on DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC)-supporting name servers and their users. A particularly coarse-grained approach is for an operator to silently discard DNS responses, although this results in non-deterministic behavior and may itself be problematic. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply these principles: 1. The organization imposes a policy on a network and its users over which it exercises administrative control (i.e., it is the administrator of a policy domain). 2. The organization determines that the policy is beneficial to its objectives and/or the interests of its users. 3. The organization implements the policy using a technique that is least disruptive to its network operations and users, unless laws or regulations specify certain techniques. 4. The organization makes a concerted effort to do no harm to networks or users outside its policy domain as a consequence of implementing the policy.	Closed	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)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf	SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure	6/14/11	R-1 The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions, in particular: - Domain Name Registration Data (DNRD). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars or registries collects. - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNRD-AP). The components of a (standard) communications exchange - queries and responses - that specify the access to DNRD. - Doman Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNRD-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registries and registrars to implement the DNRD-AP and to provide access to DNRD-DSD. Additional terminology includes ?DNRDe,? ?DNRD Policy,? ?DNRD-DS Policy,? ?Internationalized DNRD,? and ?Localized DNRD.? The term ?WHOIS? should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 3912.	Closed	On 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of new directory service policy and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-28-en#5. Both the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC's terminology: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/registries/registries-agreements-en, https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf	SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure	6/14/11	R-3 The ICANN community should develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing DNRD that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of verification methods, credential services, and access control capabilities.	Closed	This specific advice item contains no action for the Board. The PDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) is currently considering this topic.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf	SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (R-2)	6/14/11	R-2 The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of Internationalized DNRD as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC 003, SAC 027 and SAC 033.	Phase 4 | Implement	The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC051 be developed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2011-10-28-en#5). A roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-06-04-en. Implementation of this specific advice item is ongoing. ICANN is determining how to implement the new protocol in the gTLD space. The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) has submitted proposals/correspondence to ICANN regarding the registration data access protocol (RDAP) implementation: Initial Proposal, May 2017: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/diaz-to-atallah-03may17-en.pdf ICANN's response, June 2017: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/atallah-to-diaz-16jun17-en.pdf Updated proposal, June 2017: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/diaz-to-atallah-22jun17-en.pdf Adoption of Temporary Specification, May 2018: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/gtld-registration-data-specs-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC049	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf	SSAC Report on DNS Zone Risk Assessment and Management (1 of 1)	6/3/11	The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing [NINE] safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service: (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2: Design for resiliency; Recommendation (3) Actively manage DNS information; (4) Protect domain registration and hosting accounts against unauthorized access or misuse; (5) Monitor the health and well being of your name service; (6) Track operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully, and; (9): Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.	Closed	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)	5/12/11	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.	Closed	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 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (1 of 3)	5/12/11	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 definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for the proposed definition).	Closed	ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Specification 6, Section 4.2, which references the SSAC Advisory directly: "Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct." (See https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf.)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)	5/12/11	3. 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 abet malicious conduct.	Closed	ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook?full?04jun12?en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Specification 6, Section 4.2, which references the SSAC Advisory directly: "Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct." (See https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement?approved?09jan14? en.pdf.)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)	4/15/11	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.	Closed	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 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria.	Closed	SAC047 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 failover testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en. A process for EBEROs was implemented into the New gTLD Program and accounted for in GNSO Policy (http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm), the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)	4/15/11	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 to be escrowed separately.	Closed	A process for Registry Data Escrow was implemented into the New gTLD Program in the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (4 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain ownership during a transition.	Closed	SAC047 was issued in response to the Explanatory Memorandum on Registry Transition Procedures 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (6 of 7)	4/15/11	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. If the registry is replaced, 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.	Closed	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 (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Spec 2: Data Escrow Requirements (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf). More information regarding New gTLD Registry Data Escrow Requirements and Process can be found here: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/data-escrow
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (7 of 7)	4/15/11	Lastly, the SSAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Explanatory Memorandum: 1) It 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.	Closed	ICANN adopted these recommendations and clarified in the Registry Transition process that the Explanatory Memorandum is part of the Applicant Guidebook. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition process can be studied and if needed, improved.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)	12/6/10	[...] the SSAC recommends the following steps be taken before launching additional gTLDs, in parallel with continued deployment of IDNs and IPv6. Recommendation (1): Formalize and publicly document the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling.	Closed	The Board requested the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators via RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c) In a letter of 30 April 2013, ICANN's Chief Security Officer wrote to the SSAC Chair regarding the concerns raised in SAC046 and SAC047: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/moss-to-falstrom-30apr13-en.pdf RSSAC communications including advisories, reports, and statements are available on the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rssac-publications-2014-05-12-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (2): ICANN, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and VeriSign should publish statements, or a joint statement, that they are materially prepared for the proposed changes.	Closed	The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with NTIA and Verisign to explore publication of one or more statements regarding preparation for the proposed changes. https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c ICANN staff worked with NTIA and Verisign and the parties released a joint statement on 5 November 2012: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/icann-et-al-to-icann-board-ssac-05nov12-en.pdf

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status

As of 30 April 2019

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Name of Advice Document	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (3): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including IDNs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates.	Closed	The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected growth rates of TLDs: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c 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 prioritize new gTLD applications (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-23jun12-en.pdf) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (5 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (5): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities who may implement strong assumptions about the number of TLDs or use local TLDs that may conflict with future allocations.	Closed	After submission of a letter to the SSAC from the ICANN Chairman on 25 September 2012 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-25sep12-en.pdf), the SSAC formed a work party to provide a response to the ICANN Board. On 16 April 2013, the SSAC submitted SAC 059: SSAC Letter to the ICANN Board Regarding Interdisciplinary Studies to the ICANN Board. ICANN commissioned Interisle to study the namespace issue raised in SAC059 and further to JAS to provide a report on mitigating namespace collisions.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (R-4)	12/6/10	ICANN should update its "Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency," to include actual measurement, monitoring, and datasharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.	Phase 4 | Implement	The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and datasharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (1 of 6)	11/15/10	ICANN should educate users so that, eventually, private networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.	Closed	ICANN has developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources 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
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (2 of 6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN promote a general awareness of the potential problems that may occur when a query for a TLD string that has historically resulted in a negative response begins to resolve to a new TLD. Specifically, ICANN should: ?Â¢ Study invalid TLD query data at the root level of the DNS and contact hardware and software vendors to fix any programming errors that might have resulted in those invalid TLD queries. The SSAC is currently exploring one such problem as a case study, and the vendor is reviewing its software. Future efforts to contact hardware or software vendors, however, are outside SSAC?Âôs remit. ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity.	Closed	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addressed the issues related to invalid top-level domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf 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/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources 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
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 6)	11/15/10	ICANN should contact organizations that are associated with strings that are frequently queried at the root. Forewarn organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, so they may mitigate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NXDOMAIN responses from root servers.	Closed	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources 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
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 6)	11/15/10	Recommendation (2): The SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new gTLD program. - Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. 4 ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606.	Closed	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (5 of 6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the pre-existence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic observed at the root as the basis for such notification.	Closed	The NGPC resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	SAC045: Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (R-6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.	Phase 4 | Implement	This advice item requires further policy determination. ICANN will refer this advice to the GNSO for consideration.