The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 2018 focused on
Any expansion of the domain namespace must not compromise the stability, security and resiliency of the
marketplace competition aspects.
metrics for effective evaluation beyond just general consumer choice, and Domain Name System (DNS)
more immediate, increased efforts to stem 'abuse' (as defined by the contracted parties themselves).
Abuse mitigation solely to a wider ICANN community effort or "holistic approach") as foregoing a valuable
The ALAC deems the SubPro WG's approach of Recommendation 9.15 (which is to defer the issue of DNS
Therefore, the ALAC strongly recommends that it be granted, under no uncertain terms, automatic standing
be dismissed on the ground of a 'lack of standing' to file such objections.
It is incomprehensible that the ALAC, while on the one hand, funded by ICANN Org to file objections, should
and selection of CPE provider(s) by ICANN Org be subject to community input as a proactive measure for
members" is also not measurable. o Implementation Guidance 34.12 fails to stipulate that the shortlisting
worthy community applicant would still forfeit valuable points where "awareness of the community
and recognition of the community members" for CPE Criterion 1- A; the allowance made only in respect of
Implementation Guidance 34.4 fails to address an unreasonable impediment to proving both "awareness
WG recommendations fell short on 2 counts for which we call on the ICANN Board to redress:- o
CPE process, evaluation criteria procedures and guidelines in the SubPro Final Report. However, the SubPro WG
recommendations fell short on 2 counts for which we call on the ICANN Board to redress:- o Implementation Guidance 34.4
fails to address an unreasonable impediment to proving both "awareness and recognition of the community members" for CPE
Criterion 1- A, the allowance made only in respect of the "recognition of community members" aspect ignores the
conjunctive "and" in Criterion 1- A, such that a worthy community applicant would still forfeit valuable points where
"awareness of the community members" is also not measurable. o Implementation Guidance 34.12 fails to stipulate that the shortlisting
and selection of CPE provider(s) by ICANN Org be subject to community input as a proactive measure for
selecting the most suitable CPE provider for subsequent procedures in order to avoid a repeat of the widespread criticisms resulting from the CPE evaluations for the 2012 round of applications.

The ALAC applauds the SubPro WG's inclusion of many of the At-Large suggestions to reform and improve the
The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 2018 focused on
Two things: intention (goals, objectives) and data, therefore the relevant recommendations represent
important inputs.
As of 30 April 2021

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9A)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9B)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9C)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9D)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9E)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9F)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9G)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9H)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9I)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statement/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9J)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 as approved by the ICANN Board to be implemented prior to the launch of the next round of applications for new gTLDs; or, in the alternative, that delegation of any applicable string which poses a risk of name collision be withheld until the NCAP studies are completed and recommendations are addressed in implementation, retrospectively for the next round.

The ALAC continues to strongly oppose not only allowing private actions in subsequent procedures but also the use of a second-price, sealed bid auction instead of the Vickrey auction solution as the mechanism to resolve contention sets.

Further, we strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 as approved by the ICANN Board to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted on how to address applications for Closed Generics which vary in public interest.

We also question the action of involving key experts for development by a studied implementation Review Team (RT) such as addressing risk of gaming, assessment of willful gaming and penalties to deter the gaming, and development of the Balck List for Applicant Support qualifiers - since there would conceivably involve questions of policy where the community's input would prove crucial. Faced with this situation, we call for priority for ALAC membership in the Dedicated IRT.

We strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 as approved by the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted on how to address applications for Closed Generics which vary in public interest.

We strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 as approved by the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org. Firstly, to secure a larger fund to meaningfully support the ASF in the next round, and secondly, to take a more active coordinating role in the ASG pro-bono assistance mechanism.

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.10.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s continued keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) with the impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future round of the New gTLD Program.

The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted on how to address applications for Closed Generics which vary in public interest.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.

The ICANN board understands that this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. The respective public comment period closes on 8 April 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due 22 April 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ssr2-final-report-2021-01-28.en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC115</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-115-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-115-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC115: SSAC Report on an Interoperable Approach to Addressing Abuse Handling in the DNS</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to (1) examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse at the root; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this to be a request directed at the ICANN community recommending that they work towards forming a new body. That body being created will be oterrelated to “Abuse”, titled as “Common Abuse Response Facilitator”. The proposed facilitator is suggested to be a new “entity” should ideally be a wholly independent non-governmental, not-for-profit organization. This recommendation is directed to the community and does not solicit any actions from the PCC Board, the item will be considered closed. ICANN.org sent this understanding to the PCC for review on 30 March 2021. This item is considered complete as of the PCC’s confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The DNS and Internet community should be made aware of plans to use ZONEMD in the root zone, and give an opportunity to offer feedback. This may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the DNS Operations Analysis and Research Center (DNS-OARC), the North American Network Operators’ Group (NANOG), the Réseaux IP Européens (RIPE), etc.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with the Root Zone Maintainer and the Root Zone Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The DNS and Internet community should be made aware of plans to use ZONEMD in the root zone, and give an opportunity to offer feedback. This may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the DNS Operations Analysis and Research Center (DNS-OARC), the North American Network Operators’ Group (NANOG), the Réseaux IP Européens (RIPE), etc.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with the Root Zone Maintainer and the Root Zone Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-1</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>Developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default when the software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with name server software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-1)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to increase the number of gTLDs is consistent with ICANN’s strategic objective to “maximize the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant parties to contribute to serve the needs of the global Internet base.” This review should be considered an input towards updating ICANN’s strategic goals in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following areas of study based on prior rounds of the New gTLD program: ● impacts on root server operations ● impacts on SSR issues ● impacts on overall DNS operations ● Analysis of how all metrics for success were met.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that, as part of the process for creating new gTLDs, ICANN develop and adopt a protocol for measuring progress against stated goals of the program and thresholds, which if crossed, may require mitigation actions. Such measurements and actions should consider the entirety of the DNS ecosystem.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, conduct a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-4)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, conduct a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-5)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, conduct a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-6)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, conduct a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-7)</td>
<td>2/21/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, conduct a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this recommendation to have ICANN.org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICANN.org received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action/? Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone...</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC052: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1A)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data and also to accept an acceptable response as Beyond the default UDP packet size for priming requests. ICANN org understands &quot;acceptable&quot; in this context to mean with minimal risk of IP fragmentation. • Document how different resolver software responds when answers contain a reduced set of glue records. ICANN org understands &quot;different resolver software&quot; to mean all supported by the vendor versions of BIND, Unbound, PowerDNS Resolver, Knot Resolver, Microsoft DNS, and dnsmasq. ICANN.org understands &quot;a reduced set of glue records&quot; to mean from one glue record to the full set of glue records. • How current resolver implementations behave if they set the &quot;DNSSEC OK&quot; DNS bits 1 to 1 in their priming queries, such as if they validate the response and if, how they handle a Bogus response. ICANN.org understands &quot;current resolver implementations&quot; to be the same set as &quot;different resolver software.&quot; • How search lists being used by resolvers might be relevant; and • Research practical obstacles faced by signing root zone name server data to input into the development of a proposed transition plan. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone...</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC052: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN.org understands this to be a request to identify the authoritative DNS software (vendor and version) currently in use by RSOs, then research how this set of software would be affected by each proposed signing the root zone nameservers. Such research would cover the response of signing queries coming from each type of authoritative server software when the query has the DNS-SEC flag set. ICANN org requests clarification from RSSAC on how likely of UDP fragmentation should be measured and what ICANN understands &quot;acceptable.&quot; ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone...</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC053: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1C)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to review the research on the recursive resolver's testbed environment as a factor to test the queries, particularly in the case that those queries had the DNS-SEC flag set. This research should test both responses that are DNSSEC valid and those that aren't. In addition, there is a request to determine an alternative option of to query for the DNS-SEC flag set and ICANN understands &quot;current&quot; to mean the date immediately prior to publication of the research. ICANN understands &quot;no response resolver&quot; to mean all supported by the vendor versions of BIND, Unbound, PowerDNS Resolver, Knot Resolver, Microsoft DNS, and dnsmasq. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN org for review on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone...</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC054: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-2A)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to explore the cost/benefit tradeoffs and risks of signed root zone name server data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server...</td>
<td>RSSAC054</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC054: Statement on ICANN's Root Name Server Strategy and Implementation</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences seen in the RS. Since the time that RSSAC028 was published, ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server...</td>
<td>RSSAC053</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC053: Statement on ICANN's Root Name Server Strategy and Implementation</td>
<td>12/20/20</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences seen in the RS. Since the time that RSSAC028 was published, ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server...</td>
<td>RSSAC052</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC052: Statement on ICANN's Root Name Server Strategy and Implementation</td>
<td>12/20/20</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN org understands this to be a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences seen in the RS. Since the time that RSSAC028 was published, ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 17 March 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and...</td>
<td>SAC113</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac113-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac113-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC113: Draft Edition 2 (5 of 54)</td>
<td>1/18/20</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>ICANN org understands SAC113 to mean SSAC is requesting the Board to choose a TLD as described in Section 4.1 of the document, and to reserve that TLD in the DNS root for private use, and to be sure that that TLD is not delegated in the DNS root. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN org for review on 1 October 2020. ICANN Received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 30 April 2021

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC000v5 | RSSAC Operational Procedures

3/19/20

These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article III, Section 2. These Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it is necessary.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC013v4 | History of the Root Server System

5/13/20

This report documents the development of the Internet’s Root Server System, how it has evolved over time, and the way in which the entities that have evolved have done so.

RSSAC023v2 | RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan

5/13/20

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023v2 is RSSAC’s report to the Internet community on the organizational history of the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 07 June 2020.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC051 | RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators

6/12/20

As described in RSSAC023v2 (History of the Root Server System), the organizations operating root servers and the way in which they have evolved has evolved over time. As a capacity demand grows, new operators and new root servers were added. In 1995, to accommodate this growth, a consistent, non-proprietary, non-marked, and non-proprietary address block was added, which remained consistent for a number of reasons. The result was the IPv4 address 198.41.0.4 and IPv6 address 2001:503:ba3e::2:30. An outcome of the 1995-era growth was that it became common to refer to root server operators (RSOs) with “letters” (i.e., the leftmost label in the domain name).

 RSSAC023 | RSSAC Statement on Identifying Root Server Operators

6/12/20

This is a report to the ICANN community from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this report, the RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system. The RSSAC advises the Internet community and the ICANN Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s root server system.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC049 | RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community

6/14/20

Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that the type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of their recommendations in RSSAC038.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC049 | RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community

6/14/20

Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that the type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of their recommendations in RSSAC038.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC111 | SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process

6/29/20

This is a comment to the ICANN General Names Supporting Organization from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about its Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. The SSAC comments that it is not aware of any existing governance framework for the gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD) that would allow for the procedures defined in this report.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC049 | RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community

6/14/20

Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that the type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of their recommendations in RSSAC038.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC141 | SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process

6/14/20

This is a comment to the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about its Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for the generic top-level domain (gTLD) Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD). The SSAC comments that it is not aware of any existing governance framework for the gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD) that would allow for the procedures defined in this report. The SSAC also comments that it is not aware of any existing governance framework for the gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD) that would allow for the procedures defined in this report.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC049 | RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community

6/14/20

Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that the type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of their recommendations in RSSAC038.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC141 | SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process

6/14/20

This is a comment to the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about its Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. The SSAC comments that it is not aware of any existing governance framework for the gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD) that would allow for the procedures defined in this report. The SSAC also comments that it is not aware of any existing governance framework for the gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EDPD) that would allow for the procedures defined in this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC026v4</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC026v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System</td>
<td>3/12/20</td>
<td>This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.</td>
<td>This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC defines terms related to root server operations for the ICANN Community. The RSSAC seeks to advance the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC026v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. This item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 23 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC026v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-048-12mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-048-12mar20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC026v2: RSSAC Lexicon</td>
<td>3/12/20</td>
<td>On 24 January 2020, the second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team published a public comment proceeding on its draft report. This statement represents the RSSAC's full input to that public comment proceeding. The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team draft report, and would like to thank SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment.</td>
<td>This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC defines terms related to root server operations for the ICANN Community. The RSSAC seeks to advance the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC026v2: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 20 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC048</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-109-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-109-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC048: RSSAC Input on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report</td>
<td>3/12/20</td>
<td>This report analyzes the initial effects of these technologies by identifying some groups whose online experiences around privacy could change with the deployment of these technologies. Detailed analysis of these effects will have to wait for widespread deployment and measurement. This report discusses implementation issues occurring now, and raises some longer term questions for the future. This report frames the issues from the perspectives of interested parties, and understands that the issues are nuanced, and that readers coming from different perspectives will have different sensitivities: readers from two different perspectives are likely to view a single issue in two different ways. The intended audience for this report is both the ICANN community and the greater Internet community. This includes network operators, DNS implementers, policy makers, and concerned Internet users.</td>
<td>This report analyzes the initial effects of these technologies by identifying some groups whose online experiences around privacy could change with the deployment of these technologies. Detailed analysis of these effects will have to wait for widespread deployment and measurement. This report discusses implementation issues occurring now, and raises some longer term questions for the future. This report frames the issues from the perspectives of interested parties, and understands that the issues are nuanced, and that readers coming from different perspectives will have different sensitivities: readers from two different perspectives are likely to view a single issue in two different ways. The intended audience for this report is both the ICANN community and the greater Internet community. This includes network operators, DNS implementers, policy makers, and concerned Internet users.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this report is SAC109: The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC047</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System</td>
<td>3/12/20</td>
<td>This RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation can be transformed into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future versions of this document, if necessary.</td>
<td>This RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation can be transformed into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future versions of this document, if necessary.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The &quot;initial implementation&quot; is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that a long-term service would have. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 23 May 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, which calls for implementing a prototype measurement system for RSSD, and thanks ICANN org for already developing such a system to assist with defining the metrics outlined in RSSAC047.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC047</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System</td>
<td>3/12/20</td>
<td>This RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation can be transformed into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future versions of this document, if necessary.</td>
<td>This RSSAC recommends the official implementation of the metric system must: a. Meet the minimum requirements specified in Section 3.3 of this report regarding the number, location, connectivity, and other requirements for the measurement units. b. Publish all software related to its operation under an open-source license as defined by the Open Source Initiative. c. Make the raw measurement data available to anyone in the interest of transparency. A third party will be able to verify the raw data to verify the computation of these metrics. d. In its monthly reports, only publish threshold pass or fail indicators for each RSS, not the actual measurements or metrics used to determine those threshold pass or fail values. e. Publicly describe its methods for collecting measurements and aggregating metrics, including the topological location of each measurement vantage point. This description should be complete enough for ICANN and DNS researchers to create their own measurement collection systems similar to those used by the official implementation. f. Share with all RSOs the underlying measurements and metrics that result in failure any time an RSI fails to pass a threshold test. The shared measurements and metrics must include all measurements from around the time of failure and must include all measured values for all transports and address types.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is making for an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The &quot;initial implementation&quot; is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that a long-term service would have. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 23 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 23 May 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, which calls for implementing a prototype measurement system for RSSD, and thanks ICANN org for already developing such a system to assist with defining the metrics outlined in RSSAC047.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RSSAC, in collaboration with ICANN and the Internet community, should consider the following additional work: ● For a holistic view of KSK performances, it may be desirable or necessary to measure components for each of the RSK. The only reasonable way to provide for such a view would be through self-reporting. In the future, it should be considered that each RSK perform self-reporting of the defined metrics to eliminate uncertainty of components not under the RSK control, and it should be possible to include such information in the reporting that implements grant making best practices.● The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on IANA's Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments was published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-8). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-7). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-6). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-5). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-4). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-3). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-2). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-1). The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ICANN Board consideration 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's75#75's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request and of 33 March 2021.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's recomendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request. The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN.org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.
The ICANN organization understands this is the ICANN's commitment to ICANN's Policy for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and its comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-root-zone-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 05 February 2020.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

**Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider**

- IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This proposal will not introduce any stability or reliability issues to the root zone, the Root Server System (RSS), or the larger DNS ecosystem. Overall, the ICANN finds no issue with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank IANA for developing a strong proposal. The ICANN does find some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This comment also includes future considerations that IANA should take into account for subsequent rollovers.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)

2/24/20

- Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The GNSO has already produced consensus definitions of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain name" that are more expansive. According to that definition, "abuse" is an action that: (1) Causes actual and substantial harm, or a material predicate of such harm; and (2) is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose, if such a purpose is disclosed. The GNSO also recognized that "malicious use of domain name" include, but are not limited to: (1) spam, (2) malware distribution, (3) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, (4) phishing, (5) botnet command and control. ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of "abuse" before further work is done to define DNS abuse. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN should determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as reference for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

2/24/20

- Issue a rollover WHOIS revocation NRO to signify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-0)

2/24/20

- Direct IANA Org to establish clear thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct IANOrg to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-0)

2/24/20

- Provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out "systemic" abuse, not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforcement capability.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Do not process registrations with “third party” payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-6)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Adopt an “anti crime, anti-abuse” Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Campbell industry-wide good behavior for e.g. by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/1219-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-8)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Implement the above in agreement contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN Contractual Compliance to adopt. 5 Converse a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finally review what additional tools might be needed by Compliance.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC044</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-044-29oct19-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-044-29oct19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC044: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System</td>
<td>10/23/19</td>
<td>At ICANN11 the ICANN Board and the RSSAC engaged in a discussion about threats to the Root Server System (RSS). How the ICANN Board could respond to these threats, the RSSAC took this input back to the Root Server Operators (RSOs) for feedback. Since that time, the RSOs have published a document that outlines security risks and mitigations to the RSS and general methods used for mitigation. The RSSAC would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC regards the ICANN Board’s request for input fulfilled. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC107</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-107-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-107-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms</td>
<td>12/14/19</td>
<td>The International corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) submits the following comments in response to the National Institute of Standards (NIST) request for feedback on its post-quantum cryptography second-round candidate algorithms. Our comments concern the role that new cryptographic algorithms would have in the implementation of DNSSEC. In general, implementing quantum-resistant cryptography in DNSSEC should be straightforward. However, an issue that we foresee, given that there are architectural and sub-limits in the DNS, is that some of the candidate algorithms may not be upgradable in the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-045-31oct19-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-045-31oct19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC045: Report from the RSSAC, October 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>10/29/19</td>
<td>The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its eighth workshop from October 1 to 4, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, four liaisons to the RSSAC, four RSSAC Caucus members, and one ICANN research fellow attended the workshop. The RSSAC workshop also featured remote participation to facilitate broader RSSAC Caucus attendance. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC046</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-046-29oct19-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-046-29oct19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC046: RSSAC Operational Procedures</td>
<td>10/29/19</td>
<td>These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Direction on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article 41, Section 2. These 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document describes what the RSSAC will do to carry out 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. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC’s confirmation of understanding on 19 Nov 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Item Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Advice Item Status</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board understand that SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board. The ICANN org understands that the SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board. SAC105 is open for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and is incorporating it into its proposal.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>SAC105 Committee on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC106</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS) that decisions of the RSS be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 was provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS) and is operating on the basis of consensus.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>SAC106 Committee on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC107</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-107-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-107-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC107: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC107 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the ICANN Board that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>SAC107 Committee on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC043</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/rssac-043-04jun19-workshop-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/rssac-043-04jun19-workshop-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC043: Report from the RSSAC April 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 23 April 2019 to 25 April 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>RSSAC Committee on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Item Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Advice Item Status</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/pdf/m/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges</td>
<td>6/3/19</td>
<td>The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily lives by seamlessly and autonomously sensing and acting upon our physical environment through tens of billions of connected devices. While this makes the IoT vastly different from traditional Internet applications like email and web browsing, we expect that a significant number of IoT deployments will use the DNS to locate remote services that they need, for instance to enable telemetry data transmission and collection for monitoring and analysis of sensor data. In this report, the SSAC provides a discussion on the interplay between the DNS and the IoT, arguing that the IoT represents both an opportunity and a risk to the DNS. It is an opportunity because the DNS provides functions and data that can help make the IoT more secure, stable, and transparent, which is critical given the IoT's interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measurement studies suggest that IoT devices may stress the DNS, for instance, because of complex DDOS attacks carried out by botnets that grow to hundreds of thousands or in the future millions of infected IoT device within hours. We also identify and discuss five challenges for the DNS and IoT Industry (e.g., DNS and IoT operators and software developers) to address these opportunities and risks, for instance by making the DNS's security functions (e.g., response authentication and encryption) available on popular IoT operating systems and by developing a shared system that allows different DNS operators to automatically and continually exchange data on IoT Traffic activity. Unlike typical SSAC publications, the aim of this report is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. We therefore provide a tutorial-style discussion that is more forward looking than operational in nature. Our discussion partly builds on ICANN's and SSAC's past, but also goes beyond it, for instance, because the challenges we identify will take a wider range of players to address. We explicitly do not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>SAC105 Committee on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advice Provider
Reference Number
Link to Advice Document
Advice Item
Advice Document Recommendation
Issue Date
Phase
Action(s) Taken

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC042
SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-11)
SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-11)
2/17/19
Deferred
The ICANN org understands that the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.

Al-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
SAC104
https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/Committees+and+Global+Programs+by+Category+2019
SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)
SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)
12/21/18
Deferred
The ALAC and the GAC 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 sufficient basis for the work to progress to the subsequent Phase 2.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
SAC104
https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/Committees+and+Global+Programs+by+Category+2019
SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)
SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)
12/22/18
Deferred
The GAC and the ALAC take this opportunity to congratulate the EPDP team and the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred. (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+21+January+2021) passed by the ICANN GNSO Council. The topic will be considered for future consideration. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
SAC105v2
https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/Committees+and+Global+Programs+by+Category+2019
SAC105v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-11)
SAC105v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-11)
12/22/18
Deferred
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. 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.

The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered as the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide rationale for its action in the Board Resolution on the EPDP Recommendations. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 7 May 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this statement to the SACE: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered visible in the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered visible in the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://ssac.icann.org/meet/2018-04-11/pp-sac101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-10) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must address deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board consider the creation and execution of a plan that incorporates the following interconnected tasks in a co-ordinated 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. 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 4 | Implement |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://ssac.icann.org/meet/2018-04-11/pp-sac101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-10) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN community to: B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. Phase 4 | Implement |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://ssac.icann.org/meet/2018-04-11/pp-sac101-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 RDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP). Phase 4 | Implement |
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

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 RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.

Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the SSAC for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states: "Advice item seven suggests that 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. This is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes its advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs."

The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-030621-en.pdf). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 1 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-reqs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#1.c) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

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 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the SSAC for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states: "Advice item seven suggests that 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. This is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes its advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs."

The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-030621-en.pdf). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-reqs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#1.c) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-18)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN community to: Develop a policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDGS rate-limiting and corresponding service-level agreement requirements.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-24)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN community to: Develop a policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDGS rate-limiting and corresponding service-level agreement requirements.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN community to: Develop a policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDGS rate-limiting and corresponding service-level agreement requirements.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should document the content of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its November 2019 meeting, the ICANN Board noted this advice and referred to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations. The advice further suggests that these assessments should be incorporated into PDF plans at the GNSO.

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its November 2019 meeting, the ICANN Board noted this advice and referred to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations. The advice further suggests that these assessments should be incorporated into PDF plans at the GNSO.

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its November 2019 meeting, the ICANN Board noted this advice and referred to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations. The advice further suggests that these assessments should be incorporated into PDF plans at the GNSO.
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 Subsequently Delegated Name and Address (SDNAA) Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report was generated by subject matter and includes regular references to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations given in the SDNAA Subsequent Procedure-PGWIC 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 comments. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.

The ICANN org understands this statement to be the ICANN Organization’s advice to the ICANN Board on 15 August 2019. The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC039: 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 SSAC on 1 November 2018.

Recommendation 1: Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DIT data. This recommendation is for each RSO to consider anonymization procedures in this document individually. Any of the proposal given in Section 4 of this document can be used as the anonymization specification for DIT data, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.

The ICANN org understands this recommendation to be individualized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ICANN’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN Board on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this is the ICANN’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN Board on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this is the ICANN’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN Board on 7 September 2018.
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The ICANN org understands that this is the ICANN’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN sent this understanding to the ICANN Board on 7 September 2018.
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Date: 30 April 2021

This recommendation is part of version 1 of SAC101. ICANN recommended under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 pursuant to Recommendation 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v1, "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."

This recommendation is part of version 1 of SAC101. ICANN recommended under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 pursuant to Recommendation 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v1, "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."

This recommendation is part of version 1 of SAC101. ICANN recommended under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 pursuant to Recommendation 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v1, "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."

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.

The ICANN org understands RSA038 Recommendation 3 for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RACo037 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.

The ICANN org understands RSA038 Recommendation 2 for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root Server System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RACo037. The ICANN Board should refer to RSA037 section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for cost estimates. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. ICANN received this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. As the GSG begins its work to develop an RACo governance model for the Root Server System, ICANN is working on a methodology for estimating the costs of the RSS. ICANN is also working proactively with the GNSO to estimate the costs of the final governance model.

The ICANN org understands RSA038 Recommendation 3 for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root Server System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RACo037. The ICANN Board should refer to RSA037 section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for cost estimates. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. ICANN received this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Item Status</th>
<th>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(S) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC037-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11231">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11231</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0404-01-01-EN</td>
<td>4/16/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC037 Recommendation 1: for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC035</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11607">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11607</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-038</td>
<td>6/5/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 1: for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC038.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-005-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/38448">https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/38448</a> &amp; preview=/79438448/84</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-RSSAC033</td>
<td>4/10/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC035</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11607">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11607</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-RSSAC034</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The ICANN org 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.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0425-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/22107">https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/22107</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-RSSAC038</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is a draft recommendation for the ICANN Board. This recommendation pertains to the ICANN Fellowship Program and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0338-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/22123">https://atlarge.icann.org/alac/statements/22123</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-RSSAC039</td>
<td>4/26/18</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) has noted that the Fellowship Program has only successfully integrated a small percentage of its recipients. 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.

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.

The ICANN organization 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 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization 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 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization 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 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-policy-Mark-Al-Large-Workspace%3A+ICANN+Fellowship+Program+Community+Consultation). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1222">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1222</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (KSK) Rollover Process</td>
<td>4/19/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1229">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1229</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community GTLD Change Requests</td>
<td>2/2/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on a Draft Procedure for Community GTLD Change Requests.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1225">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1225</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update</td>
<td>1/15/18</td>
<td>This is the ICAC's statement on ICANN's Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1226">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/1226</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>2/28/18</td>
<td>This is the ICAC's statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10451">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10451</a></td>
<td>Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction</td>
<td>2/22/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10493">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10493</a></td>
<td>Recommendations to Improve ICANN Office of Ombudsman (IOO)</td>
<td>2/22/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on Recommendations to Improve ICANN Office of Ombudsman (IOO).</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10505">http://atlarge.icann.org/statement/10505</a></td>
<td>Recommendations to improve ICANN Staff Accountability</td>
<td>2/13/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on Recommendations to improve ICANN Staff Accountability.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC030</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-rssac-03oct17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-rssac-03oct17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Sources</td>
<td>1/30/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides an initial 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</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee (RSSAC)**

1. 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 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

**Committee (SSAC)**

2. Procedures should include a list of the operational activities, key points and steps using e.g. infographics, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information for all relevant issues, processes and activities, to that also non-expert stakeholders will be able to quickly determine if a particular issue is of concern to them and if they can participate in the 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.

**At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**

3. This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides an initial 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. ICANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the ICANN Org at the DNS root zone level. The RSSAC statement is a document that identifies the key sources that are used to maintain the DNS root zone. The RSSAC statement also provides information about the activities that are undertaken to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the DNS root zone data. The RSSAC statement is a key document that helps to ensure that the DNS root zone is accurate and complete, and that it is maintained in a manner that is transparent and accountable.

**GAC**

4. Implement

**Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC**

5. This is a joint statement that is intended to provide a comprehensive summary of the outcomes of the fifth workshop held by the University of Maryland in late October. The ALAC and GAC have worked together to develop a statement that reflects the outcomes of the workshop.

**At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**

6. This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides an initial 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. ICANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the ICANN Org at the DNS root zone level. The RSSAC statement is a document that identifies the key sources that are used to maintain the DNS root zone. The RSSAC statement also provides information about the activities that are undertaken to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the DNS root zone data. The RSSAC statement is a key document that helps to ensure that the DNS root zone is accurate and complete, and that it is maintained in a manner that is transparent and accountable.

**At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**

7. This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides an initial 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. ICANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the ICANN Org at the DNS root zone level. The RSSAC statement is a document that identifies the key sources that are used to maintain the DNS root zone. The RSSAC statement also provides information about the activities that are undertaken to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the DNS root zone data. The RSSAC statement is a key document that helps to ensure that the DNS root zone is accurate and complete, and that it is maintained in a manner that is transparent and accountable.

**ICANN Org**

8. Close Request

**Board of Directors**

9. On 11 February 2018, the ICANN Board sent a letter to Alastair Geen, Chair of the ALAC, regarding request to implement the RSSAC advice.

**ICANN Org**

10. Close Request
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-6</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response size under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 6.5 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 when the query has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider ● Choosing a scanning scheme with a single root server name ● Noting the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set ● Backward compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a priming specific signature over the entire priming set (1, 4, AAAA, DNSKEY) 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) ● Using a keyfile for the root zone instead of the current DNSSEC scheme ● Effects of allowing the Additional section in priming responses empty. The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 is 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, moving to the new scenario should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11/17/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-5</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is not to 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 agreed upon by all members of the DNS to enable a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming responses. The root server addresses should be agreed upon 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 achieved by using delegations to register the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root-servers' A/AAAA Records 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 FQDN under the root zone (5.4), are both viable options that would result in aging 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. Upon further review of our original understanding, the org would like to reassert. Because this recommendation is listed as speculative, the org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take and this item should be closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RRSSA on 11 September 2020. ICANN received confirmation of the understanding on 23 September 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-2</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>Conduct studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors. Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-3</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks. Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-1</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-AC-0717-01-01</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bin/31/35/aug17-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>RIPE NCC Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law - Process and Next Steps</td>
<td>7/14/17</td>
<td>This is the RIA 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-IG during 2016, we do not believe that the comments of our members as well as others looking for a truly implementable solution were adequately taken into consideration by the IAG and the ICANN staff in the final draft now under public consultation. Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC097</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste...sac-097-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R:1</td>
<td>6/12/17</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste...sac-097-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC017: May 2017 Workshop Report</td>
<td>6/12/17</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework for 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/publ...5-05-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC095</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-1</td>
<td>5/25/17</td>
<td>Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to the use of emoji or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.</td>
<td>Phase 1 Deferred</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-W2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The ICANN Board, ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC096</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC096: SSAC Comments on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights</td>
<td>5/25/17</td>
<td>The ALAC does not have any comments to make on the changes to the context 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 ICANN funds are returned to the internet community in line with the redistribution of funds into the community by the Internet Society, to support Internet development.</td>
<td>Phase 4 Closed Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 13 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-13jun17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-13jun17-en.pdf</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve ICANN 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/ssac-accountability-2017-04-14-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Group</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advisor Document</th>
<th>Advisor Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Acta(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0417-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://files.icann.org/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf">https://files.icann.org/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the ALAC's statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommendation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC notes that the matter at hand is a reflection of the organization’s growth and expanding mandate. The ALAC supports the proposal because it recognizes the need for a more efficient and transparent process. The ALAC offers further input on how to improve the proposed changes.</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommendation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 July 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/comments/cc2-new-gtld-round-2017-07-14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/comments/cc2-new-gtld-round-2017-07-14-en.pdf</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Reference</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action a Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC092</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9981">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9981</a></td>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>As of 30 April 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands this is the ALAC’s response on the ICANN Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comments. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC077</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951</a></td>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>3/13/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands this is the ALAC’s Statement on the Recommendations of Names of Countries and Territories as Domain Name System Market Study. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC026</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9965">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9965</a></td>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>5/1/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands this is the ALAC’s Statement on the Recommendations to Improve ICANN’s Transparency. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC007</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9955">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9955</a></td>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>3/13/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands this is the ALAC’s Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 23 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951</a></td>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>3/12/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organisation understands this is the ALAC’s input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Working Draft (CCWG-Accountability) Work Stream 2 sub-group on CCWG Accountability. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP)</td>
<td>1/22/17</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216">Public Comment Statement</a>: 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 detail has been carefully addressed to avoid any misleading 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 speed 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.</td>
<td>Phase 4: Closed</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 5 February 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 March 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irp-supp-proc-2016-11-26-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irp-supp-proc-2016-11-26-en</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy</td>
<td>12/22/17</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216">Public Comment Statement</a>: The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy. On the whole, the document is well-written, although there are some 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, in fact, actually accepted. As a rule, however, its acceptance. Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN acknowledges the diversity of our global community and the acceptance or otherwise of what are usually accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of cross-community interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but to also emphasize that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behavior 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.</td>
<td>Phase 4: Closed</td>
<td>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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 5 February 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 March 2017 ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irp-supp-proc-2016-11-26-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irp-supp-proc-2016-11-26-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.

**Reference:**
- [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1216)
- [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9913](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9913)
- [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9919](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9919)
- [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9931](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9931)
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, 20 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 "indistinguishable strings" listed in Section 2.1.3.1, the character set ISO 1166 codes prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names prescribed 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 Name Registry. 22 As described in RFC 70122, 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: (How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside of the scope of ICANN's direct influence?) How should ICANN respond to changes in the status of "private use" names perhaps introduced by new gTLD applications? (b) The SSAC is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains lists of "special use" names. What should ICANN’s response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 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 hardly discerned 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 .mil 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 new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?

Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.

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 preclude efforts in the region directly by governments. Additionally, a suggestion 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.

Recommendation 5: To recognize the impact of the ATLAS II Recommendations on the New gTLD Program.

Recommendation 6: 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.

Recommendation 7: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.

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#g).
The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's input to 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.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC's response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Workshop on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs). This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the GFoSS WP on the Review of the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services for new gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, which the RSSAC does not have any input on. There is no further action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the RSSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 is RSSAC's statement regarding the question of whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or availability of the root server system and that there are actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

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 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services for new gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, which the SSAC does not have any input on. There is no further action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN is ALAC's report on the At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalia Abdul Rahim on 10 September 2016 and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands 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 is no further action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The purpose of this document is twofold. Firstly, it outlines the key policy issues of the AI-Large community. Second, it outlines why end users should care about the specific policy issues. Issues - WHOIS/Registration Directory Services - INNA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDNs - New gTLDs - Public Internet - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency. ICANN Policies/Finances - Reviews in ICANN - Engagement & Outreach.

The ICANN organization understands the ICANN Policy Issue Report in ALAC Policy Issue Report on the AI-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Konala Abdul Rahim on 15 September 2016 (https://community.icann.org/display/alac/policy/Al-Large%20Community%20Policy%20Issues+-%20Policy%20Issue%20Report) and there is no further action for the Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

End Users Should Care - At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalia Abdul Rahim on 10 September 2016 and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Workshop on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) 10/10/16

The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is SAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services for new gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, which the SAC does not have any input on. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC084 is SAC's comments to the ICANN Policy Development Process (PDP) on the new ICANN Trust Framework and Fast Track Process. The respective public comment period closed on 13 March 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 March 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jul18-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board for review on 27 February 2017. SAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators 11/4/16

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN 9/27/16

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) ALAC Policy Issue Report 9/27/16

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) RSSAC025 9/27/16

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) SSAC084 8/31/16

RSSAC025: RSSAC's report on its third workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system, and that there is no further action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The purpose of this document is twofold. Firstly, it outlines the key policy issues of the AI-Large community. Second, it outlines why end users should care about the specific policy issues. Issues - WHOIS/Registration Directory Services - INNA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDNs - New gTLDs - Public Internet - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency. ICANN Policies/Finances - Reviews in ICANN - Engagement & Outreach.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC's report on the At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalia Abdul Rahim on 10 September 2016 and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Workshop on Next Generation Registration Directory Services 7/27/16

The purpose of this document is twofold. Firstly, it outlines the key policy issues of the AI-Large community. Second, it outlines why end users should care about the specific policy issues. Issues - WHOIS/Registration Directory Services - INNA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDNs - New gTLDs - Public Internet - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency. ICANN Policies/Finances - Reviews in ICANN - Engagement & Outreach.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC's report on the At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalia Abdul Rahim on 10 September 2016 and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC's report on its third workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system, and that there are actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/</a></td>
<td>SAC081: ALAC Statement on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement</td>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: the ALAC strongly supports the Working Group’s position on revising the process around confusing similarity of IDN ccTLDs. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group’s suggested way forward. The ALAC concur with the GNSO. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/</a></td>
<td>SAC082: ALAC Response to the Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round</td>
<td>2/15/16</td>
<td>SAC: response to the working group request for input to better inform the policy development process.</td>
<td>SAC082 in SAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group’s Request for New Generation gTLD RPS to Replace WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The respective public comment period closed 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-6y17-fiveyear-06june16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The respective public comment period closed 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.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Having been a co-Chartering Organization of several of these Cross Community Working Groups (interchangeably referenced as CCWGs or CWGs) for this very reason. Historically, the ALAC has taken part in many such initiatives: 7 Cross Community Working Group on Morality and Public Order (Reg 66) Cross Community Working Group on Line of Country/Territory Names as TLDs 7 Joint SO-AC New TLD Applicant Support Working Group (J-SOAC) 7 Joint DNS Security and Stability Working Group (J-DSSWG) 7 Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance 7 Cross Community Working Group on ANA Stewardship Transition 7 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 these groups operate. The Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups, as proposed by the CCWG-Principles (56) is therefore welcomed to increase efficiency in the process of chartering these working groups and to reduce the potential for ambiguity and timelag in finding a consensus on internal processes. The ALAC must however call attention to a number of important points that warrant further discussions.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Having been a co-Chartering Organization of several of these Cross Community Working Groups (interchangeably referenced as CCWGs or CWGs) for this very reason. Historically, the ALAC has taken part in many such initiatives: 7 Cross Community Working Group on Morality and Public Order (Reg 66) Cross Community Working Group on Line of Country/Territory Names as TLDs 7 Joint SO-AC New TLD Applicant Support Working Group (J-SOAC) 7 Joint DNS Security and Stability Working Group (J-DSSWG) 7 Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance 7 Cross Community Working Group on ANA Stewardship Transition 7 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 these groups operate. The Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups, as proposed by the CCWG-Principles (56) is therefore welcomed to increase efficiency in the process of chartering these working groups and to reduce the potential for ambiguity and timelag in finding a consensus on internal processes. The ALAC must however call attention to a number of important points that warrant further discussions.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The respective public comment period closed 22 March 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-brm-05may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC would like to register its extreme dismay and dissatisfaction with the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC would like to register its extreme dismay and dissatisfaction with the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items 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)

[Public Comment Statement] The ICANN organization understands RSSAC016 is RSSAC’s comment detailing that the RSSAC has no position 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 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rs-ac-016-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)

[Public Comment Statement] The RSSAC, composed of the root server operators and other experts involved in the operations of the root server systems, has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CWCG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1) [3] and observed the ICANN community process. [Public Comment Statement] Alan Greenberg's input on behalf of ALAC regarding the CCWG-Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1. Recommendations.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC would like to register its extreme dismay and dissatisfaction with the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items 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)

[Public Comment Statement] 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 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)

[Public Comment Statement] The ICANN organization understands RSSAC017 is RSSAC's comment of Work Stream 2 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC020v2 was published on 26 January 2015. RSSAC020v2 made a number of more substantial issues public, but were postulated. At this time the RSSAC wishes to address these other issues and again update RSSAC020. It requests Duane Wessels to lead a caucus work party to produce version 3 of RSSAC020. The RSSAC, composed of the root server operators and other experts involved in the operations of the root server systems, has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CWCG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1) [3] and observed the ICANN community process. ALAC Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GDPR Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDAP (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow Updates.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC would like to register its extreme dismay and dissatisfaction with the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-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-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.
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-1015-01-01-EN
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ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules

10/22/15

Public Comment Statement: ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC did not have the opportunity 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

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules

10/22/15

Public Comment Statement: ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC did not have the opportunity 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

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-1015-01-01-EN

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules

10/22/15

Public Comment Statement: ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC did not have the opportunity 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

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-1015-02-00-EN

ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper

11/15/15

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) states the principles of openness and transparency, 2) envisions the role of the ICANN community in the process, and 3) must favour extending the global public interest in concrete ways and endorsing the Affirmation of Commitments Report of Public Comments.

Phase 1: Closed Request

33 of 54
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making
Issued: 8/15

[Public Comment Statement] ALAC provides 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 "null" where working groups or intergroup whereby the collection and assessment of fact-based data and metrics become basic 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 timeline for the Issue Report, Charter and Final Report to update earlier IG 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-0815-en.pdf

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal
Issued: 9/15


At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report
Issued: 10/15

[Public Comment Statement] the ALAC strongly supports the research and recommendations in the Preliminary Issue Report. We are particularly impressed by the report’s fair, coherent summary of the milestone policy development activities, analysis, and implementation efforts pertaining to WHOIS. Report of Public Comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/file/report-comments-v3-pspb-07oct15-en.pdf

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC014: Comment to "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..." - 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 IG plan and observed the ICANN community response thus far. The plan is not ready to transition the root. There are many open issues and areas requiring additional work. - In addressing the RSCS problem identified in Section 4.6, the RSSAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners to increase the signature validity periods for signatures generated by both the ESIX and the ZSK. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 15 days.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Statement on Root Zone TXT
Issued: 11/15


At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Issued: 12/15


At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report
Issued: 1/15

[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 F/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 provider to comply with express requests from the customer? - Should there be mandatory publication for certain types of activity e.g. malware/viruses or violation of terms of service violations (illegal activity)? - What if any should be the mechanism for unauthorized Publication? - Should requests be allowed to escalate every request to a 3rd party forum or should the IG develop standards and thresholds? Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gpo-accred-draft-initial-31jan15-en.pdf

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for IC and Organizational Reviews
Issued: 2/15


At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AAC and Organizational Reviews
Issued: 3/15
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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 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/IANA-transition-proposal-v9.pdf). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Received during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 30 Nov 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/PublicCommentSummary-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.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for IC and Organizational Reviews. The respective public comment period closed on 08 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/file/report-comments-gpo-accred-draft-initial-31jan15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-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 08 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/file/report-comments-v3-pspb-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.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-00-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 08 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/file/report-comments-v3-pspb-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.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-00-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/file/report-comments-gpo-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.

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 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/IANA-transition-proposal-v9.pdf). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Received during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 30 Nov 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/PublicCommentSummary-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.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-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 08 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/file/report-comments-v3-pspb-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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship) - Draft Advisory: Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship)</td>
<td>6/5/15</td>
<td>- Recommendation-4: The internet community should standardize the current approach to TLDs. Specifically, Recommendation 4(- shortcomings of the current approach to TLDs) - 1. [Public Comment Statement] In general the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CWG and will provide guidance on a number of issues, some of which the CWG is explicitly seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required.</td>
<td>Item closed</td>
<td>Any action required for the ICANN Board. The public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and there is no further action for the CCWG Accountability Draft Proposal. The item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC012</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-2015-05-04-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-2015-05-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship) - Draft Advisory: Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship)</td>
<td>6/5/15</td>
<td>- Recommendation-4: The internet community should standardize the current approach to TLDs. Specifically, Recommendation 4(- shortcomings of the current approach to TLDs) - 1. [Public Comment Statement] In general the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CWG and will provide guidance on a number of issues, some of which the CWG is explicitly seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required.</td>
<td>Item closed</td>
<td>Any action required for the ICANN Board. The public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and there is no further action for the CCWG Accountability Draft Proposal. The item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship) - Draft Advisory: Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG Stewardship)</td>
<td>6/5/15</td>
<td>- Recommendation-4: The internet community should standardize the current approach to TLDs. Specifically, Recommendation 4(- shortcomings of the current approach to TLDs) - 1. [Public Comment Statement] In general the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CWG and will provide guidance on a number of issues, some of which the CWG is explicitly seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required.</td>
<td>Item closed</td>
<td>Any action required for the ICANN Board. The public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and there is no further action for the CCWG Accountability Draft Proposal. The item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAC070: R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix lists

**Title:** SAC070: R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix lists

**Issued Date:** 5/28/15

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

- Recommendation 1: Recognizing alternatives to the FSIL have been discussed (see Appendix B), the SSAC recommends the IETF and the applied community consider them for further specifications and possible standardization within the IETF process.
- Recommendation 2: The IETF should develop a consensus definition of "public suffix" and other associated terminology (e.g. "private suffix").
- Recommendation 4: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication protocols as specifications to this work.

**Action(s) Taken:**

- ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
- ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
- ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
- ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
- ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC070 | SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-3) | 1/28/15 | Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance. | Phase 5 | Close Request | The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as directing ICANN to include actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance. 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 ICANN organization has implemented the recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, ICANN staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone based on recommendation 6 of SAC070. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC070 | SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5) | 5/28/15 | ICANN should host a PSL containing information about the domains within the registry with which ICANN has direct communication. Such a PSL would be authoritative for those domains. Such a list should include, at a minimum, all TLDs in the ICANN root zone. | Phase 5 | Close Request | The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing ICANN staff to host an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which ICANN has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone. ICANN has directed a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of December 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, ICANN staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone as stated in recommendation 5 of SAC070. |
| All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-LAC-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN | 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 CWS 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. The details of its organization and governance are satisfactory — one very major concern that we believe must be addressed by the CWS, specifically the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight and involvement and we will offer guidance as to how this might be addressed — one area where the ALAC has not yet reached consensus, but we have some concerns over the current direction of the CWS, 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-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf |
| All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-LAC-ALAC-ST-0515-05-01-EN | ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget | 5/28/15 | [Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC is satisfied with the budget proposal as a whole, but has one specific area of concern, related to the evolution of support for ICANN Policy Development. Both the GND and the ALAC's activities are essentially funded under the ICANN Policy budget. Policy Development is core activity at ICANN. It is this Multistakeholder Policy Development that differentiates ICANN from any other organization. The overall budget allocated to Policy Development and supporting the SGODs, 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 low. This concern translates directly to concerns about staffing levels. The budget indicates that 15 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 PDVs, 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 transforming to a need for increased support of its increased activity. The ALAC is concerned that this need to increase PSL supporting Policy both in the GND and in the ALAC is not currently reflected in the budget and may lead to Staff burnout, 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-fy16-05june15-en.pdf |
| All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-LAC-ALAC-ST-0515-05-02-00-EN | ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY17 Operating Plan & Budget | 5/22/15 | [Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC is satisfied with the budget proposal as a whole, but has one specific area of concern, related to the evolution of support for ICANN Policy Development. — Both the GND and the ALAC's activities are essentially funded under the ICANN Policy budget. Policy Development is core activity at ICANN. It is this Multistakeholder Policy Development that differentiates ICANN from any other organization. The overall budget allocated to Policy Development and supporting the SGODs, 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 low. This concern translates directly to concerns about staffing levels. The budget indicates that 15 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 PDVs, 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 transforming to a need for increased support of its increased activity. The ALAC is concerned that this need to increase PSL supporting Policy both in the GND and in the ALAC is not currently reflected in the budget and may lead to Staff burnout, 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-fy17-05jun15-en.pdf |

---

**Phase 5 Close Request**
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**Advisory Item Status**

**As of 30 April 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisory Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice_ALAC/0010">HTTP://atlarge.icann.org/advice_ALAC/0010</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2</td>
<td>03/15</td>
<td>Procedure is finalized and the maximal repertoire version 2 is implemented.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice_ALAC/0010">HTTP://atlarge.icann.org/advice_ALAC/0010</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement</td>
<td>03/15</td>
<td>Procedure is finalized and the maximal repertoire version 2 is implemented.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security Through the Stewardship Transition and Stability of the IANA Functions

In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.

**Recommendation 1:** The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.

**Recommendation 2a:** Each of the communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms are sufficient to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable for the external controls.

**Recommendation 3:** If additional external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.

**Recommendation 4:** The process of the transition, each affected community should consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of the IANA Functions might need additional mechanisms or safeguards.

**Recommendation 5:** The affected communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms are sufficient to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable for the external controls.

**Recommendation 6:** If additional external controls are necessary, it should be held that the IANA Functions Operator is not sufficient to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable for the external controls.

**Recommendation 7:** The affected communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms are sufficient to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable for the external controls.

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 January 2015 and this item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

As of 30 April 2021

Committee (RSSAC)

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

SSAC Overview and History of the IANA Functions

RSSAC008: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Town Hall Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014

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.

The ICANN Board will continue to work with the ALAC to support the transition of the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The Board will continue to solicit ALAC advice to ensure that it reflects the evolving needs and responsibilities of the ICANN community.

ICANN has published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions.

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 Board should consider the implementation of these recommendations.

The ALAC recommends that the Board continue to work with the ICANN community to develop a framework for the transition of the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The Board should consider the implementation of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2.

Recommendation 7: The ALAC recommends that the Board should continue to work with the ICANN community to develop a framework for the transition of the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The Board should consider the implementation of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2.

ICANN, as operator of its Root, has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its compliance at https://www.dns.icann.org/rssac001/response.html.

recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2. Notwithstanding, the ALAC recommends that the Board should consider the implementation of these recommendations. General information and information on progress of the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

The RSSAC recommends that each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advice. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implemenation of these measurements. Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.

In March 2015, the ICANN requested and received input to develop a proposal for transitioning the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The proposal was submitted in August 2015, and the 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).

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 applicable) to ensure that the ICANN community is not unduly impacted.

In March 2015, the ICANN requested and received input to develop a proposal for transitioning the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The proposal was submitted in August 2015, and the 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, as operator of its Root, has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its compliance at https://www.dns.icann.org/rssac001/response.html.

The ALAC recommends that the Board continue to work with the ICANN community to develop a framework for the transition of the ICANN administrative role associated with root zone management. The Board should consider the implementation of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions</a></td>
<td>RSSAC006</td>
<td>7/30/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on &quot;Service Expectations of Root Servers&quot; (RSSAC001) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/issue was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions</a></td>
<td>RSSAC005</td>
<td>7/30/14</td>
<td>The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on &quot;Service Expectations of Root Servers&quot;.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC007</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement of Scope for &quot;Service Expectations of Root Servers&quot;</a></td>
<td>RSSAC005</td>
<td>7/30/14</td>
<td>The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on &quot;Service Expectations of Root Servers&quot;.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-38)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-6-ICANN should ensure that its Beginner Guides are easily accessible.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-10)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-10-7: The next evolution of language services must adapt 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.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-11-1-ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various characteristics, such as diversity and user needs.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-12)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-12-1-ICANN should enhance its professional and technical interpretation and translation services and make them available a timely manner.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-13)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-13-1-ICANN should ensure the overall balance of stakeholder representation in order to ensure that all views, proportionally to their scope and relevance.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-14)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-14-1-ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-15)</a></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-02-EN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>RI-15-1-ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure to facilitate a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.</td>
<td>Final ATLAS II Declaration: Final ATLAS II Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-28)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-28. The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ACs to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-29)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> Implementation work is underway on the ATLAS II Recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9">https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9</a>. In addition, this work is part of ICANN's Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CWG-Accountability webpage: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/">https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-30)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-30. For each Public Comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> There has been redesign 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 дпм деспн дстпмт дпспн дпспн дпспн 1 dй. This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9">https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9</a>. In addition, this work is part of ICANN's Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CWG-Accountability webpage: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/CWG-Accountability/">https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/CWG-Accountability/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-31)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-31. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simple terms.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion letter went to Board on 25 May 2018 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/5q0g-5m5l1-0vzn-v5lw-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/5q0g-5m5l1-0vzn-v5lw-en.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-32)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simple terms.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion letter went to Board on 25 May 2018 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/5q0g-5m5l1-0vzn-v5lw-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/5q0g-5m5l1-0vzn-v5lw-en.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-33. ICANN should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Webinars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> There has been redesign 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 дп деспн дстпмт дпспн дпспн дпспн 1 dй. This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9">https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9</a>. In addition, this work is part of ICANN's Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CWG-Accountability webpage: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/">https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-34. ICANN should work with the community to enhance engagement in ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no action items for ALAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/display/atlas/2017-08-16-atlas-02-dcl-01-01-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-35. The Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> ICANN Board status advice is a key part of day-to-day work of ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Several ICANN offices have been opened over the past years, most recently the Engagement office in Nairobi. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9">https://community.icann.org/display/atlas/ATLAS+II+Recommendations+9</a>. In addition, this work is part of ICANN's Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CWG-Accountability webpage: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/">https://community.icann.org/display/WTAW12+4/cWGW-Accountability/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-42. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programmes having brought valuable members to the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> 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: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+42">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+42</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-40. ICANN should offer auspices to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP), but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> Work has been 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 outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN55. The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+40">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+40</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+41</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-43. The ALAC should encourage its advisors to make ALAC allocations, either at ICANN, to link to relevant events.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+43">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+43</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-44)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-44. ICANN should be able to assign funds to RALO advisories, either at ICANN, to link to relevant events.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+44">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+44</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-45)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-45. RALOs should encourage their reactive ADS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+45">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+45</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC01-01-06</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/advice/documents/2014/08/AL42-Declaration-with-appendix-PDF.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-3. ICANN should continue to support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The Fellowship Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+46">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+46</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-7)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-7. A periodic review of ICANN’s MMB should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN’s constituent parts adequately addresses the relevant decision-making requirements in the Corporation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-17. ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries and, in conjunction with technical tools, promote credible alternatives.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-22)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-22. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an orderly, non-bias basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/ccwgatlas/ICANN+Accountability+History+Home

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 in its 9 September 2014 resolution: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS2+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS2+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/ccwgatlas/ICANN+Accountability+History+Home

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 an ALAC Website, there have been public commits improvements, expanded webgroup on-boarding program, capacity building workshops, as well as radio and webinar. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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/alac/WS1+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016

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 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 has been addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016

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 specific advice item was covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2; WS2 proposal has been provided to the NTIA for review and consideration. For further information on the OEC's consideration of this topic, see: 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 an ALAC Website, there have been public commits improvements, expanded webgroup on-boarding program, capacity building workshops, as well as radio and webinar. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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 specific advice item was covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2; WS2 proposal has been provided to the NTIA for review and consideration. For updates, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016

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 are no actionable items for ICANN.

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 an ALAC Website, there have been public commits improvements, expanded webgroup on-boarding program, capacity building workshops, as well as radio and webinar. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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 are no actionable items for ICANN.

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 are no actionable items for ICANN.

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 For updates, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+Proposal+to+NTIA+2016

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 an ALAC Website, there have been public commits improvements, expanded webgroup on-boarding program, capacity building workshops, as well as radio and webinar. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/WS1+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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 are no actionable items for ICANN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Acta(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-23)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continuing Operations

The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-24(a)) was adopted by the ICANN Board in June 2014. The declaration included a call for the community to continue to function during the 120-day test period with less risk of catastrophic business impact. The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

### Phase 1

**Recommendation:** ICANN should implement a notification approach that accommodates the different types of hosts.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

### Phase 2

**Recommendation:** ICANN should provide clarity to registries on the rules and the method of allocation of blocked names after the conclusion of the test period.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

### Strategic Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** ICANN should in due course publish information about not yet disclosed material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

**Recommendation 2:** ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings to substantially larger domains.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

### Compliance

**Recommendation:** ICANN should continue to improve the reporting data based on community feedback and mostly based on working group requests to support policy development and policy evaluations.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

### ICANN Transparency and Accountability

**Recommendation:** ICANN should seek a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.

**Action:** The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>DNS Infrastructure - R-6</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>1. Identify the potential risk of DNS infrastructure being leveraged for DDoS attacks.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 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 RSSAC Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-2</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>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 RFC 3330 and SAC064, to restrict protocol-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.</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: Recursive DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure open recursive DNS servers. This involves: a. Identify unmanaged open recursive DNS servers operating in the network and take immediate steps to restrict access to these servers in order to prevent abuse. b. Follow SAC065 Recommendation 3 to (1) disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and (2) only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to avoid in reducing amplification vectors for DNS DDoS attacks. c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abuse 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) (attacks likely target victim attack traffic is targeted at addresses of heavily targeted server) and restricting or disabling responses to those IPs, and during conversations with similar operators to coordinate efforts to stop such attacks.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-3 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Authorization DNS server operators should reevaluate deploying authoritative responses or limiting RRL (in DNS server software), and implement those that are appropriate for their environment; b. Encourage DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; c. Frequently review the state of the art of such mechanisms and update their environment as necessary.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-4 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicates with their software vendors to keep ahead 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 ongoing and an emergency basis; b. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities at a reasonable cost in system resources.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-5 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurations of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurations of customer premise networking equipment, including home networking equipment, should take immediate steps to secure these devices and ensure that they are field upgradable when new software is available to fix security vulnerabilities, and aggressively replace the installed base of non-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-upgradeable 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.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurations of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS Security List Processing - R-1</td>
<td>CAC065: SSAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-1)</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 1: Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syste_m/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing - R-1</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The SSAC notes that ICANN should: a. Implement a process for search list processing that is based on referrals from the community; b. Implement a process for search list processing that is based on referrals from the community; c. Implement a process for search list processing that is based on referrals from the community.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization acknowledges SSAC064 advice 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 SSAC Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the SSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-3)

23/10/14

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 context 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 systems administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions 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: Deferred

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior:

a. ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the context 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 systems administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions 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.

SSAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-2)

27/11/14

The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 1: Close Request

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 1353 and other RFCs related to this topic should be 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).

SSAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

1/11/13

Recommendation 1: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances an delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaning 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 stakeholder management partners, to create additional processes or update existing ones to accommodate the potential need for rapid removal of the delegation of a TLD.

Phase 4: Close Request

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to take the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#11). 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

SSAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

1/11/13

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 operator host 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?

Phase 4: Close Request

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to take the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#11). 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

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Roll Over in the Root Zone - Item 2

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Roll Over in the Root Zone - Item 3

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Roll Over in the Root Zone - Item 4

1/11/13

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

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Roll Over in the Root Zone - Item 5

1/11/13

SSAC 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.

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Roll Over in the Root Zone - Item 6

1/11/13

SSAC 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.

This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover

SSAC064: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk

2/13/14

SSAC advised the Board to resolve the issue of how 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

Phase 5: Close Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-4 means that the SSAC recommends the ICANN advised the Board to resolve the issue of how 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/ssa-action-revtext-2013-04-00-EN.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/ssa-action-revtext-2013-04-00-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/8/13</td>
<td>The SAC advices the Board to review the objection decision system with multiple panels that leads to inconsistency and not only review the obvious case of .com where conflicting objection decisions have been made such review;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/ssa-action-revtext-2013-04-00-EN.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/ssa-action-revtext-2013-04-00-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/8/13</td>
<td>The SAC advices the Board to determine a stable way forward which will not create unwarranted contention or delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure confusion and implict loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="http://ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">http://ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061: SAC Comment on ICANN’s Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services</td>
<td>9/8/13</td>
<td>The SSAC Board should explicitly deny any activity within ICANN (net) directed at finding a solution to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy has been developed and accepted in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>When registries calculate variant sets for use in validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented GDRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The matching algorithm for TMDH must be improved.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The TMDH must add support for IDN variant TLDs. Particularly during the TMDH services, a name registered under a TLD that has allocated variant TLDs should trigger trademark holder notifications for the registration of the name in all of its allocated variant TLDs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/24/13</td>
<td>ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Ensure the removal of delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a GDR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the GDR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (recent) activations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/24/13</td>
<td>This specific advice item is directed at registries and contains no actionable advice for ICANN.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**


**Note:**

- ICANN agrees with the 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 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/en/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
- ICANN agrees with the 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. LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by the integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
- 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. LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by the integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en

**Reference:**

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.

The Org (OCTO) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies’ public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 04 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Collison and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: Scaling the Root Report on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Scale 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-08oct10-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 DataDriver-Analyis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-25jan19-en.pdf.

A process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in GDR.

A detailed analysis of public input and recommendations for managing IDN variant TLDs, which has been approved by ICANN Board at ICANN64. The analysis has been forwarded to the GNSO and ccTLDs for their consideration for relevant policy and procedure development. The analysis is available at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en. Specifically see section 3 of the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-25jan19-en.pdf.

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0258</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0258-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0258-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-2 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>In the ICANN community it is important to ensure that the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered</td>
<td></td>
<td>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: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf</a>. Information on the public comment process can also be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/Public-comments/en%20prelim-issue-2015-07-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/Public-comments/en%20prelim-issue-2015-07-13-en.pdf</a>. The GNSO's process for information to be made publicly available for this purpose is at: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/public-comment">http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/public-comment</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0258</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0258-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0258-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC026: R-3 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the SSAC community should seek to identify validation techniques that are accepted and to develop policies that incentivize the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but will yield improving the quality and accuracy of registration data in the long term.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The SSAC organization understands SAC026 Recommendation 3 that the SSAC community should seek to validate policies that are used by registrars and registrants for validating registration data. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO (or his designee) to implement the advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-22-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0266</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0266-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0266-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System</td>
<td>9/19/12</td>
<td>SAC 026 concludes that “governments and others should take the issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or filter Internet content.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC 026 is an Advisory that contains no recommendations that require Board action. The information on the conclusion of the Advisory has been disseminated through published articles referenced within SAC026 and has been acted upon in various outreach and engagement with governments to help explain the technical implications of policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0255</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC051: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>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 and the 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>. The ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a> and 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0255</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC055: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>. The ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a> and in response to recommendations 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG) Final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and translation of contact data, which addresses the submission of Internationalized data. Board resolution 2013.03.10-07-07 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and direct staff to incorporate recommendations into Translation &amp; Translation policy implementation as consistent with policy: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0255</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>The Board should explicitly define any other activity within ICANN that requires direct action in resolving the WHOIS problem until the registration data identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>. The ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a> and in response to recommendations 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG) Final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and translation of contact data, which addresses the submission of Internationalized data. Board resolution 2013.03.10-07-07 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and direct staff to incorporate recommendations into Translation &amp; Translation policy implementation as consistent with policy: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0255</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>. The ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a> and in response to recommendations 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG) Final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and translation of contact data, which addresses the submission of Internationalized data. Board resolution 2013.03.10-07-07 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and direct staff to incorporate recommendations into Translation &amp; Translation policy implementation as consistent with policy: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0255</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0255-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicate for each data element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>. The ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a> and in response to recommendations 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG) Final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and translation of contact data, which addresses the submission of Internationalized data. Board resolution 2013.03.10-07-07 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and direct staff to incorporate recommendations into Translation &amp; Translation policy implementation as consistent with policy: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0254</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0254-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0254-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC024: Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)</td>
<td>11/12/12</td>
<td>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 directory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SAC013 and SAC031.</td>
<td></td>
<td>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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0254</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0254-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0254-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC024: Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)</td>
<td>11/12/12</td>
<td>The SSAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0243</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0243-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/sac-0243-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC023: Report on Existing Domains</td>
<td>2/14/12</td>
<td>Recommendation: dotless domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that these be 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>On 13 August 2013, the ICANN Board new gTLD Program community Mapped a resolution affirming that “dotless domain names” are prohibited: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#%25">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#%</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | LA032 | http://www.icann.org/resources/pages/document/sac-052-en.pdf | SAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2) | 2/13/12 | Recommendation (1): Given the potential for confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends that the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains be postponed until such work is complete. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on confusable string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be delayed until the current work on string similarity is complete. 2. For exceptions, when made for some scripts, only after careful consideration of confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should include comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN/WHOIS advisory committee. 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 application 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 considered for the delegation of single character IDNs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be modified 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. 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 in one of the following Unicode categories: lowercase letter (Ll), uppercase letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard.12 c) Some single character IDNs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Ligature code points. These should be subject 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 internally incompatible with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Direct/ Cyrillic, Latin/Thai, etc.). e) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Delegation 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 allowed should be provided. | The SSAC is concerned with the potential for user confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants. The SSAC recommends delaying the delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs until such work is complete.

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | LA031 | http://www.icann.org/resources/pages/document/sac-051-en.pdf | SAC Advisory on WHOIS Terminology and System | 1/14/11 | 2/13/12 | SAC Advisory on WHOIS Terminology and System | 1/14/11 | Recommendation (6): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variants, 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 work items mentioned above have been completed. | The SSAC recommends that ICANN review the findings of this report and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the work items mentioned above have been completed.

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | LA033 | http://www.icann.org/resources/pages/document/sac-053-en.pdf | DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms: An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains as a Domain Name System | 1/14/11 | 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 traditional telephony controls that are used to block access to an organization 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 a Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN)). A DNS resolver or network operator could also receive a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator choses, whether rewriter a Non-Existing Domain (NEDOORR) 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 make problems harder to diagnose. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply the following 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. | Considerable work has been performed on ongoing relating to DNS and IDN variats. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en. A string similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules project. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be considered for delegation of single character IDNs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be modified if appropriate. | The specific advice 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) | LA034 | http://www.icann.org/resources/pages/document/sac-054-en.pdf | SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure | 1/14/11 | SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure | 1/14/11 | 6. ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report to its 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 registry collects - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNRD-AP). The components of a [standard] communications exchange - packets and responses - that specify the access to DNRED - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DND-DSS). The service(s) offered by domain name registrants and registrars to implement the DND-DSS and to provide access to DND-DSS. Additional terminology, includes TLDNS, TLDNS Policy, TLDNS-DS Policy, TLDNA, and TLDNS-DS Policy. TLDNS should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 1962. | The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the new gTLD Application Definitions Document to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs. | The specific advice contains no action for the Board. The PDF on Next Generation (TLD Registration Directory Service) is currently considering this topic.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Officer</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advisor Document</th>
<th>Advisor Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-047-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-047-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model</td>
<td>5/12/11</td>
<td>1. 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.</td>
<td>SAC047 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>This specific action contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)</td>
<td>6/15/11</td>
<td>2. Orphan 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 &quot;abuse prevention and mitigation&quot; and we suggest that it be removed.</td>
<td>SAC048 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the reason for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC049: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (1 of 3)</td>
<td>7/15/11</td>
<td>1. The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 2. 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).</td>
<td>SAC049 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the reason for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC050: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)</td>
<td>8/15/11</td>
<td>1. 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 also whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.</td>
<td>SAC050 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the reason for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC051: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 7)</td>
<td>9/15/11</td>
<td>1. The SSAC recommends that ICANN define existing processes that culminate in a false positive scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate that ability to satisfy the testing criteria.</td>
<td>SAC051 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the reason for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-052-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-052-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC052: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)</td>
<td>10/15/11</td>
<td>1. The SSAC recommends that all registry operators ensure that their provision of 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.</td>
<td>SAC052 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>A process for Registry Data Escrow was implemented into the New gTLD Program in the Applicant Guidebook (<a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf</a>), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (<a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC053</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-053-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-053-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC053: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (4 of 7)</td>
<td>11/15/11</td>
<td>1. The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrar retains the registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain ownership during a transition.</td>
<td>SAC053 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the reason for the decision to not implement this advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf</a>) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC054: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)</td>
<td>12/15/11</td>
<td>1. The SSAC recommends that as part of the registration database, 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</td>
<td>SAC054 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition processes.</td>
<td>Registry Data Escrow Requirements (<a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf</a>). More information regarding new gTLD Registry Data Escrow Requirements and Process can be found here: <a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/data-escrow">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/data-escrow</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Acted on Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Process Model (2 of 7)</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN implement operational data about 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.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the SSAC and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): 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.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): 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.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): 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.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (4 of 5)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): 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.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (5 of 5)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): 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.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Involved Top Level Domains Quarantines at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (1 of 4)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>ICANN should educate users to that, privately, prove networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Involved Top Level Domain Quarantines at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (2 of 4)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>ICANN should educate users to that, privately, prove networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Involved Top Level Domain Quarantines at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 4)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>ICANN should educate users to that, privately, prove networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Involved Top Level Domain Quarantines at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 4)</td>
<td>12/19/10</td>
<td>ICANN should educate users to that, privately, prove networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>30 April 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The ICANN Board Status Advice Report provides an overview of the status and recommendations for various items, including:

1. **Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the DNS:**
   - **Recommendation:** ICANN should study invalid TLD query data at the root level of the DNS and contact ICANN's chief security officer to discuss any findings.
   - **Purpose:** The purpose is to ensure the DNS is functioning as expected and to address any potential issues.

2. **Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling:**
   - **Recommendations:**
     - ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including IDNs and their variants.
     - Solicit public feedback on these estimates.

3. **Recommendation for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency:**
   - **Recommendation:** ICANN should update its 'Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency' to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing framework when possible.

4. **Involved Top Level Domain Quarantines:**
   - **Recommendation:** ICANN should educate users about the risks associated with resolving local names via the root system of the public DNS.

5. **Close Request:**
   - **Recommendation:** Close request for the items discussed, marking them as completed.

---

For further details, please refer to the ICANN Board Status Advice Report, available through the ICANN website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>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, &quot;Reserved Top Level Domain Names,&quot; currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. 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 2016.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (5 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (6 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>