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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>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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04D)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article X, Section 3.1(b) reads: “ICANN shall not regulate . , impose standards or promote services that use the Internet’s unique identifier resources in a manner that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 3.1(a).” The parenthetical expression clearly states that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators or registrars that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04F)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC believes the SubPro WG’s Affirmation 41.1 and Recommendation 41.2 are not in conflict with the use of a second-price, sealed bid auction instead of the Vickrey auction solution as the mechanism to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or PICV and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that the ICANN Contractual Complainant not publish more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or PICV for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering appealing Registry Agreement termination.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04F)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>At the time that PICs were first introduced, the ALAC was assured that they would be enforceability through Contractual Compliance and not solely through PIC Dispute Resolution Procedures (PICDRPs). PICDRPs require that the entity initiating the dispute must show measurable harm, which should not be necessary to show harm to contracts enforced and the Board must ensure that the original commitment is honored.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04A)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>In light of this, the ALAC recommends that the Board direct the SubPro WG to re-evaluate its approach to certain of the PICs to balance the interests of the community, including a review of the PICs where the entity initiating the complaint must show measurable harm, which should not be necessary to show harm to contracts enforced and the Board must ensure that the original commitment is honored.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-05A)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC finds the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to be another area for which a lack of concrete policy is evident and recognizes that the community has come to rely on the ALAC to provide guidance and comments to assist the Board in making its decisions. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any new gTLD applications for the coming 60 days and to publish more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or PICV for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering appealing Registry Agreement termination.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06A)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s continued keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC’s Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06B)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>At the time that PICs were first introduced, the ALAC was assured that they would be enforceability through Contractual Compliance and not solely through PIC Dispute Resolution Procedures (PICDRPs). PICDRPs require that the entity initiating the complaint must show measurable harm, which should not be necessary to show harm to contracts enforced and the Board must ensure that the original commitment is honored.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article X, Section 3.1(b) reads: “ICANN shall not regulate . , impose standards or promote services that use the Internet’s unique identifier resources in a manner that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 3.1(a).” The parenthetical expression clearly states that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators or registrars that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC finds the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to be another area for which a lack of concrete policy is evident and recognizes that the community has come to rely on the ALAC to provide guidance and comments to assist the Board in making its decisions. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any new gTLD applications for the coming 60 days and to publish more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or PICV for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering appealing Registry Agreement termination.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article X, Section 3.1(b) reads: “ICANN shall not regulate . , impose standards or promote services that use the Internet’s unique identifier resources in a manner that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 3.1(a).” The parenthetical expression clearly states that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators or registrars that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.</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-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08C)</td>
<td>4/16/2021</td>
<td>The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article X, Section 3.1(b) reads: “ICANN shall not regulate . , impose standards or promote services that use the Internet’s unique identifier resources in a manner that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 3.1(a).” The parenthetical expression clearly states that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators or registrars that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 30 June 2021

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-098)

4/16/21

We state the Board’s concern towards an applicant’s ability to “shuffle funds” between private auctions. This ability to be able to apply proceeds from one private auction to fund their private auctions only really benefits incumbent multi-TLD registry operators or multiple-string applicants, and clearly disadvantages single-TLD niche applicants. With ongoing and increasing consolidation of the domain name industry, allowing private auctions will likely exacerbate the advantage for merged contracted parties, seeking to less competition among registrants.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-092)

4/16/21

For, we believe there should be a ban on private auctions. Also, by mandating ICANN only auctions, the proceeds of any such ICANN auctions can at least be directed for use in pursuit of public interest, such as was determined through the CGWG on Auction Proceeds.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-001)

4/16/21

We also believe that the use of a bona fide intent affirmation – whether for all applicants or otherwise – where factors establishing a lack of bona fide intent are too subjective, and without determination through penalty, serves little purpose.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-010)

4/16/21

The ALAC applauds the SubPro WG’s helpfully ambiguity of the advice for the need to respect and improve the CPE process, evaluation criteria procedures and guidelines in the SubPro Final Report. However, the SubPro WG recommendations fall short on 2 counts for which we call on the ICANN Board to address: a) Implementation Guidance 34.4 fails to address unreasonable impediment to proving both “awareness and recognition of the community members” for CPE Criterion 1-1; b) the lack of a “community members” aspect ignores the constructive “aid” and in Criterion 1-4, such that a worthy community applicant would still forfeit valuable points where “awareness of the community members” is not measurable. c) Implementation Guidance 34.12 fails to stipulate that the shortlisting and selection of CPE providers by ICANN (who are subject to market input) as a pre-emptive measure for selecting the most suitable CPE Provider for subsequent procedures in order to avoid a repeat of the widespread criticism resulting from the CPE evaluations for the 2012 round of applications.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11A)

4/16/21

Despite the welcomed retention of much of the 2012 AGB implementation relating to Geographic Name at the Top Level and their adoption as new consensus policy in place of much less favorable ones in the 2012 AGB, the ALAC remains concerned over the insufficient support within the community for the need to request and take into consideration the voice of stakeholders to future 

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11B)

4/16/21

We ask the ICANN Board to consider the public interest ramifications and serious potential consequences in allowing applications for Non-Capital City name strings which do not clearly relate to and in control applicants to whether the TLD will be used primarily for purposes associated with that city name. We oppose that stronger preventive protection for such strings is merited to prevent unintended consequences. Therefore, we reiterate our call for applications for strings which match the names of non-capital cities meeting specified criteria to be accompanied by letters of support/non objection from relevant local governmental/public authorities irrespective of the applicant’s declared use of the TLD.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11C)

4/16/21

For, the ALAC also asks that the ICANN Board consider directing ICANN to provide a Notification Tool exclusively to GAC Members who wish to be informed of any applications for strings matching any names with geographical meaning as submitted by participating GAC Members under any established conditions or criteria.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11D)

4/16/21

Lastly, we are disappointed at the lack of community-wide support for an ICANN Org provided opt-in updating button for interested parties to automatically keep them informed on application(s) for specified strings, a tool we see simply as a logical extension of SubPro WG’s Implementation Guidance 20.5.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12A)

4/16/21

The 2012 AGB Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.2.4 appear to suggest that the ALAC is required to prove 2 elements to qualify for standing for a community objection. The tool we see simply as a logical extension of SubPro WG’s Implementation Guidance 20.5.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12B)

4/16/21

As for the proposed Contention Resolution Transparency Requirements framework, we do not agree with the protections for disclosing applicants and advise the ICANN Board to ensure that all terms of any concluded private resolution be disclosed to ICANN Org (subject to non-disclosure commitment by ICANN Org where necessary) as data to support and inform future policy work.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12C)

4/16/21

Therefore, the ALAC strongly recommends that it be granted, under no uncertain terms, automatic standing for a community objection.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Al-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN

ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12D)

4/16/21

The 2012 AGB Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.2.4 appear to suggest that the ALAC is required to prove 2 elements to qualify for standing for a community objection. The tool we see simply as a logical extension of SubPro WG’s Implementation Guidance 20.5.

Phase 1

Receive & Acknowledge

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 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>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC115</td>
<td><a href="https://ssac-115-en.pdf">https://ssac-115-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC115: SSAC Comments on the Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR) Review Team Final Report</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the GNSO community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort (1) to examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse victimization; and (2) to define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC116</td>
<td>SAC116: SSAC Comments on the Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR) Review Team Final Report</td>
<td>SAC116: SSAC Comments on the Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR) Review Team Final Report</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN develop and adopt a plan for the deployment of ZONEMD in the root zone and make relevant technical bodies aware of plans to deploy ZONEMD in the root zone, and make relevant technical bodies aware of plans to deploy ZONEMD in the root zone. ICANN org further understands opportunity for feedback from the community resulting from those presentations should be offered any input provided be included as appropriate in the final ZONEMD deployment plan. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</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 root zone maintainer and root server operators should verify and confirm that the addition of a ZONEMD resource record will in no way negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RRS. ICANN received SAC116 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing. Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</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 make aware of plans to add ZONEMD to the root zone, and give an opportunity to offer feedback. This feedback could include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), the Internet Standards Organization (ISO), the Internet Society (ISOC), the Internet Society (ISOC), the Internet Society (ISOC), the Internet Society (ISOC), the Internet Society (ISOC). ICANN received SAC116 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing. Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-4</td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-4</td>
<td>2/12/21</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. ICANN received SAC116 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing. Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://ssac-114-en.pdf">https://ssac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-1)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-6)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-6)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-8)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-8)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-9)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-9)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-11)</td>
<td>SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-11)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that 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. ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td>Phase 2 Understood/Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee (RSSAC)

The RSSAC recommends that ICANN org conduct further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having a signed root zone name server data.

Committee (RZERC)

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response. Would it result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?

Committee (RSSAC)

The RSSAC recommends that ICANN org conduct further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data? What fraction of priming queries today have the D0 bit set?

Committee (RZERC)

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data? What fraction of priming queries today have the D0 bit set?

Committee (RSSAC)

Committee (RZERC)

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on Recommendations for Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 23 November 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/purp/newsroot-scaling-2020-10-05-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 29 June 2021.

Committee (RSSAC)

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. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the IANA Bylaws, Article III, Section 2.C. 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 ICAAN Bylaws, the ICAAN Bylaws take precedence.

Committee (RSSAC)

This is a report to the Internet community from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC).

Committee (RZERC)

This item contains no new action for the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. The RZERC can monitor progress of RSSAC028 by accessing the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Advice Status page (https://features.icann.org/board-advice/rssac). ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 29 June 2021.

Committee (RZERC)

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response. Would it result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?

Committee (RSSAC)

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.

Committee (RSSAC)

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.

Committee (RSSAC)

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.

Committee (RZERC)

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on Recommendations for Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 23 November 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/purp/newsroot-scaling-2020-10-05-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 29 June 2021.

Committee (RZERC)

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on Recommendations for Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 23 November 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/purp/newsroot-scaling-2020-10-05-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 29 June 2021.

Committee (RSSAC)

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.

Committee (RSSAC)

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.

Committee (RSSAC)

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.
Committee (RSSAC)  
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  

As of 30 June 2021

Advice Item | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System | 3/19/20 | | | The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. It is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.

RSSAC011: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators | 5/13/20 | | | The ICANN organization understands that this statement is the RSSAC011: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 19 May 2020.

SAC111: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process | 4/1/20 | | | The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC111: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. This item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 29 March 2020.

RSSAC038: RSSAC Statement on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report | 4/1/20 | | | The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC038: RSSAC Statement on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. This item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 16 May 2020.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  

Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
RSSAC002v4 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002v4-en.pdf | RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System | | The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. This item is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.

SAC111 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-111-en.pdf | SAC111: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process | | The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC111: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. This item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 29 March 2020.


Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)  

Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
RSSAC050 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-050-en.pdf | RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators | | The ICANN organization understands that this statement is the RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.

RSSAC002v4 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002v4-en.pdf | RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System | | The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. This item is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.


RSSAC050 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-050-en.pdf | RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators | | The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.
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Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System-2

1/12/20

The 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 RRS. The initial implementation should be such that it can transform into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary.

Phase 1: Implement

ICANN understands that this recommendation is asking for an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The "initial implementation" is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that the term service would be described after thorough sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the experimental implementation will be put in place, e.g., as an RFP for a system meeting all the requirements described in RSSAC047 or a determination that the interim implementation can meet RSSAC047 requirements (including those enumerated in Recommendation 2) or another approach. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 21 April 2020.

Phase 2: Implement

ICANN understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is instead describing a longer-term service that might be implemented. The operational details of the longer-term service will be described after thorough sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the experimental implementation will be put in place, e.g., as an RFP for a system meeting all the requirements described in RSSAC047 or a determination that the interim implementation can meet RSSAC047 requirements (including those enumerated in Recommendation 2) or another approach. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 21 April 2020.

Phase 3: Close Request

ICANN 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 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 02 April 2020. On 23 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC048's Recommendation 4 calls for additional work to be done in the future, and the ICANN Board agreed to do so. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 25 March 2021.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

1/12/20

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 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.

Phase 1: Implement

ICANN understands that this RSSAC048's recommendation is asking for additional work in the future. The ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC047's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future. The ICANN Board 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 and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 21 April 2020.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC049: RSSAC Advisory on System R-3

1/12/20

The RSSAC requests the ICANN Board to implement this system as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary.

Phase 1: Implement

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closes on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consultation https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/ssr2-rt-draft-report-2020-01-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 20 March 2020.
The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG’s report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its findings and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of grant making processes for the auction process that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG’s Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG’s recommendations.

ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-8)

The Registry must enshrine in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takedown demands with a political basis.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. 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 Registry agreement must establish a DNS Abuse hotline. This RA should include both a reference to an ICANN community established definition of DNS Abuse as well as an explicit ceiling in terms of a percentage of average daily material delisting volume.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. 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.
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-7)

The Registry Agreement must enshrine PIR prohibited practices such as bulk sales to commercial registrars. The Registry Agreement must also include a commitment to a fair mark-up of their domain names registration renewal fees and the option of a 20-year renewal thereof at the pre-increase price.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
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**Link to Advice Document**

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13747

**Issue Date**

12/24/19

**Advice Document Recommendation**

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

1. **Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse.** The DNS already provides a consensus definition of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain name" that are well-explained. According to that definition, "abuse" is an action that: (1) causes actual and substantial harm, or is 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, or such a purpose is disclosed. The DNS also recognized that "malicious use of domain name" include, but are not limited to: (i) spam, (ii) malware distribution; (iii) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse; (iv) phishing; and (v) 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 references 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.

2. **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 enforceability.**

ICANN should understand ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN to establish a clear definition of "abuse" that is within ICANN’s remit. We assume that such a definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity involving activity that interacts with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse). ICANN (org) further understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct org to clarify the “purposes and applications of ‘abuse’” before further work is done to define DNS abuse. We are unsure, however, what ALAC’s references to “purposes and applications” of abuse intended to mean and request clarification on this point. It is ALAC’s advice to identify the characteristics of abuse (e.g., behavior that affects the DNS in a specified way) that would be within ICANN’s remit. Yes, ICANN (org) also understands ALAC to advise that once the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit is identified, a determination should be made whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as references 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. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

3. **Cease rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.**

ICANN (org) understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) requests or to require Contracted Parties to simplify the process of whitelisting. ICANN understands that ALAC believes that these changes would facilitate improved reporting on the rate of abuse in the registration ecosystem that falls within ICANN’s remit. ICANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN to prohibit Contracted Parties from using a uniform and timely framework for publicly accessible registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC’s recommendations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussion leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN (org) understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDP process calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the white listing process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

4. **Direct ICANN Org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom on-going action ought to be contemplated.**

ICANN (org) understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from (i) identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom on-going action ought to be contemplated. However, ICANN (org) understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN Org to use DAAR to identify operators with high concentrations of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abusive behaviors within ICANN’s remit once, with respect to the latter, agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit (through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN (org) also understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN (org) to identify and acquire data needed to publish more actionable DAAR data and to identify registrars that sponsor or registers containing high concentrations of domain registrations engaged in such behaviors. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

5. **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 enforceability.**

ICANN (org) understands ALAC to advise the Board to 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 enforceability. We interpret this to mean that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN (org) to do so now with respect to malware, bots, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and, once agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit (through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties), other such behaviors. We understand that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN (org) to undertake regular audits of compliance with root-level obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

6. **Do not process registrations with “third party” payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.**

ICANN (org) understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN (org) to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where payments are made by an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ICANN is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN (org) understands that ALAC advises the Board to either (i) initiate a PDP by calling for an Issues Report on this topic or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC’s advice. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747">http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747</a></td>
<td>RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Implement the above recommendations, with clear enforcement language for ICANN's Contractual Compliance to adopt 5. Convene a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finally resolve what additional tools might be needed by Compliance.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747">http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747</a></td>
<td>RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System</td>
<td>12/1/19</td>
<td>ICANN understands that the ICANN Board and the RSSAC engaged in a discussion about threats to the Root Server System (RSS) and how the ICANN Board could respond if threats to the RSS materialized. 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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC107</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-107-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-107-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ICANN understands that this statement is SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms</td>
<td>12/3/19</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 concerns 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 caveat we foresee, given that there are some architectural assumptions in the DNS, is that some of these candidate algorithms may not be deployable in the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC044</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747">http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747</a></td>
<td>RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>10/20/19</td>
<td>The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its eighth workshop from October 1 to 3, 2019, hosted by the Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, four Risons to the RSSAC, four RSSAC Caucus members, and one ICANN researcher attended the workshop. The 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>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC047</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747">http://atlarge.icann.org/sac/statement/13747</a></td>
<td>RSSAC047: RSSAC Operational Procedures</td>
<td>10/27/19</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 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 61, 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>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ICANN understands that this statement is SAC105: SSAC Comments on Improving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-2)</td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the SSAC not begin any operational role in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG. But it is open to invitations to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN Board Status Advice Report is a document that outlines the advice provided by various ICANN advisory committees. It includes recommendations on various topics such as the Root Server System, DNS abuse, and quantum cryptography. The advice is provided to the ICANN Board, which then takes action on these recommendations. The report also includes links to the advice documents and external links to relevant information. The advice is categorised by phase (Phase 3: Evaluate & Consider or Phase 4: Implement) and action taken (Evaluate & Consider, Implement, or no action). The report is a valuable resource for understanding the advice given to the ICANN Board and the actions taken in response.
The ICANN organization understands that the aim of SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is not to provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board. Therefore, the item will be closed as closed."}

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) be made on the basis of consensus. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.

The ICANN Organization understands that RSSAC037 states, "RSOs must be autonomous and independent," and this must be preserved in future RSS governance models. RSOs must remain independent from each other as well as from any overarching organization, government, or community. This serves to prevent capture of the RSS by an entity that may diverge from the guiding principles of the RSS as set forth in RSSAC037. This document illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 1 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that bodies involved in the ongoing oversight of the Root Server System (RSS) be reviewed regularly to ensure that the RSS is both meeting its commitments and that it remains responsive to evolutionary needs and changing environmental factors as appropriate. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and are operating on the basis of consensus.

The ICANN organization 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 closed as 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 organization understands that ICANN.org is a high-level summary of the content 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.

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, three liaisons to the RSSAC, and four RSSAC Caucus members attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. The RSSAC also discussed several matters related to its proposed governance model for the RSS from RSSAC037. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.

The ICANN organization understands that the GAC understands RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content 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.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, three liaisons to the RSSAC, and four RSSAC Caucus members attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. The RSSAC also discussed several matters related to its proposed governance model for the RSS from RSSAC037. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content 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.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board has made the RSSAC be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formally required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and are operating on the basis of consensus.

The ICANN organization 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 closed as 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 organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that 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. As of December 2019, ICANN has approved a member to the OSG. This advice item will now be closed.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board has made the RSSAC be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formally required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and are operating on the basis of consensus. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands that 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. As of December 2019, ICANN has approved a member to the OSG. This advice item will now be closed.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC043 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that 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. As of December 2019, ICANN has approved a member to the OSG. This advice item will now be closed.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content 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.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content 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.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC042 illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the content of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 3 Jun 2019.
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Advice Item

Advice Document Recommendation

Phase

Action(s) Taken

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC108


SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process

2/21/18

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

The ICANN.org understands that this statement to be SAC108. SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered in the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Follow-up to the Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC: Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN

2/21/18

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement “Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN”, issued at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and synopses for all relevant issues, processes and activities—something that could be implemented without delay. In the context of the ALAC transition process, ICANN was able to offer timely and comprehensive information by breaking down complex issues into understandable components, which allowed interaction within the entire community. The ALAC and the GAC are now asking from ICANN that the same level of effort be made and the same service be provided to the community concerning information on all other relevant issues.


Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101v2


SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1C)

12/11/18

The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to 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.

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org and the community’s progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of EPDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf) between the GNSO Council and the Board, following a motion (https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/council/motions/2018-21January2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101v2


SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1C)

12/11/18

The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. 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.

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org and the community’s progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of EPDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf) between the GNSO Council and the Board, following a motion (https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/council/motions/2018-21January2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

Phase 4

Deferral

Phase 4

Implementation
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1) | 12/21/18 | 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 | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law. | Phase 4 | Implement |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | 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 |

As of 30 June 2021

Advice Item Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>Implement Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>Implement Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>Implement Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advice Document Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action(s) Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1, and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to work with the community to: clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/offices/2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item 2B suggests that the Board direct ICANN or gTLD registries to work with the community to: clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements." In accepting advice item 2B, the Board noted that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits." ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. 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-2-05feb21-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-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021. The ODP for the SSAD was launched on 29 April 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-bliss-report-recommendations-2021-04-29-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-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics on 11 June 2021, adopted GNSO Council Recommendations 19-22 and directed ICANN org to develop and execute an implementation plan for the recommendations (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2021-06-21-en.pdf).

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 GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item three suggests that the Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law." As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of ODPs.

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 GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item three suggests that the Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law." As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of ODPs.

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 GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item four suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to: clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. In accepting advice item 2B, the Board noted that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits." ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. 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-2-05feb21-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-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mатериал/offices/2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-14)</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should include a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data, policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 report (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-25-en#1). 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. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The 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/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.
As of 30 June 2021

**Committee (SSAC)**

Committee (RSSAC)

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
SAC102v2 | SAC102v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-18) | Phase 5 | Close Request

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC102v2 and accepted Recommendation 1, and directed the ICANN Board to: A) review the reports on ICANN org and the community's progress towards the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c); B) consider the policies recommended in the current report in the context of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report was organized by subject matter and included regular reference to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. Each section begins with a listing of relevant questions and preliminary recommendations from the Initial Report then follows with the SSAC's comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.

**Committee (SSAC)**

Committee (RSSAC)

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
SAC101v2 | SAC101v2: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5) | Phase 5 | Close Request

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

**Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
RSGA041 | RSGA041: RSGA Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3) | Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 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 rationale the Board states, “Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The ICDAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

**Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
RSGA044 | RSGA044: RSGA Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4) | Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 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 rationale the Board states, “Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The ICDAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

**Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
RSGA041 | RSGA041: RSGA Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5) | Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 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 rationale the Board states, “Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The ICDAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
SAC103 | SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report | Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC103 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 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 rationale the Board states, “Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The ICDAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
SAC102 | SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Reflower | Phase 1 | Close Request

On 11 May 2018 the ICANN Board requested that the SSAC provide advice in the Board on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Reflower. This comment represents the SSAC’s response to that request.
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Advice Item Status
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Document Recommendation

Action(s) Taken

---

Committee (RSSAC)
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC39

RSSAC39: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1
6/18

RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from reconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from reconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. ICANN org also understands the RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase and that the RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

RSSAC39

RSSAC39: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-2
6/18

The KSK rollover back out plan was written in July of 2016, updated in April of 2018, and may become a critical procedure that needs to be revisited immediately in case of KSK rollover failure. This document, its procedures and triggers should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RIO, RSSAC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. RSSAC pledges that all of the RSSDs will be prepared to participate in monitoring and measuring to ensure adequate data is available upon which a rollover decision can be made.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC advises the KSK rollover back out plan should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RIO, IAAAC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

RSSAC40

RSSAC40: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-1
6/18

Recommendation 1: KSK Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DNS traffic. Any RSKO that decides to share anonymization of data should communicate the plan details to other RSKOs. In addition, this recommendation notes that the ICANN needs to consider the advantages and disadvantages of sharing of anonymization strategy and, simplify the understanding of the properties of the data for those who use data from multiple RSKOs.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC40 Recommendation 1 for the Root Server Operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DNS Traffic Data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

RSSAC40

RSSAC40: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-3
6/18

Recommendation 3: Autonomous System (AS) number of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. In order to properly anonymize the data, the RSKO should wish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the AS of the original data. Such a table should have a timespan for when the mapping was made due to AS values changing over time.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC40 Recommendation 3 for Autonomous System (AS) number of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

RZERC001

RZERC001: Feedback on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Signing Key Rollover
7/18

The Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC) is pleased to respond to the Board request for advice on ICANN’s “Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover” per its resolution 2018.05.13.09. The RZERC has confirmed that the RZERC, the root zone management partners, and ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO). At this time, the RZERC does not have significant additional advice to add to what these actors have already provided. Additionally, the RZERC is not aware of any reason for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the root KSK rollover.

The ICANN org understands RZERC001 is the RZERC’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN org understands the RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by SSAC, RSSAC, the root zone management partners, and ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO). The RZERC does not have significant additional advice and the RZERC is not aware of any reason for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the root KSK rollover. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RZERC on 7 September 2018.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC36

RSSAC36: RSSAC Statement on the Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSS
1/18

The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) appreciates the opportunity to participate in this public comment proceeding on the draft final report as part of its ongoing organizational review. This report builds on RSSAC312 and the feedback on the draft recommendations from the RSSAC Review Work Party (RWP) to the independent examiners.

The ICANN org understands that this statement refers to RSSAC36. ICANN org sends the draft report on the Second Organizational Review of the RSS. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 19 July 2018.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC37-08

RSSAC37-08: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System
1/18

The ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC37-08: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root Server System (RSS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). The model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RSS.

The ICANN org understands that this is a detailed proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands this proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board for RSSAC37-08 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC3: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5
1/18

Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board, ICANN, and ICANN community must continue long-term efforts regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation staff should be a top priority of the Board and the ICANN organisation staff. A ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purpose for the collection and publication of the data. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation should be responsible for the collection and publication of the data. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation should be responsible for the collection and publication of the data. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation should be responsible for the collection and publication of the data. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation should be responsible for the collection and publication of the data. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organisation should be responsible for the collection and publication of the data.

The ICANN org understands SSAC advisory regarding access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5. This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC103. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC103v2, “Version 2 of SAC103 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expanded Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC103 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.”
<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>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a> m/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The Model initial drafts should be 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.</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee (RSSAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

Advice Item Status

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

RSSAC032

Reference Number

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item

Issued - Update

Advice Document Recommendation

Phase

Action(s) Taken


The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation.

This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 May 2018.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) RSSAC034 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/rssac-034-09may18-en.pdf RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC, May 2018 Workshop 5/18 This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC, May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of his workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root System. (At-Large) The workshop reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Verisign in May/June.

The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) workshop held from 1 May 2018 to 3 May 2018. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 16 May 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) RSSAC033 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-04/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on Draft Project Plan for the Proposed Interim Model 4/24/18 The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed refill fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (i). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of $US 15 million in total, in line with principle (i). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be $US 16 million, corresponding to the total amount of outflows of Reserve Fund to the ICANN Org. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large administrative activities and outreach.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/reserve-fund-replenishment-2018-03-06-en). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-AC-ST-0425-01-01-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/11233 ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops 4/25/18 This can not be processed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation.

This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 24 April 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-AC-ST-0418-01-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13361 ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy 4/18/18 The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed refill fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (i). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of $US 15 million in total, in line with principle (i). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be $US 16 million, corresponding to the total amount of outflows of Reserve Fund to the ICANN Org.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy and was submitted as part of a public comment (https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/reserve-fund-replenishment-2018-03-06-en). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-AC-ST-0404-01-01-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13363 ALAC Statement on Draft Project Plan for the Proposed Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) 4/1/18 The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed refill fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (i). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of $US 15 million in total, in line with principle (i). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be $US 16 million, corresponding to the total amount of outflows of Reserve Fund to the ICANN Org.

The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation.

This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 24 April 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 Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC031</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-RSSAC-0318-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-RSSAC-0318-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC031: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures request for input from RSSAC, SSAC, the Office of the CID, and the Global Domains Division on root scaling. This is the RSSAC's response.</td>
<td>2/2/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures request for input on root scaling. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0318-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-ALAC-0318-02-01-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-ALAC-0318-02-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>Recommendations to Improve ICANN Staff Accountability</td>
<td>2/9/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC's comment on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14.en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14.en</a></td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC100</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-SSAC-100-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-SSAC-100-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC100: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling</td>
<td>2/21/17</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this statement is the ALAC's comment on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14.en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14.en</a></td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC030</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-RSSAC-030-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-Item-RSSAC-030-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Source</td>
<td>11/4/17</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Source. The document provides a broad statement about the DNS root system information contained in these key sources, which are the attributes of the organization responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Source. The document provides a broad statement about the DNS root system information contained in these key sources, which are the attributes of the organization responsible for the operation of the DNS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Document</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>Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) 2017 Workshop</td>
<td>10/4/17</td>
<td>Issued on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The SSAC sent a letter (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/faltstrom-to-icann-board-03oct17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/faltstrom-to-icann-board-03oct17-en.pdf</a>) to the ICANN Board on 3 October 2017, regarding the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2). The ICANN organization understands that this is a brief discussion on each of the apolitical mind map components developed in the previous workshop, and a high-level summary of the outcomes from the SSR2 workshop held hosted by the University of Maryland in early October.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R 4
3/8/17
Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response size under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.5 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 cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider: • Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name • Noting the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set • Backward compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a priming specific a single signature over the entire priming set (R-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) • Having a single key for the root zone instead of the current RSA+EC scheme • Effects of allowing the Additional section in priming response empty

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R 5
8/3/17
The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is to not change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC Caucus Root Server Naming Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming responses. The root server addresses should be signed in a way that reduces the potential for operational breakage. • Because the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same server. This can be done by using delegations to the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root server’s AAAA RRs and the root zone should be hosted on the root server. • Amongst the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (S-3), or adding a new FQDN under the root zone (S-4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R 2
8/3/17
Conduct studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors.

Recommendation 3: Study impact of node re-delegation attacks. The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Phase 1: Close Request

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 is to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with goals of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 1/17/18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1**

- 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 subscription to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registrar 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.

**SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-2**

- The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conforms to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1.

**SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3**

- The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.

**SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-4**

- The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly compiled with all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.

---

**RSSAC027: May 2017 Workshop Report**

- The ICANN organization understands 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

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

---

**Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Reports, R-1**

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

---

**Footnote:**

- SAC097 was prepared in the first half of 2017.
- The number of complaints requiring Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption rate of the new auto-approve feature increased to 45% from 40% in June 2019. The number of complaints raised concerns. ICANN org will work with registries to improve the accuracy of the Zonefile access metric. The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Registro Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**RSSAC027: May 2017 Workshop Report**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.

---

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

- The ICANN organization notes that 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 high-level discussion to the ICANN community.
As of 30 June 2021

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The 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 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The 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 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAO95: SSAC Advisory on the use of brng in Domain Names R-1

23/02/17

Because risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.

Phase 1: Deleted

On 3 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLDs and ccTLDs on various issues on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformity with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mats/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#e). IDN conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor is also a requirement of gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGRs is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tlds-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN66 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Finally the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/system/files/idn/resolutions-2017-07-19-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2018 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAO95: SSAC Advisory on the use of brng in Domain Names R-2

23/02/17

Because risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrars of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.

Phase 1: Closed

On 3 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLDs and ccTLDs on various issues on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformity with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mats/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#e). IDN conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor is also a requirement of gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGRs is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tlds-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN66 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Finally the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/system/files/idn/resolutions-2017-07-19-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2018 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advisory Item Status
As of 30 June 2021
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 23 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccnso-review-deferral-2017-04-06-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

SSAC092: SSAC on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 23 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccnso-review-deferral-2017-04-06-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 23 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccnso-review-deferral-2017-04-06-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC Statement on the GNSO Community Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has clearly gone into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCF/CTC) analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focused on the interests of end users of the Internet, specifically, while increased competition may be considered as an important outcome of the new gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.

SSAC092: SSAC on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 23 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccnso-review-deferral-2017-04-06-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC039: SSAC on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 19 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 23 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations for the New gTLD Portfolio (ssac-accountability-2017-04-14-en)

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations for the New gTLD Portfolio. The respective public comment period closed on 23 April 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 30 May 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-bylaws-bgc-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 15 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response to the ICANN Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

- The ICANN organization understands this in the ALAC's statement on the Draft FY18 African Domain Name System Market Study. The respective public comment period closed on 7 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 May 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/pubdocs/icann-africa-market-study-2017-05-11-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. 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 their in European Cross-Carri Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains 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.

- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Recommendations from the Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2 Subgroup on ICANN Transparency. ALAC and Au-Ng Members participated in the CWG-CAccountability Workstream 2 Subgroup on ICANN Transparency and the ALAC supports the recommendations in their entirety. The ALAC also provided three additional comments for consideration.

- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response to a Call for Public Comments “on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of a name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers”. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

- The ICANN organization understands SAC091 is the SSAC's comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators and is a response to a Call for Public Comments on “the description of five diseases that could affect the health of a name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers”. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 05 May 2017.

- The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC's documentation of the terms commonly used by any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be used to discuss the root server system evolves.

- The ICANN organization understands ALAC082 is ALAC's discussion of the terms commonly used by any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be used to discuss the root server system evolves.
### Committee (SSAC)

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

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

### As of 30 June 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Reference 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-1207-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9909">http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9909</a></td>
<td>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of Operating Plan and Budget</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy. On the whole, the document is well written, although there are several instances where the extensive listing of details could be counter-productive, as it makes the text look like an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list is actually acceptable... ...Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN acknowledges the diversity of our global community and the acceptance or otherwise of what are usually accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of crosscommunity interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but it also emphasises that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behaviour or not. The other main concern is that this policy could be misused as a weapon against someone. This policy is best produced by professional HR persons who are familiar with the language and legal implications.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-01-00-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>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1207-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9913">http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9913</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Updated ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy. On the whole, the document is well written, although there are several instances where the extensive listing of details could be counter-productive, as it makes the text look like an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list is actually acceptable... ...Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN acknowledges the diversity of our global community and the acceptance or otherwise of what are usually accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of crosscommunity interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but it also emphasises that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behaviour or not. The other main concern is that this policy could be misused as a weapon against someone. This policy is best produced by professional HR persons who are familiar with the language and legal implications.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-01-00-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>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1207-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9911">http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9911</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Continuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) The overall budget estimates are reasonable increment figures of PTI FY17 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 15 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 February 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-09feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-09feb17-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.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the PContinuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 15 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 February 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-09feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-09feb17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1207-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9910">http://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9910</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) The overall budget estimates are reasonable increment figures of PTI FY17 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 10 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-0126sep16-plan-budget-23jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-0126sep16-plan-budget-23jan17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 10 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-0126sep16-plan-budget-23jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-0126sep16-plan-budget-23jan17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC0350</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/policy/en/draft-policy-ssac-0350-es.txt">http://www.icann.org/policy/en/draft-policy-ssac-0350-es.txt</a></td>
<td>SAC0350: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Name System</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 1 Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSAC088: SSAC Response to the ccNSO Implementation Report

The ATLAS II Recommendations Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy

Phase 1 Close Request

The ICANN organization understands SAC089 is SSAC's Response to ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Middle East and the Domain Namespace, R-2 on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Phase II Request for comments on the 21 December 2016 Report of Public Comments was released on 21 December 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-competitive-effects-assessment-21dec16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Phase 1 Close Request

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Al-LAC-Adv-2016-01-01-EN

The ALAC understands SAC089 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
<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>SAC084</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC084: Key Technical Elements of Potential Root-Operator Systems</td>
<td>9/8/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC084 to be an input to the technical discussion of key technical elements for 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC025</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-021-statement-9/8/16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-021-statement-9/8/16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC025: RSSAC Statement Concerning the Extended Process Similarity Review</td>
<td>9/10/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 to be an input to the technical discussion of the similarity of processes for gTLDs 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC085</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-085-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-085-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC085: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for Root Server System</td>
<td>10/6/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC085 to be an input to the technical discussion of the guidelines for the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC026</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-9/10/16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-9/10/16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC026: RSSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on WhoIs/Registration System Enhancements</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 to be an input to the technical discussion of the enhancements to the WhoIs/Registration system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSC086</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-086-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-086-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSC086: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for Root Server System</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SSC086 to be an input to the technical discussion of the guidelines for the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-A large community Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC-Policy Issue Report</td>
<td><a href="https://alac-icann.org/alac-poly/en">https://alac-icann.org/alac-poly/en</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta)</td>
<td>9/29/16</td>
<td>Policy Comment Statement</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC-Policy Issue Report to be the ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 23 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Large community Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC-016-07-09-16 18-11</td>
<td><a href="https://alac-icann.org/alac-policy-report-comments-2016-07-09-16.pdf">https://alac-icann.org/alac-policy-report-comments-2016-07-09-16.pdf</a></td>
<td>Advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. in this Advisory, the SSAC identifies key technical elements of potential Root-Operator systems. SAC084 and RSC075 are considered as starting points; at least, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operator. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethics, etc.) to be important and form an overall assessment but are not addressed herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet.</td>
<td>9/29/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SSAC084 to be an input to the technical discussion of key technical elements for 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC027</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-beta-18-09-2016-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-beta-18-09-2016-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC027: RSSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services 7 Second Outreach</td>
<td>9/8/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC027 to be an input to the technical discussion of the next generation of gTLD Registration Directory Services 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Large community Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC-016-07-09-16 18-11</td>
<td><a href="https://alac-icann.org/alac-policy-report-comments-2016-07-09-16.pdf">https://alac-icann.org/alac-policy-report-comments-2016-07-09-16.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta)</td>
<td>9/29/16</td>
<td>Policy Comment Statement</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC-Policy Issue Report to be the ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 23 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-086-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-086-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSC086: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for Root Server System</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SSC086 to be an input to the technical discussion of the guidelines for the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Large community Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC-Policy Issue Report</td>
<td><a href="https://alac-icann.org/alac-poly/en">https://alac-icann.org/alac-poly/en</a></td>
<td>Al-Large Community Policy Issues - Why End Users Should Care</td>
<td>5/10/16</td>
<td>Policy Comment Statement</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC-Policy Issue Report to be the ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 23 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC029</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-beta-23sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-beta-23sep16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC029: RSSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Subsequent Procedures - Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>9/10/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC029 to be an input to the technical discussion of the next generation of gTLD Subsequent Procedures 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSC087</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-087-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-087-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSC087: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for Root Server System</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>As of 30 June 2021</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SSC087 to be an input to the technical discussion of the guidelines for the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 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-001-01-DN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/st001">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/st001</a></td>
<td>SAC081: ICANN Statement on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement</td>
<td>6/26/16</td>
<td>Public Comment (Statement) - The ALAC strongly supports theWorking Group has made observations on the process around conflating sensitivity with privacy. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group's 'engaged way forward.' The ALAC congratulates the PFIt Working Group for making significant, positive impact on the overall ICANN policy for the selection of TLD strings. The ALAC believes that the proposed guidelines help promote linguistic diversity, mitigate the risk of user confusion, and preserve and ensure the security, stability, and interoperability of the DNS.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC081 is ALAC's response to the Proposals on the Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 July 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 September 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-guidelines-op06-16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-guidelines-op06-16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)   | AL-ALAC-ST-001-01-DN | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/st002 | SAC082: ICANN Statement on Request for Input on Next Generation RDS to Replace WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP) | 6/15/16     | Public Comment (Statement) - Without taking away from the importance of the documents, we suggest that the Working Group focus on more critical documents, including: - The latest WHOIS Policy Review Team Final Report 2012 - SAC Reports 054, 055 and 058 - 2013 RAA and 2014 New gTLD Agreement - Relevant RLG - The latest documents from the IDN data protection, particularly the latest Directive/Regulation - The WHOIS Final Report. In addition to the above documents, EWG members The WHOIS must, at a minimum and by Full Consensus, address the following question: - Should the domain name registration process capture, collect and curate personal data elements for a valid domain name registration transaction? - Should ICANN compel the capture, collection and the curtailment of certain specific personal data elements of the domain name registration transaction? Specifically, the Working Group should identify all data that ICANN requires to be collected. This data, together with other data, can potentially be of concern to individuals/users. With the increasing use of data analytics, a great deal of information about individuals can be gained by analyzing data from a variety of sources in combination with other data. | The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is ALAC's response to the Proposals on the Request for Input on Next Generation RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP. The input was provided to the OBG on 15 June 2016 for consideration (https://community.icann.org/display/LG0/DRS/Outreach+request%2C+but+not+received). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSA000 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-root-server-system-000-20160131-en.pdf | RSSA035: ICANN Statement on Proposal Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement | 6/19/16 | Public Comment (Statement) - The RAC is committed to supporting the global root DNS namespace. The ICANN Statement on Proposal Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement specifically states that the root server operators will continue to support the technical and operational requirements of the root name system. | The ICANN organization understands RSSA035 is RSSAC's statement confirming that operators of root server operators are committed to supporting the global root DNS namespace and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSA000 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-root-server-system-000-20160131-en.pdf | RSSA036: ICANN Statement on Proposal Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement | 6/19/16 | Public Comment (Statement) - The ICANN Statement on Proposal Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement specifically states that the root server operators will continue to support the technical and operational requirements of the root name system. | The ICANN organization understands RSSA036 is RSSAC's statement confirming that operators of root server operators are committed to supporting the global root DNS namespace and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC083 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-083-en.pdf | SAC083: SSAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement | 7/11/16 | Public Comment (Statement) - The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) provides a brief comment on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreements. Specifically, Section 1.2 of Exhibit A (Approved Services) introduces new text relating to the potential collection of non-delegation records in the root zone, thereby introducing unnecessary ambiguity regarding the permissibility of data collection. | The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is SSAC's comment on draft proposed amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The Public Comment period for the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-amend-new-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en) closed on 20 July 2016. ICANN and the Working Group established by the Registry Stakeholder Group are considering the comments received, and plans to begin a proposed final version of the amendments for approval of the Registry Stakeholder Group (according to the process defined in Section 7.6 of the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement) and the ICANN Board of Directors. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017. |

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC084 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf | SAC084: ICANN Statement on Request for Comments | 7/15/16 | Public Comment (Statement) - The ICANN Statement on Request for Comments specifically states that the root server operators will continue to support the technical and operational requirements of the root name system. | The ICANN organization understands SAC084 is SSAC's statement confirming that operators of root server operators are committed to supporting the global root DNS namespace and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC085 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-085-en.pdf | SAC085: ICANN Statement on Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process | 7/15/16 | Public Comment (Statement) - The ICANN Statement on Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process specifically states that the root server operators will continue to support the technical and operational requirements of the root name system. | The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is SSAC's statement confirming that operators of root server operators are committed to supporting the global root DNS namespace and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
### Action(s) Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC041</td>
<td>3/17/16</td>
<td>This is SAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC042</td>
<td>4/16/16</td>
<td>This is SAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC043</td>
<td>4/30/16</td>
<td>This is SAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
<td>The SSAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4) addresses caused by the increasing diversity of network technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC039</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC040</td>
<td>3/17/16</td>
<td>This is SAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC041</td>
<td>4/16/16</td>
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<tr>
<td>SAC042</td>
<td>4/30/16</td>
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<tr>
<td>SAC043</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
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<td>SAC039</td>
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<td>4/30/16</td>
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<tr>
<td>SAC043</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC043</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC043</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
<td>7/17/16</td>
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Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations

12/28/15

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines.

The RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC020 document with a number of minor clarification fixes. RSSAC020v2 was published on 20 January 2016. In this document, a number of minor formatting issues were improved, but were not proposed. 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 Organization understands RSSAC017 describes RSSAC's scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC020 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC016 describes RSSAC's report on its first workshop in which it discussed the evolution of the Root Server System as well as accountability, continuity and evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC015 describes RSSAC's comment detailing that the RSSAC has no impact on the evolution of the Root Server System as well as accountability, continuity and evolution, and that there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC014 describes RSSAC's report on its second workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on a foundation for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the root name space, streamlining the standard framework for accessing Domain Name Registration Data (DNS). This framework would facilitate and implement verification methods, credential services and access control capabilities. The Board accepted SSAC recommendations and established the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWSG) to begin implementation of the recommendations. In its Final Report, the EWSG recommended a paradigm shift wherein gTLD registration data is collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only, with some data elements being available only to authenticated requesters that are then held accountable for appropriate use. Therefore, while existing ICANN policies do not now require differentiated access to gTLD data, if stream from Board decisions and EWSG recommendations in this regard, ICANN policies will likely have that requirement. The Operational Profile of RDDS, therefore, should include an obligation on all gTLD registrars and registrants that the basic functionality will support authentication and authorization framework. Specifically, therefore, this allows differentiation of access must be required now, as part of this proposal even if it starts as access with all be one class of this public. In that case, when differentiation access requirements are imposed, protocol features will already be deployed to provide such access.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC013 describes RSSAC's request to produce version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC012 describes RSSAC's report on its first workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on the foundational terms for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RNS.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC011 describes RSSAC's report on its second workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on a foundation for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the root name space, streamlining the standard framework for accessing Domain Name Registration Data (DNS). This framework would facilitate and implement verification methods, credential services and access control capabilities. The Board accepted SSAC recommendations and established the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWSG) to begin implementation of the recommendations. In its Final Report, the EWSG recommended a paradigm shift wherein gTLD registration data is collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only, with some data elements being available only to authenticated requesters that are then held accountable for appropriate use. Therefore, while existing ICANN policies do not now require differentiated access to gTLD data, if stream from Board decisions and EWSG recommendations in this regard, ICANN policies will likely have that requirement. The Operational Profile of RDDS, therefore, should include an obligation on all gTLD registrars and registrants that the basic functionality will support authentication and authorization framework. Specifically, therefore, this allows differentiation of access must be required now, as part of this proposal even if it starts as access with all be one class of this public. In that case, when differentiation access requirements are imposed, protocol features will already be deployed to provide such access.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC's request to produce version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC009 describes RSSAC's report on its second workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on the foundational terms for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RNS.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC008 describes RSSAC's request to produce version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's report on its first workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on the foundational terms for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RNS.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC006 describes RSSAC's report on its second workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on the foundational terms for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RNS.

The RSSAC Organization understands RSSAC005 describes RSSAC's report on its second workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on the foundational terms for the future evolution of the root server system (RNS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RNS.
### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

#### ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal

By 30 June 2021

The ALAC organization understands: ALAC-51-1215-03-00-EN=ALAC's Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](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.

---

#### ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report

By 30 June 2021

The ALAC organization understands: ALAC-51-1215-02-01-EN=ALAC's Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 31 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 30 January 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-draft-review-30jan16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-draft-review-30jan16-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.

---

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

By 30 June 2021

The ALAC organization understands: ALAC-51-1115-01-00-EN=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-prm-prelim-issue-02dec15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prm-prelim-issue-02dec15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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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-0715-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9729">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9729</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AC and Organizational Reviews</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] ALAC provides comments and input into the Initial Report from the GNSO's Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report. The comments address concerns related to the IPR protection of privacy and proxy services, the role of the ICANN Board in the decision-making process, and the potential impact on the GNSO's ability to make informed decisions. ALAC recommends that the Board consider the comments and take appropriate action.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AC 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 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0715-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9729">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9729</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] ALAC response to IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. Answers questions concerning the Proposal as a Whole, the NTIA Criteria, and the ICG Report and Executive Summary List of Public Comments: [<a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-public-archive-of-submitted-comments/">https://www.icann.org/files/files/iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-public-archive-of-submitted-comments/</a>] and ICANN Board Statement on the ICG Proposal: [<a href="https://comments.ianag.org/pdf/submission/submission121.pdf">https://comments.ianag.org/pdf/submission/submission121.pdf</a>]. The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-0715-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community was released on 20 Aug 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/documents/iana-transition-proposal-v9.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/documents/iana-transition-proposal-v9.pdf</a>]). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Released during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 23 Nov 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf</a>]). There is no action for the ALAC Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. 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>RSSAC014</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6729">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6729</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] ALAC strongly supports the research and recommendations in the Preliminary Issue Report. The ALAC endorses the proposal to...</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AC 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 Sep 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf</a>]). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Released during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 23 Nov 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf</a>]). There is no action for the ALAC Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC014</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6729">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6729</a></td>
<td>RSSAC014: Comment to “Proposed Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...”</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
<td>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 IGP plan and observed the ICANN community process that has led to it.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN is ALAC's statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AC 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 Sep 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf</a>]). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Released during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 23 Nov 2015 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09aug15-en.pdf</a>]). There is no action for the ALAC Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</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>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC070 describes SAC's advice on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the ALAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC015-01-00-00</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-015-01-00-00.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-015-01-00-00.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the At-Large Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Approved Final Proposal - PTI Board Members should adopt at large-governor - Success of PTI contingent on adequate funding - Affirms its commitment to continue to support the CWG-Stewardship</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC015 describes ALAC's motion to adopt the At-Large Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Approved Final Proposal and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the ALAC in May 2017.</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>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/governance/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/governance/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN</td>
<td>03/15/15</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands Recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the UASG to explicitly include the use of a PSL and actions related to a PSL as part of their work. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the ICANN organization implemented the recommendation as directed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/governance/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/governance/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN</td>
<td>03/15/15</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN as ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 March 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 12 June 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-0515-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/al-ac-statements/6491">https://www.icann.org/al-ala c-statements/6491</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions</td>
<td>02/22/15</td>
<td>Statement: As noted in the General Comments: The ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft Proposal. That being said, the ALAC does have a number of critical concerns that will need to be addressed to allow us to fully support the final CWG proposal. As detailed in the comments on section II.A.1., the ALAC would prefer an IANA wholly integrated into ICANN, but was willing to accept a compromise of a separate legal entity. If the details of its organization and governance are satisfactory – one very major concern that we believe must be addressed by the CWG, specifically the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight and decision making – and we will offer guidance as to how this might be addressed – one area where the ALAC had not yet reached consensus, but we have some concerns over the current direction of the CWG, specifically the Board (or other controlling entity) of the Post-Transition IANA (PTI); and – a number of lesser concerns and requests for clarification. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-1jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-1jun15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2017.01.04.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-05-0515-02-00-EN as ALAC’s statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 June 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-1jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-1jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-07-0515-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/al-ac-statements/6501">https://www.icann.org/al-ac-statements/6501</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan &amp; Budget</td>
<td>03/15/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement]: The ALAC is satisfied with the Budget proposal as a whole, but has one specific item of concern, related to the evolution of support for ICANN Policy Development. - Both the GNSO and the ALAC’s activities are essentially funded under the ICANN Policy budget. Policy Development is a core activity at ICANN. It is this Multistakeholder Policy Development that differentiates ICANN from any other organisation. The overall budget allocated to Policy Development and supporting the GNSO, including constituency travel support, is about $14.4 million USD, which is surprisingly less than 10% of total budget for Core Activity and Staff Differentiation factor. - The ALAC believes the growth of the budget to be too low. This concern translates directly to concerns about staffing levels. The budget indicates that 16 new staff hires are expected for FY16, yet, none of the hires seem to be in Policy Support. The ALAC forecasts a number of new PDPs, review processes, as well as a potential next round of gTLDs which will only serve to increase the demand on already busy staff. The Community of At-Large structure will soon reach the 200 mark translating to a need for increased support of increased activity. The ALAC is concerned that this need to increase FTEs supporting Policy both in the GNSO and in the ALAC is not currently reflected in the budget and may lead to Staff turnover, Community frustration, and a reduction in Community involvement that risks making long-term evolution of the Multistakeholder model unsustainable. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2017.01.04.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-07-0515-01-01-EN as ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan &amp; Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 01 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 05 June 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-07-0515-01-03-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/al-ac-statements/6511">https://www.icann.org/al-ac-statements/6511</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan &amp; Budget</td>
<td>03/15/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement]: General Comments: ALAC generally supports the proposed principles. Working definitions (Section 3): No Comment - Policy &amp; Implementation Principles (Section 4): Note concern when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process. Public Interest issues should be referred back to Chartering Organization. When policy issues involve public interest issues, involve all impacted stakeholders (all impacted stakeholders). - Proposed Additional New gTLD Processes (Section 5): Generally supports the introduction of new processes that may be able to deal in some matters in a more appropriate way. Suggest stressing to understand effect of changes and changes should be reviewed within reasonable short periods to ensure they achieved goal. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2017.01.04.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-07-0515-01-03-EN as ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 March 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 12 June 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Provider</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>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-providing-information-in-english-as-well-report-of-public-comments.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-providing-information-in-english-as-well-report-of-public-comments.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report</td>
<td>30/05/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR 2 is expected to benefit several million users, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs are named and active, others have been less active or inactive. It is important that the DNI program is harmonized in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building after transition. The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report. This statement renews the request to ICANN to take into account the ALAC’s proposal. The task force should be kept active in order to provide a solution to the issue. The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report. This statement renews the request to ICANN to take into account the ALAC’s proposal. The task force should be kept active in order to provide a solution to the issue.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 01 Feb 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 Feb 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC011</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-communities.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-communities.pdf</a></td>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC011: IAB-Liaison to the RSSAC</td>
<td>16/12/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - The eviction of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: Registrant and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNI penetrability, education at all levels is key to increasing demand and local suppliers; requirements placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost of living and related financial constraints; the insurance required for registrars is a real concern for under-served regions; the second round of the new TLD program should give preference, first eligibility, to applicants from under-served regions, with adequate outreach efforts. - In response to the frequencies posted in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrant rights must be secured through the GCL insurance or any other mechanism(s); 2) No opinion; 3) The ICANN determines that a permanent fund reserved by ICANN and provided by the registrants based on their transaction volumes for covering any harm caused to registrants is a &quot;best practice,&quot; registrants using registra with no fees not follow the practice must not be disadvantaged; 4) The GCL requirement is maintained; the $500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrar can demonstrate that it will still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) If ICANN decides to eliminate the GCL requirement, it should be applied to all registries and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrant and user rights. The elimination of the GCL requirement could be the best way to support under-served regions to participate in the TLD. Registrant rights must be secured by another mechanism. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-communities.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-communities.pdf</a>.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisory Provider:** Large Advisory Committee (LAC)  
**Reference Number:** SAC069  

#### Recommendation 1:  
Recommendation 1: The operational communities’ protocol parameters, names, and numbering that have been subject to local or international agreements should not be revised without the consent of all stakeholders involved. The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

#### Recommendation 2:  
Recommendation 2: The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

#### Recommendation 3:  
Recommendation 3: The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

#### Recommendation 4:  
Recommendation 4: The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

#### Recommendation 5:  
Recommendation 5: The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

#### Recommendation 6:  
Recommendation 6: The recommendations should be made in consultation with the appropriate technical communities and stakeholders to ensure that all relevant input is considered. These recommendations should be clear and implementable.

---

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**  
**As of 30 June 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 Item Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root System Security Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC008</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm</a></td>
<td>RSSAC008: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System</td>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>The initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server system. The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. 2. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3. Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC007</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ssac/SSAC-Overview-and-History-of-the-IANA-Functions">https://community.icann.org/display/ssac/SSAC-Overview-and-History-of-the-IANA-Functions</a></td>
<td>SSAC007: SSAC Statement at the ICAAN Accountability Town Hall during ISF 2014</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC’s guidance to the Representatives on the NTIA IANA Functions? Stewardship Transition Coordination Group? and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC001-01-00-DN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/files/files/rssac-stewardship-31jul14-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/files/files/rssac-stewardship-31jul14-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding Consideration of GAC Advice</td>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>the ALAC values the board’s continued effort on the implementation of the AFST and AFSTD recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the AFST and 9 of the AFSTD. Nonwithstanding, the ALAC is concerned that the proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice by the Board may deviate from an unbiased weight to the advice compared to that of the other AO’s or the policies proposed by each of the SN. Moreover, the ALAC observes a trend in the Internet Governance ecosystem that tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BIR has already designed a “Process for consultations between the [Board] and the [GAC],” the ALAC asks the Board to reconsider the proposed Bylaws changes and continue to foster equal footing among all participants of the ICANN community. If the Board is to implement this Bylaw change, the ALAC advises the Board to fully implement recommendation 9.1 of AFSTD in the same round of Bylaw changes. This would preserve the delicate balance of advice coming from the ICANN, SSAC and RSSAC along with the GAC. The ALAC is confident that the Board will continue to implement the recommendations of the AFST and AFSTD in a way that safeguards the principles of the multi-stakeholder model, more specifically those that help bring balance among participants.</td>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>Considerable work has been completed on the ICANN Bylaws related to the ICANN Stewardship Transition. This work and progress can be tracked here <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2-Implementation-Program">https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2-Implementation-Program</a>. Moreover, additional implementation work is underway on the AFSTD2 recommendations. General information and information on progress of the implementation efforts can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/AFST2-Implementation-Program">https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/AFST2-Implementation-Program</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root System Security Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC008</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project-Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions">https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project-Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions</a></td>
<td>RSSAC008: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall during ISF 2014</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC’s “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC007</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ssac/SSAC-Overview-and-History-of-the-IANA-Functions">https://community.icann.org/display/ssac/SSAC-Overview-and-History-of-the-IANA-Functions</a></td>
<td>SSAC007: SSAC Statement at the ICAAN Accountability Town Hall during ISF 2014</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC’s guidance to the Representatives on the NTIA IANA Functions? Stewardship Transition Coordination Group? and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 6) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions. 5) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions. 4) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions. 3) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions. 2) education at all levels is key; 1) education at all levels is key.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC007</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/SSAC-14-RSSAC-Declaration-with-appendices-SSAC-14.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/SSAC-14-RSSAC-Declaration-with-appendices-SSAC-14.pdf</a></td>
<td>AD-007: ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and relevance.</td>
<td>6/26/14</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 is ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on &quot;Measurements of the Root Server System&quot;.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02- DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-27)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-27. The Board must implement ATLAS Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This recommendation work is underway on the ATLAS recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+9.1+File">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+9.1+File</a>. In addition, this work is part of CCWG Work Stream 1 and 2. The CCWG provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG Accountability white paper: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-+Accountability+Policy+Home">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-+Accountability+Policy+Home</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-28)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-28. The ALAC should work with all MAOs and ASes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This recommendation work is partially met by the roll out of the new ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+28">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+28</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.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>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This recommendation work is partially met by the roll out of the new ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.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, SDS and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.</td>
<td>Completion letter went to Board on 25 May 2018 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/attachments/11/04/carlson-to-chabali-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/attachments/11/04/carlson-to-chabali-25may18-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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.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 and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-32)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simple terms.</td>
<td>- Completion letter went to Board on 25 May 2018 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/attachments/11/04/carlson-to-chabali-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/attachments/11/04/carlson-to-chabali-25may18-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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-33. The ALAC should arrange for more Large Capacity Building Webinars.</td>
<td>- The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+33">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+33</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest. (R.34)</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-35. The ALAC should hold a minimum of one conference call with the AT-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td>- The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of the ALAC, however the Board has no action items for this. The ALAC has attended meetings/webinars with the ALAC between meetings as requested/filed. See the ALAC Workspace here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+35">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+35</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/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/dcl/01/02/01-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-36)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-36. The ALAC should arrange for more Large Capacity Building Webinars.</td>
<td>- The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-ma...recommendation-2014-09-09-en#3</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of the ALAC, however the Board has no action items for this. The ALAC has attended meetings/webinars with the ALAC between meetings as requested/filed. See the ALAC Workspace here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+36">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+36</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-40. The ALAC should encourage open data? best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC submitted a proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

**Phase**
6/26/14

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-42. The ALAC should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-43. The ALAC should consider support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-44. ALAC should encourage that ICANN representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.

**Action(s) Taken**
There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-45. ALAC should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-46. ALAC should develop an accountability model reaching not only board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.

**Action(s) Taken**
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in F17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C: 30 for Meeting B.

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**
DCL-01-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document**

**Issued Date**
6/26/14

**Advice Document Recommendation**
R-47. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki.

**Action(s) Taken**
Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to rework the website and Wiki to ensure that our “Policy Advice” pages are concise and understandable. This will continue as volunteer and staff resources allow. We will also ensure that as documents are published, the classification of the document is clear. The goal is to add two issues: • Concision about the type of document (“Advice” vs “Comment”) • “The End user” justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff, together with at-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (as advice, public comment, correspondence, etc.) in a more granular fashion and provide enhanced tools with which to filter search results based on these categories. Furthermore, staff will create a new field in the database for “End User Issue” and at-Large leadership will populate this field both in current documents and those generated going forward. The following items have been created to satisfy these goals: • An Executive Summaries: ALAC Policy Comments & Advice resource page has been created to address “type” of document (i.e., • The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) meets weekly to discuss “end user” justification for intervention (KE). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a Wiki visitor to pursue the work of the At-Large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.
The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+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 Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
SSAC065: The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC’s comments on the “Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition IANA’s Stewardship of the IANA Functions”. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the Board.

SSAC066: The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.b.

SSAC067: Operational Recommendation 4: ICANN should implement a notification approach that accommodates the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.

SSAC067: Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

SSAC067: The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

SSAC067: The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was rejected and the recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

SSAC067: The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

SSAC067: The recommendation was considered while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

SSAC067: The recommendation was considered while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e.

SSAC067: The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24.

SSAC067: 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. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: 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. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: 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. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Update, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings.

SSAC067: The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/om
<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>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/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 all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community consider the following proposed behavior for search list processing and comment on its correctness, completeness, utility and feasibility. a. Administrators (including DHCP server administrators) should configure the search list explicitly, and must not rely on or use implicit search lists. b. Where DNS parameters such as the domain search list have been manually configured, these parameters should not be overridden by DHCP. c. When a user enters a single-label name, that name may be subject to search list processing if a search list is specified, but must never be queried in the DNS in its original single-label form. d. If a user queries a hostname that contains two or more labels separated by dots, such as <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a>, applications and resolvers must query the DNS directly. Search lists must not be applied in any such cases.</td>
<td>SAC064 R-1 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS-ADS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-2</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: All types of network operators should take immediate steps to prevent network address spoofing. This involves a. implementing network ingress filtering, as described in RFC 3393 and SAC064, to restrict packet-level forgery to the greatest extent possible; b. disclose the extent of their implementation of network ingress filtering to the Internet community as a means of encouraging broader and more effective use of ingress filtering.</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS-ADS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: Recursion DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure open recursive DNS servers. This involves: a. identifying unmanaged open recursive DNS servers operating in their network and take immediate steps to restrict access to these servers in order to prevent abuse. b. follow SAC065. Recommendation 3 to (i) disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and (ii) only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to avoid in reducing amplification vectors for DNS ADS attacks. c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abuses 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., rpx.nix.net) triggering likely victim attacks (attacks reported or addresses of heavily targeted servers) and restricting or disabling responses to those IP addresses, and sharing information with similar operators to coordinate efforts to combat such attacks.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-3 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS-ADS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Authoritative recursive DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response limiting. This involves: a. investigate mechanisms to deter DNS amplification attacks (e.g., Response Rate Limiting (RRL) in DNS software vendors, and implement those that are appropriate for their environment; b. encourage DNS software vendors to implement similar capabilities, and 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS-ADS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicate with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational practices as necessary to ensure that a process is in place to systematically perform DNS software updates on both an ongoing and an emergency basis; and b. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities at reasonable cost in system resources.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-5 is directed towards DNS operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS-ADS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurations of customer premise networking equipment, including home networking equipment, should take immediate steps to secure these devices and ensure that they are field upgradable when new software is available to fix security vulnerabilities, and aggressively replace the installed base of non-upgradable devices with upgradable devices. This minimally involves: a. ensuring that the default configuration of 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 address current security threats, or as a necessary alternative replacing non-upgradable equipment with appropriately configured devices; c. Encourage that large-scale participants in purchasing of customer premise networking equipment (e.g., ISPs, government procurement, large enterprises) insist that networking equipment meet the standards discussed in this document.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurations of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice; but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior:

1. **Recommendation 1:** ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of TLDs is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to make additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of the delegation of a TLD.

2. **Recommendation 2:** ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why in as part of its discussion as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis. What type of advice is to be collected? What data are to be collected? Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) own the trial or should the applicant operate it? - Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? - Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? 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.

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

In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior:

1. **Recommendation 1:** ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of TLDs is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to make additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of the delegation of a TLD.

2. **Recommendation 2:** ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why in as part of its discussion as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis. What type of advice is to be collected? What data are to be collected? Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) own the trial or should the applicant operate it? - Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? - Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? 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.

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

The ICANN Board passed resolution on 21 Nov 2017 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-21-en#2). 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-2014-07-10-en

The ALAC advises the Board to revisit the issue of new TLD strings, which are singular and plural versions of names, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior:

1. **Recommendation 1:** ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of TLDs is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to make additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of the delegation of a TLD.

2. **Recommendation 2:** ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why in as part of its discussion as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis. What type of advice is to be collected? What data are to be collected? Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) own the trial or should the applicant operate it? - Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? - Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? 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.

3. **Recommendation 3:** ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to make additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of the delegation of a TLD.
| Advice Provider | Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|}
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-05-2013-04-01-EN | [http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/document?docid=9117-20130801-en](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/document?docid=9117-20130801-en) | R-3 ALAC Statement on Confusingly Similar GTLDs | 9/6/13 | The ALAC advises the Board to determine a viable way forward which will not create unwarranted contention between or delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure user confusion and implicit loss of faith in the DNS. | In February 2019, the GNSO directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanisms for addressing known incipient Domain Name Controversies from the new gTLD Confusion Objection Process. [https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions/new-gtld-2014-02-05-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions/new-gtld-2014-02-05-en). The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evolutions in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds. [https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). | }
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC061 | [http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-061-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-061-en.pdf) | R-4 SAC Comment on ICANN'S Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services | 9/6/13 | The SSAC suggests that the EWG address this recommendation from SAC058: “SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation. At the ICANN community discussing validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of validation data validation should be answered: What data elements need to be added or validated to comply with requirements or expectations of different stakeholders? Is additional registration processing overhead and delay an acceptable cost for improving accuracy and quality of registration data? Is higher cost an acceptable outcome for improving accuracy and quality? Would accuracy improve the registration process were to provide natural persons with privacy protection upon completion of multi-factor validation? | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report. [http://en.icann.org/parking-input-to-wg23/2013/thread.html](http://en.icann.org/parking-input-to-wg23/2013/thread.html). A Final Report was published in June 2014: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-06jul14-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-06jul14-en.pdf). | }
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC060 | [http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-060-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-060-en.pdf) | Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14) | 7/23/13 | Often registries calculate variant sets for user validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for. | This specific advisory is directed at registries and contains no actionable advice for ICANN. | }

---

In February 2018, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanisms for addressing known incipient Domain Name Controversies from the new gTLD Confusion Objection Process. [https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions/new-gtld-2014-02-05-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions/new-gtld-2014-02-05-en). The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evolutions in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds. [https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC060 Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The matching algorithm for TNCCH must be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC060 Active Variant TLDs (2 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The TNCCH must add support for TLDs that have been allocated variant TLDs. Particularly during the TLD activation and registration of the name in all of the allocated variant TLDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC060 Active Variant TLDs (3 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rules (LGR) calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC059</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

**SAC058**

**Reference Number**: SAC058


**Advice Item**: SAC058: Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)

**Issued Date**: 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation**: Process should be developed to activate variants from allocated variants in GDR.

**Phase**: Phase 4

**Action Taken**: Deferred

**SAC059**

**Reference Number**: SAC059


**Advice Item**: SAC059: R.1 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone

**Issued Date**: 4/18/13

**Advice Document Recommendation**: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.

**Phase**: Phase 3

**Action Taken**: Deferred

**SAC059**

**Reference Number**: SAC059


**Advice Item**: SAC059: R.2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone

**Issued Date**: 4/18/13

**Advice Document Recommendation**: The SSAC believes the use of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding stubbornly unresolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.

**Phase**: Phase 3

**Action Taken**: Deferred

---

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Advisory Status**

As of 30 June 2021
As of 30 June 2021

Advice Item | Status | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | ---
R.2 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation | 3/27/13 | 6/11/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN.

R.2 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation | 3/27/13 | 6/11/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN.

R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant | 9/14/12 | 9/14/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant | 9/14/12 | 9/14/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

R.3 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant | 3/14/12 | 3/14/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) SAC055 http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-055-en.pdf SAC055: R-2 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation | 3/14/12 | 3/14/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) SAC055 http://www.icann.org/en/documents/sac-055-en.pdf SAC055: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation | 3/14/12 | 3/14/12 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)

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. | 3/27/13 | 3/27/13 | This SAC report contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a)
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC052 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf | SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (2 of 2) | 2/5/12 | Recommendation (J): Given the potential for confusion and the currently uncontrolled work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board adopt the Delegation of Single-Character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on confusingly similar IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single character IDN TLDs if all scripts should be defined by default. 2. Exclusions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of potential confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should include comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN’s various advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each 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 restricted with respect to the delegation of single-character IDNs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be varied if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into considerations the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a new 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 should be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be valid according to IDNA2008. b) The code point is not one of the following: lower case letter (l), upper case letter (L), and letter (L) as defined by the Unicode Standard 12. c) Some single character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Lx-class code points. Those should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria be well defined and made public. d) If the script in which an exception is made and a single character IDN is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Diye/MPC, Lao/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. If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is allowed. | The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Application Dispute Resolution Process to allow for the delegation of single-character IDNs. \[https://www.icann.org/en/appr/appr-dispute-resolution-process-for-the-delegation-of-single-character-domain-names-12-07-en.pdf\] |...

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC052 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf | SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (2 of 2) | 2/5/12 | Recommendation (J): Given the potential for confusion and the currently uncontrolled work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board adopt the Delegation of Single-Character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on confusingly similar IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single character IDN TLDs if all scripts should be defined by default. 2. Exclusions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of potential confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should include comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN’s various advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each 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 restricted with respect to the delegation of single-character IDNs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be varied if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into considerations the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a new 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 should be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be valid according to IDNA2008. b) The code point is not one of the following: lower case letter (l), upper case letter (L), and letter (L) as defined by the Unicode Standard 12. c) Some single character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Lx-class code points. Those should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria be well defined and made public. d) If the script in which an exception is made and a single character IDN is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Diye/MPC, Lao/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. If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is allowed. | The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Application Dispute Resolution Process to allow for the delegation of single-character IDNs. \[https://www.icann.org/en/appr/appr-dispute-resolution-process-for-the-delegation-of-single-character-domain-names-12-07-en.pdf\] |...

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC053 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-053-en.pdf | DNS Blocking: Benefits versus Harms. An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the 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 for otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organization from receiving 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 rewrite a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether rewriting a Non-Existent Domain (NXDOMAIN) response or rewriting the DNS response for an existing FQDN, with potentially harmful effects on DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC) supporting name servers and their users. A particularly coarse-grained approach is for an operator to silently discard DNS responses, although this results in non-deterministic behavior and may be problematic. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply these principles: 1. The organization imposes a policy on a network and its users over which it exercises administrative control (i.e., it is the administrator of a policy domain). 2. The organization determines that the policy’s benefits justify 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 DNS variants. Some of this work can be found on the internationally Domain Names page of the ICANN website: \[https://www.icann.org/resources/page/ddn-2012-02-25-en#StringSimilarity\] study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules Project (Project 1), but this project was dropped based on public comment, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken. |...

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC054 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf | SSAC Report on DTLD Terminology and Structure | 1/14/11 | A. The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in its documents and discussions, in particular: Domain Name Registration Data (DDND). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars collect. Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DDND-API). The components of a standard communications exchange - queries and responses - that specify the access to DDND - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DDND-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registrars and registrants to implement the DDND-API and to provide access to DDND-DS. Additional terminology includes: DDND-API Policy, DDND-DS Policy, Prefered site(s) of DDND-DS, and DDND-DS Protocol. | On 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of a new directory service policy and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. \[https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-28-en#5. Both the new gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC’s terminology; that is, the access to DDND-DS should be specified in the Registration Data Directory Service (RDS) is currently considering this topic. |...

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf | SSAC Report on DTLD Terminology and Structure | 1/14/11 | A. The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in its documents and discussions, in particular: Domain Name Registration Data (DDND). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars collect. Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DDND-API). The components of a standard communications exchange - queries and responses - that specify the access to DDND - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DDND-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registrars and registrants to implement the DDND-API and to provide access to DDND-DS. Additional terminology includes: DDND-API Policy, DDND-DS Policy, Prefered site(s) of DDND-DS, and DDND-DS Protocol. | On 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of a new directory service policy and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. \[https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-28-en#5. Both the new gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC’s terminology; that is, the access to DDND-DS should be specified in the Registration Data Directory Service (RDS) is currently considering this topic. |...
### Advice Item: SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)

**Description:**
- 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 notes whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that registry transition processes be tested for failover success.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should provide further guidance on the testing process.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)

**Description:**
- The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain names that are registered by a current registrar.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN report on this advice item at the next Board meeting.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should develop guidance on the process for transitioning critical functions.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC049: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (1 of 3)

**Description:**
- The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphaned glue is an ambiguous term for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has prepared a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for the proposed definition). 2. Orphaned glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN update the definition of orphaned glue in the Applicant Guidebook.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should update the definition of orphaned glue in the Applicant Guidebook.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Implementation and Management (2 of 2)

**Description:**
- Active manage DNS information; (4) Protect domain registration and hosting accounts against record manipulation by ICANN contractual compliance and Technical Services. Additionally in the event of a transition the DNS records are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN org expects to initiate the roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012:

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that the Registry Transition process be tested for failover success.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should develop guidance on the process for transitioning critical functions.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC052: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 3)

**Description:**
- The SSAC notes that ICANN defined process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate that they satisfy the testing criteria.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that the Registry Transition process be tested for failover success.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should develop guidance on the process for transitioning critical functions.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC053: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 3)

**Description:**
- 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 notes whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate that they satisfy the testing criteria.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should provide further guidance on the testing process.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---

### Advice Item: SAC054: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)

**Description:**
- The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphaned glue is an ambiguous term for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has prepared a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for the proposed definition). 2. Orphaned glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed.

**Recommendation:**
- The SSAC recommends that ICANN update the definition of orphaned glue in the Applicant Guidebook.

**Advice Document Recommendation:**
- ICANN should update the definition of orphaned glue in the Applicant Guidebook.

**Action(s) Taken:**
- The SSAC Board sent the SAC this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

---
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advisory Status
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Advice Provider | Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC047 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf | SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5) | 11/15/11 | Issued, the SSAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Exploratory Memorandum: 1) it should consider a question of how best to name and address the root server operators to be consistent with its own structure; 2) it should consider a question of whether the root server operators should be contacted by ICANN on the same basis as other root zone management participants; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Close Request | The Board requested the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other users whose DNS policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC047 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf | SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5) | 1/15/11 | The SSAC recommends the following steps be taken before launching additional gTLDs, in parallel with continued deployment of IDNs and IPv6: Recommendation (1) Formalize and publish document the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (2): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Phase 3 | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) | 1/19/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of gTLDs, 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. Recommendation (3): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (4): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Action Item | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) | 1/19/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of gTLDs, 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. Recommendation (3): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (4): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Close Request | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5) | 2/26/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (3): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Action Item | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5) | 2/26/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (3): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Close Request | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (4 of 5) | 3/9/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (3): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Action Item | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/security/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | SAC045: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (5 of 5) | 4/15/10 | Recommendation (2): ICANN should work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. Recommendation (3): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 3) it should consider whether the root server operators should be included in the root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. | Close Request | The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling. ICANN should: 1) commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability impacts from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities whose policy and operation strategy may be affected by the expected growth of the root zone; 2) define a specification for a root zone monitoring capability that may conflict with future allocations.
<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. Warn 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>-</td>
<td>The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 address the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm</a>; <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en</a> As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf</a>. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en</a> Resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf</a></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 2606.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 address the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm</a>; <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en</a> As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf</a>.</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>ICANN recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.07), the Board finds that the actions called for in SAC045 can be considered resolved by the NCAP and that the remaining item related to SAC045 being tracked in the ICANN org Action Request Registry may therefore be completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>