ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC052	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-052-25nov20-en.pdf	RSSAC052: Statement on Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling	11/25/20	RSSAC052 is RSSAC's review of OCTO-15: Recommendations for Early Warning for Root Zone Scaling, and also RSSAC's input to the ICANN Public Comment Proceeding of the same name. The RSSAC considers OCTO-15 to be well written. However, the RSSAC has several comments on OCTO-15, which are discussed in RSSAC052.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 23 November 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 7 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/recommendations-early-warning-root-scaling-2020-10-05-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 4 December 2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC113	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-113-en.pdf	SAC113 SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs	9/18/20	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 4.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	ICANN org understands SAC113 to mean SSAC is requesting the Board to choose a TLD as described in Section 4.1 of the document, and to reserve that TLD in the DNS root for private use, and to be sure that that TLD is never delegated in the DNS root. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 01 October 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC000v5	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-01sep20-en.pdf	RSSAC000v5 | RSSAC Operational Procedures	9/8/20	These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. The RSSAC's responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article XII, 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 ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.	-	ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This documents how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 28 September 2020. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 28 September 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC023v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-17jun20-en.pdf	RSSAC023v2: History of the Root Server System	6/17/20	This is a report to the Internet community from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this report, the RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system. The RSSAC advises the Internet community and the ICANN Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's root server system.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023v2 is RSSAC's report to the internet community on the organizational history of the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 08 July 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-051-02jun20-en.pdf	RSSAC051: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan	6/2/20	Per the ICANN Bylaws, the role of the RSSAC, "is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System." The RSSAC limits its comments to its remit. With that in mind, the RSSAC supports the following five strategic objectives outlined on the draft strategic plan: ● Maintain stakeholders's trust that IANA is the proper home for enabling global interoperability through unique identifier coordination. ● Monitor and adapt to security threats and ensure resilient and secure IANA operations. ● Continue to drive the implementation of operational initiatives to enhance the delivery of services based on the needs of the IANA customer. ● Monitor the delivery and performance of the IANA functions to achieve operational excellence. ● Support ICANN org on its governance efforts to sustain and improve openness, inclusivity, accountability, and transparency. In particular, RSSAC welcomes the following goal on the strategic plan as it aligns with RSSAC046: RSSAC Statement on IANA's Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. "2.2. Performing key ceremonies with high levels of transparency and accountability and improving key management facilities to mitigate security threats and maintain facility quality"	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on RSSAC051: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan. The respective public comment period closed on 01 June 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 15 June 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/draft-pti-fy21-24-strategic-plan-2020-04-20-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC050	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-050-13may20-en.pdf	RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators	5/13/20	As described in RSSAC023 (History of the Root Server System), the organizations operating root servers and the way in which they are identified have evolved over time. As capacity demands grew, new operators and new root servers were added. In 1995, to accommodate further growth, a consistent nomenclature was adopted, which remains in use today. For example, Verisign currently operates a.root-servers.net, which has the IPv4 address 198.41.0.4 and IPv6 address 2001:503:ba3e::2:30. An outcome of the 1995-era growth is that it became common to refer to root server operators (RSOs) with "letters" (i.e., the leftmost label in the host name) and more commonly as abbreviated identifiers (e.g., C-root, F-root). However, the use of letters as metonyms for operators over the years has led to misconceptions within the global community in how root servers are architected, and contributed to a lack of clarity around the organizations responsible for providing the service.	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the The ICANN org 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 19 May 2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	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	5/4/20	This is a comment to the ICANN Generic Names Supporting Organization from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about its Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. In this document, the SSAC provides input to the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for the generic top-level domain (gTLD) Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP).	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC111: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 19 May 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC049	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-049-14apr20-en.pdf	RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community	4/14/20	Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that this type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board's implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC038.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands Recommendation 1 to mean that the RSSAC believes that the best way for the RSO community to join the Empowered Community is through the implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC038. Also, the RSS GWG should note the expectations and needs of the RSO community. There is no immediate action for the ICANN Board. For the purposes of the ARR, this item will remain in Phase 3 until the RSS GWG delivers its proposed final governance model for the RSS to the ICANN Board for consideration. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 04 May 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 May 2020.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

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)	SAC110	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-110-en.pdf	SAC110: SSAC Comments on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report	3/19/20	The ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) appreciates the circulation of an early draft of the findings and recommendations from the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team (RT) Draft Report, and we thank the RT for the opportunity to comment on this interim report. In this comment the SSAC presents general comments about the SSR2 review and specific comments on individual recommendations in the report. The SSAC has endeavored to meet the SSR2 timeline, and due to these time constraints this response may not be as comprehensive as the SSAC would have preferred. The SSAC would be happy to discuss these comments with the SSR2 RT at their convenience to explain any items that are unclear and require further elaboration. There are some strongly-held mixed opinions within the SSAC on parts of the SSR2 report. Where there is SSAC consensus the document will state a view on behalf of the SSAC. Where there is a diverse set of opinions within SSAC, the SSAC comment will indicate this. The SSAC would like to acknowledge the significant time and effort devoted by the members of the SSR2 Review Team and thank them for their contribution on this important topic.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ssr2-rt-draft-report-2020-01-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 23 March 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC002v4	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-measurements-root-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System	3/12/20	This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet's root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits	-	The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 23 March 2020
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC026v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-026-lexicon-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC026v2: RSSAC Lexicon	3/12/20	This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC defines terms related to root server operations for the ICANN Community. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.	-	The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC026v2: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC048	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-048-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC048: RSSAC Input on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report	3/12/20	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's full input to that public comment proceeding. The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team draft report, and would like to thank SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment.	-	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 consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ssr2-rt-draft-report-2020-01-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC109	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-109-en.pdf	SAC109: The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS	3/12/20	This report analyzes the initial effects of these technologies by identifying some groups whose online experiences around privacy could change with the deployment of these technologies. Detailed analysis of effects will have to wait for more widespread deployment and measurement. This report discusses implications occurring now, and raises some longer-term questions for the future. This report frames the issues from the perspectives of interested parties, with the understanding that the issues are nuanced, and that readers coming from different perspectives will have different sensitivities: readers from two different perspectives are likely to view a single issue in two different ways. The intended audience for this report is both the ICANN community and the greater Internet community. This includes network operators, DNS software implementers, policy makers, and concerned Internet users.	-	The ICANN organization understands that this report is SAC109: The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 19 March 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-1	3/12/20	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 RSS. The initial implementation should be designed 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 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org 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 a long-term service would have. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020.

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-2	3/12/20	The RSSAC recommends that the official implementation of the metric system must: a. Meet the minimum requirements specified in Section 3 of this report regarding the number, location, connectivity, and other requirements for the vantage points. b. Publish all software related to its operation under an open source license as defined by the Open Source Initiative. c. Make the raw measurement data available to anyone in the interest of transparency. A third party should be able to use the raw data to verify the computation of these metrics. d. In its monthly reports, only publish threshold pass or fail indicators for each RSI, not the actual measurements or metrics used to determine the threshold pass or fail values. e. Publicly describe its methods for collecting measurements and aggregating metrics, including the topological location of each measurement vantage point. This description should be complete enough for RSOs and DNS researchers to create their own measurement collection systems similar to those used by the official implementation. f. Share with an RSO the underlying measurements and metrics that resulted in failure any time an RSI fails to pass a threshold test. The shared measurements and metrics must include all measurements from around the time of failure and must include all measured values for all transports and address types.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is instead describing a later long-term service that might be implemented. The operational details of the long-term service will be described after there is sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the official implementation will be put in place, e.g. an RFP process 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 for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-3	3/12/20	The RSSAC, in collaboration with ICANN and the Internet community, should consider the following additional work: ● For a holistic view of RSS performance, it may be desirable or necessary to include measurements for all instances of each RSI. The only reasonable way to provide for such a view would be through self-reporting. In the future, it should be considered to have each RSO perform self-reporting of the defined metrics to eliminate uncertainty of components not under the RSO's control, and it should probably be tied to an SLA including compensation for the RSO to implement. ● Create a reference data set. ● Explore the financial aspects of increased accountability and how it might relate to these metrics. ● Keeping with the provisions of RSSAC037 and RSSAC038 publish a document that advises any bodies created as part of the ongoing evolution of RSS governance on how they should interpret and act on data from the measurement systems. ● Investigate a better long-term plan for the location of the vantage points. Such a plan would distribute the vantage points by network topology instead of geographic location. ● Whereas the current work is based on a largely empirical model of the RSS, future versions of this document may want to take a more analytical and theoretical modeling approach.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 02 April 2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SSAC2020-06	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac2020-06-14feb20-en.pdf	SSAC2020-06: SSAC Public Comment on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group	2/14/20	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 finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG recommendations.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN org understands 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 finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. The ICANN org also understands that the SSAC recommends that 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 recommendations. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 16 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 22 July 2020.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1)	1/31/20	The Registry for .ORG must be organized as either a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a "Benefit Corporation" (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must receive and maintain B Corporation certification.	-	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2)	1/31/20	One-third of the Registry Corporate Board must be representatives of charitable nonprofits. The designation of such nonprofits in the US is 501c(3) but a list of similar designations internationally should be generated.	-	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3)	1/31/20	One Board member selected by the ALAC. Ideally, at least one member or small group of members of the corporate Board should have the explicit mandate to focus on the overall public interest and specifically the interests of individual end users.	-	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4)	1/31/20	The Registry for .ORG must enshrine in its bylaws that the principal focus of the domain is nonprofits and individuals and not commercial interests.	-	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5)	1/31/20	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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-6)	1/31/20	The Registry must provide 6 months prior written notice to its registrants of any increase in wholesale price 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-7)	1/31/20	The Registry Agreement must enshrine PIR prohibited practices such a bulk sales to commercial registrars.	-	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.

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-ST-0120-01-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13759	ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-8)	1/31/20	The Registry Agreement must establish a "DNS Abuse Ceiling". The RA should contain both a reference to an ICANN community established definition of DNS Abuse as well as an explicit ceiling in terms of a percentage of second level domains engaged in DNS Abuse as material terms. Failure to address DNS Abuse above this ceiling will constitute a breach of the RA and grounds for terminating the RA and for re-delegation of .ORG by ICANN.	-	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.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC046	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-046-29jan20-en.pdf	RSSAC046: RSSAC Statement on IANA's Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers	1/29/20	Foremost of importance for the RSSAC is that future KSK rollovers be done in a consistent, predictable and deliberate manner. Thus, the RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on subsequent KSK rollovers, and would like to thank IANA for preparing this plan and submitting it for public comment.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on IANA's Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-rz-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC108	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-108-en.pdf	SAC108: SSAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers	1/29/20	This publication represents the full SSAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers ICANN Public Comment Proceeding. The SSAC reviewed the proposal in order to assure itself, and others, that the proposal will not introduce any stability or reliability issues to the root zone, the Root Server System (RSS), or the larger DNS ecosystem. Overall, the SSAC finds no issue with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank the IANA for developing a strong proposal. The SSAC does find some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This comment also includes future considerations that IANA should take into account for subsequent rollovers.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on IANA's Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-rz-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 05 February 2020.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)	12/24/19	Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The GNSO has already produced consensus definitions of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain names" that are more expansive. 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, if such a purpose is disclosed. The GNSO also recognized that "malicious use of domain names" include, but are not limited to: 1) spam, 2) malware distribution, 3) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, 4) phishing, 5) botnet command-and-control. ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of "abuse" before further work is done to define DNS abuse. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN should determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as 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.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish a clear definition of "abuse" that is within ICANN's remit. We assume that any such definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity insofar as they intersects 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 reference to "purposes and applications" of abuse is intended to mean and request clarification on this point. Is ALAC's advice to identify the characteristics of abuse (e.g., behavior that affects the DNS in specified ways) that would be within ICANN's remit? If so, 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)	12/24/19	Cease rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	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 require Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC's expectations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDP process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)	12/24/19	Direct ICANN Org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. We interpret this to mean that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to use 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 (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN 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 registries 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.

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-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4)	12/24/19	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.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	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 the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to do so now with respect to malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and, once agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN's remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties), other such behaviors. We understand that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of compliance with resulting obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)	12/24/19	Do not process registrations with "third party" payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payor is or the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (1) initiate a PDP by calling for an Issue 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-6)	12/24/19	Adopt an "anti-crime, anti-abuse" Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (1) initiate a PDP by calling for an Issue Report on this topic (ii) or 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.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)	12/24/19	Compel industry-wide good behavior: for ex. by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to compel Contracted Parties to adhere to industry-wide good behavior, for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties regarding (i) pricing and (ii) industry best practices. We interpret "abuse" in this context to refer, for the time being, to harmful activity insofar as it intersects 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). We understand that the scope of this could expand once agreement has been reached (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties) on the scope and characteristics of "abuse" within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-8)	12/24/19	Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN 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.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement the above advise, and to include clear enforcement language to facilitates ICANN Contractual Compliance to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN org to ensure that ICANN Contractual Compliance has the tools it will need to enforce the output of any relevant Consensus Policy and/or voluntary contract negotiations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC045	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-045-03dec19-en.pdf	RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System	12/3/19	At ICANN61 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.	-	ICANN understands that this is the Root Server System Advisory Committee's (RSSAC) Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System.2 Furthermore, the RSSAC regards the ICANN Board's request for input fulfilled. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 16 Dec 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC107	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-107-en.pdf	SSAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms	12/3/19	The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) submits the following comments in response to the National Institute of Standards (NIST) request for feedback on its post-quantum cryptography second-round candidate algorithms. Our comments concern the role that new cryptographic algorithms would have in the implementation of DNSSEC. In general, implementing quantum-resistant cryptography in DNSSEC should be straightforward. However, an issue that we foresee, given that there are some architectural size limits in the DNS, is that some of the candidate algorithms may not be supportable in the DNS.	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is input to the NIST on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 10 December 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC044	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-044-29oct19-en.pdf	RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop	10/29/19	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its eighth workshop from October 1 to 3, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, four liaisons to the RSSAC, four RSSAC Caucus members, and one ICANN research fellow attended the workshop. The RSSAC workshop also featured remote participation to facilitate broader RSSAC Caucus attendance. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.	-	The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC044 is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) eighth workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 05 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC000v4	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-13mar19-en.pdf	RSSAC000v4: RSSAC Operational Procedures	10/23/19	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 XII, 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 ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.	-	ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This documents how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 19 Nov 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-2)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that the SSAC not be given any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG, but is open to invitations to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities.	Phase 4	Implement	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 2 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC not be given any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG. The ICANN org also understands the SSAC is open to invitations from the bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities. 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 is incorporating it into its proposal.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-3)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.	Phase 4	Implement	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 was provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) and is operating on the basis of consensus.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that bodies involved in the ongoing oversight of the 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.	Phase 4	Implement	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 4 to mean that the SSAC recommends 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 is incorporating it into its proposal.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-1)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Governance Working Group (GWG).		The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 1 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the ICANN Board that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. As of December 2019 SSAC is appointed a member to the GWG. This advice item will now be closed.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC043	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-043-04jun19-en.pdf	RSSAC043: Report from the RSSAC April 2019 Workshop	6/4/19	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, three liaisons to the RSSAC, and four RSSAC Caucus members attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of 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 RSSAC043 is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 23 April 2019 to 25 April 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC105	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf	SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges	6/3/19	The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily lives by seamlessly and autonomously sensing and acting upon our physical environment through tens of billions of connected devices. While this makes the IoT vastly different from traditional Internet applications like email and web browsing, we expect that a significant number of IoT deployments will use the DNS to locate remote services that they need, for instance to enable telemetry data transmission and collection for monitoring and analysis of sensor data. In this report, the SSAC provides a discussion on the interplay between the DNS and the IoT, arguing that the IoT represents both an opportunity and a risk to the DNS. It is an opportunity because the DNS provides functions and data that can help make the IoT more secure, stable, and transparent, which is critical given the IoT's interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measurement studies suggest that IoT devices may stress the DNS, for instance, because of complex DDoS attacks carried out by botnets that grow to hundreds of thousands or in the future millions of infected IoT devices within hours. We also identify and discuss five challenges for the DNS and IoT industries (e.g., DNS and IoT operators and software developers) to address these opportunities and risks, for instance by making the DNS's security functions (e.g., response verification and encryption) available on popular IoT operating systems and by developing a shared system that allows different DNS operators to automatically and continually exchange data on IoT botnet activity. Unlike typical SSAC publications, the aim of this report is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. We therefore provide a tutorial-style discussion that is more forward looking than operational in nature. Our discussion partly falls within ICANN's and SSAC's remit, but also goes beyond it, for instance, because the challenges we identify will take a wider range of players to address. We explicitly do not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board.	-	The ICANN org understands that the aim of SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN org understands that SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 June 2019.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC042	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-042-17may19-en.pdf	RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence	5/17/19	Principle 10 of 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, 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 org 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. As RSSAC042 does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board, the ICANN Org understands that there is no action for the ICANN Board and the item is closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC104	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-104-en.pdf	SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process	12/21/18	On 21 November 2018, ICANN opened a public comment proceeding to obtain input on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP). The SSAC welcomes this opportunity to provide input. We thank the EPDP team for its hard work in delivering such a substantive report. A new mandatory mechanism for collecting public comment was implemented for the purpose of this EPDP: an online poll that asks respondents specific questions about each recommendation in the report. This was meant to provide easy collation of responses from the public. The SSAC has submitted feedback through the form. However, we have found that the form limited our ability to provide comment. The SSAC therefore asks that the EPDP members consider comments in this document, and we would like your assurance that the below will be taken into account and incorporated into the Final Report as appropriate.	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-4)	12/11/18	The initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).	Phase 4 | Deferred	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 "Advice item four suggests that 'initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).' 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." 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.	Phase 4 | Deferred	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 "Advice item six suggests that 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.' 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.	Phase 4 | Deferred	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 "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.

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)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDAP protocol. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism.	Phase 4 | Implement	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's 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 PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations." a) 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. The EPDP Phase 2 Report contains recommendations regarding: Accreditation of SSAD requestors, Required criteria and content of SSAD requests, Response requirements, Required Service Level Agreements (SLAs), Automation of SSAD processing, Terms and conditions of SSAD, Logging, auditing, and reporting requirements, Implementation of a GNSO Standing Committee. b) gTLD registries and registrars were required to implement an RDAP service by 26 August 2019. Based on this, this item can be considered complete. c) On 7 November 2019, the Board passed a resolution deferring contractual compliance enforcement of the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy, pending: - the gTLD Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team (IRT) completes its review and establishes an implementation timeline estimate of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) Team's recommendations as adopted by the ICANN Board on 15 May 2019; - ICANN org and the IRT provide the GNSO Council with the required information on the impacts of the EPDP Team's recommendations on existing policies and procedures (including the Thick WHOIS Transition policy), and - the GNSO Council makes a determination on whether to take action on updates to relevant policies and procedures (which could include additional policy work, guidance, or other actions to be determined) impacting the Thick WHOIS Transition Policy. Based on this, item (c) can be deferred pending the above. d) As noted in the Board resolution on this advice, the Board cannot dictate PDP outcomes. As noted in the resolution, the Board will consider the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. 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
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2B)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.	Phase 4 | Implement	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-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board state "Advice item 2B 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 notes 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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2A)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: A) develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements	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 "Advice item 2A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to 'develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.' As policy is developed by the community and this 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. In taking this action, the Board also notes that in the Annex to the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, the Board asked that the topic of rate limit be discussed and resolved by the community as quickly as possible."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.	Phase 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 "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 PDPs."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-5)	12/11/18	The SSAC reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061: "The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.	Phase 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 "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council."

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should, with sufficient detail, define an ICANN organizational review. This definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be crisp and tight in order to ensure complete clarity of scope.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should document the intent of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should continue to use its RFP process to select the IE. The process should be modified to ensure that the IE are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)	10/5/18	When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that the organizational review is meeting contractual obligations. Depending on the outcome of each checkpoint, the ICANN organization should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)	10/5/18	At the conclusion of any organizational review, the ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. If there are any lessons learned from the organizational review, the ICANN organization should demonstrate how the process will be modified.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC103	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf	SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report	10/3/18	This is an advisory to the ICANN Board, the ICANN Organization staff, the ICANN community, and, more broadly, the Internet community from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report is organized by subject matter and includes regular references to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations given in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Initial Report. Each section begins with a listing of relevant questions and/or preliminary recommendations from the Initial Report then follows with the SSAC's comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 1 November 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC102	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-102-en.pdf	SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover	8/20/18	On 13 May 2018, the ICANN Board requested the SSAC to provide advice to the Board on the "Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover." This comment represents the SSAC's response to that request.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN org understands SAC102 is the SSAC's response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.13.09. ICANN org understands the SSAC had not identified any reason within the SSAC's scope why the October 2018 root zone KSK rollover should have not proceeded as it was planned. The ICANN org also understands that the SSAC would like the ICANN org to establish a framework for scheduling further rolls of the root KSK based on analysis of the outcomes of this initial roll of the KSK. This is an updated understanding of SAC102 based on feedback provided by the SSAC on 16 July 2019. ICANN sent this updated understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. As of 07 November 2019, a proposed framework requested in the SSAC advice has been put up for public comment and communicated to the community in various sessions in ICANN 66 and on the customary DNSSEC-related mailing lists.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC039	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-039-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1	8/7/18	RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.	-	The ICANN org understands the RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover plan. ICANN org also understands the RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase and that the RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC039	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-039-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-2	8/7/18	The KSK rollover back out plan was written in July of 2016, updated in April of 2018, and may become a critical procedure that needs to be invoked immediately in case of KSK rollover failure. This document, its procedures and triggers should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. RSSAC pledges that all of the RSOs will be prepared to participate in monitoring and measuring to ensure adequate data is available upon which a rollback decision can be made.	-	ICANN org understands the RSSAC advises the KSK rollover back out plan should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-1	8/7/18	Recommendation 1: Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. RSOs need to decide whether to pursue harmonization of anonymization data that comes from multiple operators, particularly the DITL data. That decision needs to include consideration of the advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of the RSO, of the users of the RSS, and of researchers looking at the anonymized data. Harmonization using mixing full addresses or bit-by-bit will help the research community correlate sources of DNS queries across datasets that are collected from different RSOs. However, full harmonization inherently relies on sharing a secret value that will invalidate the anonymization if it is later revealed. Even if the RSOs decide not to harmonize with sharing of secret values, harmonizing the method used can help RSOs choose an anonymization strategy, and simplify understanding the properties of the data for those who use data from multiple RSOs.	-	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 1 is for the Root Server Operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-2	8/7/18	Recommendation 2: Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually. Any of the proposals given in Section 4 of this document can be used as the anonymization specification for IP addresses, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.	-	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 2 is for each RSO to consider anonymization procedures in RSSAC040 individually. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC040	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-040-07aug18-en.pdf	RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-3	8/7/18	Recommendation 3: Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. It should be possible for an operator to publish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the AS of the original data. Such a table should have a timestamp for when the mapping was made due to AS values changing over time.	-	The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 3 is for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC036	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-036-14jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC	6/14/18	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report as part of its ongoing organizational review. This response builds on RSSAC032 and the feedback on the draft recommendations from the RSSAC Review Work Party (RWP) to the independent examiners.	-	The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 19 July 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System	6/14/18	The ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root Server System (RSS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). The Model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RSS.	-	The ICANN org understands that this is a detailed proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board for RSSAC037 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-1	6/14/18	Recommendation 1: The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the Board and the ICANN Organization staff. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDAP protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining thin gTLD registries to move to thick status per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism. E. The ICANN Board should arrange updates to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and registry contracts as necessary to ensure compliance with A through D above.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2	6/14/18	Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to incorporate the following principle into its contracts with gTLD RDDS service providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain operational access to the registration data that policy says they are authorized to access, and must not be rate-limited unless the user poses a demonstrable threat to a properly resourced system. This recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3	6/14/18	Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-4	6/14/18	Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RDDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5	6/14/18	Recommendation 5: The SSAC reiterates recommendation 2 from SAC061: "The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-6	6/14/18	Recommendation 6. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to clarify that if a data field is required to be published, the registry or registrar must publish it in RDDS server output, not just in Web-based output.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf	SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-7	6/14/18	Recommendation 7: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.	-	This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN's Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.5.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.	Phase 4 | Implement	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root Server System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The ICANN Board should refer to RSSAC037 section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. As the GWG begins its work to develop a final governance model for the Root Server System, ICANN org is working on a methodology for estimating the costs of the RSS. ICANN org will also work proactively with the GWG to estimate the costs of the final governance model.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 1 is for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 07 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed RSSAC037 Recommendation 1 https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-11-07-en#2.d. The ICANN Board directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to publish the final charter, operating procedures, and work plan for the GWG and to convene the GWG. RSSAC037; the Concept Paper; and the GWG charter, operating procedures, and work plan provide a starting point for discussions in the ICANN community about evolving RSS governance. By convening the GWG, the ICANN Board completes its consideration of recommendation one from RSSAC038. Furthermore, the ICANN Board continues its evaluation and consideration of recommendations two and three from RSSAC038.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC035	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-035-11may18-en.pdf	RSSAC035: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee	5/11/18	The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom).	-	The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee submitted during the public comment period to the independent examiner. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 May 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC034	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-034-09may18-en.pdf	RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop	5/9/18	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Verisign in early May.	-	The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 1 May 2018 to 3 May 2018. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 16 May 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC033	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf	RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops	4/24/18	RSSAC and Root-Ops are names for two separate communities that relate to the Internet's DNS Root Server System. They have different missions and scopes. RSSAC provides this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted.	-	The ICANN org understands that RSSAC033 is the RSSAC's statement on the distinction between RSSAC and Root-Ops. The RSSAC is providing this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted. The document is informational only and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 5 June 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC032	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-en.pdf	RSSAC032: Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation	3/28/18	On 27 February 2018, Interisle Consulting Group, the independent examiner performing the second independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report.1 The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.	-	The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation. The RSSAC requests that the independent examiner reviews their stated concerns and applies them in the formulation of independent examiner's recommendations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 24 April 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC031	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf	RSSAC031: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures	2/2/18	On 14 September 2017, the co-chairs of the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures requested input from RSSAC, SSAC, the Office of the CTO and the Global Domains Division on root scaling. This is the RSSAC's response.	-	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.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC100	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-100-en.pdf	SAC100: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling	12/22/17	The SSAC welcomes this opportunity to provide input on the issues related to root scaling. The SSAC understands the working group's request on 14 September 2017 to be: 1. whether the limitations on delegations per annum (1000 / year) could be revisited given the results of the Continuous Data-driven Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) study and if so, what guidance can the SSAC provide to maintain the security and stability of the root; 2. suggestions on ways that might mitigate potential issues in the event the working group recommends to increase the maximum annual delegation rate; and 3. inputs on the total number of TLDs that could be delegated without negative impact to root server performance.	-	The ICANN org understands that SAC100 is the SSAC's response to the 14 September 2017 request from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group regarding root scaling. The SSAC's response contains four recommendations to the Working Group based on the review of past SSAC advisories on root scaling (SAC042, SAC046), reports on root scaling (Root Scaling Study Team Report, TNO's Root Scaling Study, ICANN's Summary Report) and the CDAR study. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 3 January 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 18 January 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC099	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf	SAC099: SSAC Response to the ICANN Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) Guidelines Working Group	11/17/17	Response from the SSAC to the IDN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter that raised a question around "not-authoritative" records constrained to comply with IDNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The SSAC recommends that for normal infrastructure records and other records identifying hosts: It should be either: 1) a traditional label, ASCII letters, digits, and the hyphen with the further restrictions that a hyphen cannot appear at the beginning or end of the string or adjacent to another hyphen, or 2) a valid A-label complying with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 (also known as IDNA2008) and their successors, and not in any way dependent on mapping These records should be used without delegated variants, other variations, and, insofar as one can control it, any infrastructure records that create a referral, such as CNAME or DNAME records pointing into or out of the Fully Qualified Domain Name, even if the DNS protocol or other procedures allows those mechanisms.	-	The ICANN org understands that SAC099 is a response from the SSAC to the IDN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter that raised a question around "not-authoritative" records constrained to comply with IDNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The IDN Implementations Guidelines WG has opened a second public comment to get general feedback as well as the response to some specific queries: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-10-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 1 December 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 18 January 2018.

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC030	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-030-04nov17-en.pdf	RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Sources	11/4/17	This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server information contained in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organization responsible for the operation of the DNS.	-	ICANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions operator necessary for identifying the DNS root servers. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R1)	11/2/17	I. Develop a simple and efficient document management system that allows non-experts to easily and quickly access and identify documents, starting with defining minimal requirements that ensure that every document has a title and a date or reference number, identifies the author and indicates intended recipients, makes reference to the process it belongs to and explains the acronyms used in the document; and	Phase 4 | Implement	The Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team previewed new Announcements and Blog pages on feedback.icann.org in October 2018. Work on the authoring and content model in the document management system has begun and several content types have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project. On 30 October 2019, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new search experience for Board Meeting content for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improved searchability, which is core to ITI, includes: filters to narrow search by document type (Resolutions, Minutes, Agenda), Board Committees (current and former), and Board Meeting type; a date range filter; an expandable and collapsible table structure, jump-to links for upcoming Board Meetings, Year, and Month/Year; and keyword(s) search within Board Meeting content with results available by relevance (number of instances of the keyword(s)) or newest (search results ordered by publish date). Also, the ITI team is developing an improved Public Comment feature based on invaluable input from members of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. This new feature will be available for testing in late January 2020. ITI is aiming for an April 2020 soft launch of the new site. In September 2019 and October 2019, blogs were published to https://icann.org, which provided the community with an update on the project's status. On 7 February 2020, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new Public Comment feature for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improvements include: Closed Proceedings will be searchable via filters (category and date) or keyword, Submissions will be included in search results, the most recent published Submissions and Reports will be more easily accessible, a count of the number of Public Comment Submissions will be displayed, the Submission process will include a guided form to help with the efficiency of the submission process. Alternative processes like bypassing the form and uploading a Submission as a document or emailing Submissions to the org will also be available. During the development phase of this feature, the ITI convened a small group of community participants who aided us in providing requirements, recommendations, and feedback. Additionally, we conducted demos to this same group of community stakeholders from 10-27 February. Their feedback on the implementation of the new Public Comment feature has been very positive. The ITI team is aiming for an 22 April soft launch of the
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R2)	11/2/17	II. Produce easily understandable executive summaries, key points and synopses (using e.g. infographs, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information) for all relevant issues, processes and activities, so that also non-expert stakeholders will be able to (a) quickly determine if a particular issue is of concern to them and (b) if yes, to participate in the policy process easily and effectively, on equal footing with other stakeholders. This should be done at least, but not only, before putting issues up for public comment. Attention should be paid to using plain English (and if possible translations into other languages) in order to allow non-English native speakers to understand the issues;	Phase 4 | Implement	On 9 February 2018, the ICANN Board sent a letter to Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC, regarding this joint ALAC-GAC advice. Please see the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-greenberg-09feb18-en.pdf. In August 2019, ICANN Org shared an update that a meeting will be facilitated at ICANN66 with the ALAC, GAC, and NCSG to discuss the needs of all groups regarding simple language documentation and capacity building activities. Additionally, the co-chairs of the At-Large Consolidated Policy WG will prepare podcasts for each public comment which ALAC has agreed to prepare a statement. During ICANN66, representatives of the ALAC and NPOC, with input from GAC support staff, held an informative session on current communication procedures and tools within their respective groups. They received useful comments from Sally Costerton and Sally Newell-Cohen. Next steps will include the ALAC reaching out to the GAC and NPOC leadership on organizing an inter-sessional call early in 2020 to discuss follow up from their successful session. The ALAC will propose a joint f2f session during ICANN67 in Cancun.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC029	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17-en.pdf	RSSAC029: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop	10/24/17	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fifth RSSAC workshop held hosted by the University of Maryland in early October.	-	The ICANN organization understands that this is a brief discussion on each of the apolitical mind map components developed in the previous workshop, and a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) fifth workshop held from October 10th to 12th. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 10 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC000v3	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf	RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures	10/23/17	These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.	-	ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This documents how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 10 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC098	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf	SAC098: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2)	10/4/17	The SSAC sent a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/faltstrom-to-icann-board-03oct17-en.pdf) to the ICANN Board on 3 October 2017, regarding the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted advice to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The SSAC has serious concerns that the SSR2 effort may fail bringing a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The SSAC believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. SSAC recommendation: The ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community should take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSR2 Review Team instructing the team to pause all work related to the review, excepting only planned engagement meetings at ICANN 60 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-ssr2-28oct17-en.pdf). On 7 June 2018 ICANN Org announced the formal restart of the SSR2 Review with four additional Review Team members (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2018-06-07-en).

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-4	8/3/17	Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.6 generated the smallest possible size, as expected. However, some implementations would become brittle if this naming scheme was adopted. Future work in this area could include modeling and proposing protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider: ● Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name ● Testing the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set ● Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using EDNS0 to support a priming specific single signature over the entire priming set (NS, A, AAAA, DNSKEYs). Further, more speculative studies about how to reduce the response size might include: ● Using different cryptographic algorithms ● Advertising what is expected in the Additional section (this would require modifying the DNS protocol) ● Having a single key for the root zone instead of the current KSK + ZSK scheme ● Effects of leaving the Additional section in priming responses empty	-	The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit-ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit-ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-5	8/3/17	The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is to not change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC Caucus Root Server Naming Work Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. The root server addresses should be signed in a way that reduces the potential for operational breakage. • Because the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. This can be done using delegation or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root-servers' A/AAAA RRsets and the root zone should be hosted on the root servers. • Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (5.3), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (5.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.	-	Upon further review of our original Understanding, the org would like to revise it. Because this recommendation is listed as speculative, the org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take and this item should be closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RRSSA on 15 September 2020. ICANN received confirmation of the understanding on 23 September 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-1	8/3/17	No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-2	8/3/17	Conduct studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviours.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as the DO bit are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-3	8/3/17	Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that proof-of-concept code for testing these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC027	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-027-16jun17-en.pdf	RSSAC027: May 2017 Workshop Report	6/16/17	This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop will soon yield advice and a statement on this theme. It is evident that a future model is evolving. The content generated during this workshop will inform future RSSAC advice to the ICANN community.	-	The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability and that this workshop will soon yield advice and a statement on this theme. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding approved by the RSSAC on 23 June 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to consider revising the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default, for example by allowing subscriptions to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber's access at any time.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zone files. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product road map for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in 2QFY20.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-2	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to adjust the zone file access subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate the implementation of Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN continues to work with the Policy team to inform the community to have the recommendation to be considered for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN's expectations with respect to zone file access (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). 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 TLDs that approve requests for a period longer than 2 years is increasing.

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)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-4	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the public reporting for Webbased WHOIS query statistics (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org continues to facilitate the conversation between SSAC and RySG. The SSAC and RySG met to discuss observations of SSAC during ICANN65 where RySG members raised concerns. ICANN org will work with registries to improve the accuracy of the Zonefile access metric. ICANN encourages SSAC to continue engagement directly with the Registries to potentially develop best practices that can be utilized across the gTLDs.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC096	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf	SAC096: SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights	5/30/17	This is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC wishes to thank the Human Rights Sub-Group for its enormous effort over a significant period of time and for this excellent report. The SSAC provided previous input to the Human Rights Sub-Group in SAC092: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights3 and thanks the CCWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are no associated security and stability aspects, the SSAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC notes that, as a Chartering Organization of the CCWG-Accountability, formal SSAC approval of the final version of the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-hr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-1	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.	Phase 4 | Deferred	On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDNA2008 which does not allow for emojis (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-cctld-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDNA2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGRs is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN64 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. 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/en/system/files/files/recommendations-rz-lgr-14may19-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-2	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.	Phase 4 | Implement	On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDNA2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs do not permit emojis. The same restrictions are also also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN org's GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/idn - which is being disseminated by the GSE team. ICANN org continues to conduct outreach to ccTLDs to inform them of the risks of registering emoji domains.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC094	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf	SAC094: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2	5/22/17	This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. On 22 March 2017, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) opened a public comment forum to obtain input on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the GNSO's Policy Development Process Working Group that is evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-03-22-en). This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

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)	SAC093	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf	SAC093: SSAC Comments on the Draft Recommendations of the CCWGAccountability-WS2 on SO/AC Accountability	5/18/17	[Public Comment Statement] Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) provides its statement on the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 (WS2) draft recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability). It is organized by Track 1-3. Track 1: Review and develop recommendations to improve SO and AC processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture. SSAC agrees it would be beneficial to determine and implement best practices which are applicable to SSAC's structure and purpose. SSAC does not believe appropriate to incorporate a review of the extent SO/AC/Groups have implemented best practices in accountability, transparency, participation, and outreach into the scope of future ATRTs Track 2: Evaluate the proposed ?Mutual Accountability Roundtable? to assess its viability. The SSAC considers a more informal approach be adopted: exchange of views, experiences and best practices during regularly scheduled meetings between SO/AC chairs only. Track 3:Assess whether the Independent Review Process (IRP) should be applied to SO/AC activities. The SSAC agrees, IRP should not be made applicable to activities of SO/AC/Groups	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC Comments on the Draft Recommendations of the CCWGAccountability-WS2 on SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A report of public comments will be published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-04-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC026	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-026-14mar17-en.pdf	RSSAC026: RSSAC Lexicon	3/13/17	The precise technical language often found in RFCs, while often providing consistency and clarity to technical communities, can sometimes be incomprehensible or misleading when used in a non-technical setting. The purpose of this document is to increase the understanding of terms used commonly when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community. It is not to redefine or provide guidance to any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be useful to anyone discussing the DNS root server system. This includes RSSAC members, RSSAC Caucus members, ICANN staff, and the larger ICANN community. It will be updated by the RSSAC as the vocabulary used to discuss the root server system evolves.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC's documentation of the terms commonly used when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org received confirmation of this understanding on 3/22/17.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC092	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-092-en.pdf	SAC092: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights	3/12/17	The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), as a chartering organization of The Cross Community Working Group On Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWGAccountability), wishes to ensure that discussions concerning Human Rights are scoped within the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers? (ICANN) remit during discussions on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Stewardship Transition. ICANN?s remit is limited to coordinating the allocation and assignment of Domain names, Internet Protocol(IP) addresses, Autonomous System (AS) numbers, and protocol port and parameter numbers	-	The ICANN Organization understands that SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC091	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-091-en.pdf	SAC091: SSAC Comment on Identifier Technology Health Indicators	1/20/17	The SSAC has reviewed the presentation on Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) and provides this response to the Call for Public Comments on ?the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers.?	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC091 is the SSAC's comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators and is a response to a Call for Public Comments "on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of a name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers". There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1	12/22/16	Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2	12/22/16	The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications,20 ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied-for new gTLD names, such as the "reserved names" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the "ineligible strings" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. 21 As described in RFC 676122, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined "special" way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names? If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-3	12/22/16	Recommendation 3: Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-4	12/22/16	Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

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)	SAC089	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-089-en.pdf	SAC089: SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084	12/12/16	SAC089 is the second SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC089 is the SSAC's follow up to SAC088 and is a response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ATLAS II Report	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9917	The ATLAS II Recommendations Implementation Report	11/7/16	Endorsed by the ALAC by consensus, this ATLAS II Recommendation Implementation Report is the final deliverable of the Taskforce, which serves as a conclusion to the two-year endeavors post ATLAS II. The completion of the ATLAS II Recommendation implementation and the submission of this Report does not imply the end of their relevance. Quite the contrary, ATLAS II Recommendations have been deeply ingrained in the mission of the AtLarge Community and incorporated in its ongoing activities to further the aforementioned goals in the Declaration. There is also a growing recognition that ICANN is behooved to move in the direction pointed by the ATLAS II output. Such recognition has been reflected in ICANN Staff departments? efforts and commitments in collaborating with the At-Large Community, fulfilling the requirements in the Recommendations, and ensuring that they have a lasting impact.	-	The ICANN organization understands this ATLAS II Report is ALAC's Implementation Report. The report was provided to the ICANN Board on 7 November 2016, at ICANN57 (https://icann572016.sched.com/event/8cym). There is no further action required of the Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC088	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf	SAC088: SSAC Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084	11/6/16	SAC088 is the SSAC's Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC088 is the SSAC's response to the ccNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. The SSAC states it will continue to study the ccNSO document and provide complete feedback within four weeks. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC023	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC023: History of the Root Server System	11/4/16	A report to the Internet community from the RSSAC. The RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023 is RSSAC's report to the community on the organization history of the root server system and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC024	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC024: Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators	11/4/16	An Advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. RSSAC001 and RFC 7720 are considered as starting points; alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethos, etc) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not address herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC025	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf	RSSAC025: RSSAC October 2016 Workshop Report	11/4/16	Overview of RSSAC's third workshop (October 11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the mind map constructed during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC's report on its third workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC085	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-085-en.pdf	SAC085: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC086	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf	SAC086: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures -- Seeking Community Comments	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures -- Seeking Community Comments	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC087	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-087-en.pdf	SAC087: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services ? Second Outreach	10/19/16	SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services ? Second Outreach	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC022	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-newgtld-06oct16-en.pdf	RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures	10/6/16	Response to 9 June 2016 input request from PDP Working Group on the new gTLDs Subsequent Procedures regarding overarching questions (as part of the Group?s first Community Comment process). RSSAC does not have any input on those overarching questions. RSSAC does not foresee any technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. If the approach to future TLD expansion significantly changes, the RSSAC would like to be consulted. RSSAC advises root zone management partners and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service. Similarly, ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registries so that it can delay their addition to the root zone in case of root name service instabilities.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, for which the RSSAC does not have any input and does not foresee technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC021	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-021-statement-unavailability-single-root-server-08sep16-en.pdf	RSSAC021: RSSAC Statement Concerning The Impact of the Unavailability of a Single Root Server	9/8/16	The RSSAC?s answer of whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system. Based on information available as of the statement, loss of a single root server would not cause immediate stability issues for the root server system and the Internet that depends upon it.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 is RSSAC's statement regarding the question of whether the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC084	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf	SAC084: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process	8/31/16	SSAC Comments on Guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)

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)	SAC083	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-083-en.pdf	SAC083: SSAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement	7/15/16	Dotless Domains: The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) provides a brief comment on the Proposed Amendments to Base New Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreement. Specifically, Section 1.2 of Exhibit A (Approved Services) introduces new text relating to the potential provision of non-delegation records in a TLD's apex, thereby introducing unnecessary ambiguity regarding the permissibility of dotless domains.	-	ICANN staff understands SAC083 provides SSAC's comments on draft proposed amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The Public Comment period for the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-amend-new-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en) closed on 20 July 2016. ICANN and the Working Group established by the Registries Stakeholder Group are considering the comments received, and plan to submit a proposed final version of the amendments for approval of the Registries Stakeholder Group (according to the process defined in Section 7.6 of the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement) and the ICANN Board of Directors. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC020	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-client-reliability-root-dns-28jun16-en.pdf	RSSAC020: RSSAC Statement on Client Side Reliability of Root DNS Data	6/28/16	RSSAC confirms that the operators of the root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace The RSSAC fully supports the IAB's viewpoints expressed in RFC 2826. The RSSAC reiterates its support for integrity protecting protocols such as DNSSEC.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC020 is RSSAC's statement confirming that operators of root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace and that there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC019	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-workshop-26jun16-en.pdf	RSSAC019: RSSAC Workshop 2 Report	6/26/16	Overview of RSSAC's second workshop (May 11-12, 2016). The RSSAC continued upon its previous workshops and deliberated theses, including accountability, continuity, operational and organizational evolution. The work was framed around Architecture, Evolution and Reinveting RSSAC. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted during the two day effort.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC019 is RSSAC's report on its second workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and operational and organization evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC082	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-082-en.pdf	SAC082: SSAC Response to the Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round	6/3/16	On 13 May 2016, the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures requested input from the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituencies seeking assistance in building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. Several SSAC reports and advisories consider topics or issues related to new TLDs, such as SAC045, SAC062, and SAC066 in relation to domain collision issues. You can review a list of our publications here as an indexed list and also by category. The SSAC is looking forward to reviewing Working Group documents as the work progresses and also is prepared to answer specific questions as needed for the Working Group?s deliberations.	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is SSAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input on building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC081	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-081-en.pdf	SAC081: SSAC Response to Request for Input on Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP)	5/25/16	SSAC response to the working group request for input to better inform the policy development process	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC081 is SSAC's response to a call for input by the GNSO Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP Working Group. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC080	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-080-en.pdf	SAC 080: SSAC Approval of CCWG-Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations	4/21/16	The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), in its capacity as a Chartering Organization of the ICANN Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability, received an invitation on 23 February 2016 to consider and approve the Working Group?s Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations.1	-	SAC080 is informational and there are no actionable items for the Board within that document.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC079	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-079-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Changing Nature of IPv4 Address Semantics	3/17/16	The SSAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4) addresses caused by the increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPv4 addresses.	-	SAC079 is primarily information and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: ? Network operators should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. ? Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. are not directed at the Board, thus there are no actionable items in SAC079 for the ICANN Board or staff.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC018	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-icg-ccwg-accountability-10mar16-en.pdf	RSSAC018: RSSAC Statement on the Transmission of the ICG and CCWG-Accountability Proposals	3/10/16	The RSSAC congratulates the Internet stakeholder community for the transmission of the proposals, from the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group and the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, to the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration via the ICANN Board of Directors	-	The ICANN Organization understands RSSAC018 is RSSAC's statement congratulating the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group and the CCWG on the Transmission of the ICG and CCWG-Accountability proposals to the NTIA and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC078	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-078-en.pdf	Advisory on Uses of the Shared Global Domain Name Space	3/7/16	SSAC has formed a work party to investigate the implications of this work as it pertains to the security and stability of the DNS. This work party will study the security and stability issues associated with multiple uses of the domain name space.	-	ICANN staff understands SAC078 is informational. There are no actionable items in SAC078 for the ICANN Board or staff.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC076	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-076-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability 3rd Draft Proposal	2/8/16	SSAC comments on the CCWG?A Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations in the Public Comment Forum that opened on 30 November 2015 and is scheduled to close on 21 December 2015, specifically on those aspects that are related either to security and stability or to the manner in which SSAC functions as an Advisory Committee of ICANN.	-	SAC 076 provides SSAC's comments on the third draft proposal from the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC017	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-scope-04feb16-en.pdf	RSSAC017: RSSAC Statement of Work and Scope for RSSAC002 v3	2/4/16	The RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC002 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC002v2 was published on 26 January 2016.1 While working on the v2 updates, a number of more substantial issues came to light, but were postponed. At this time the RSSAC wishes to address these other issues and again update RSSAC002. It requests Duane Wessels to lead a caucus work party to produce version 3 of RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC caucus procedures.	-	The ICANN Organization understands RSSAC017 describes RSSAC's scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC077	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal	1/28/16	The (SSAC) comments on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal in the 17 November 2015 Public Comment Forum support SSAC member Greg Aaron, in his personal capacity, and expands on some of his comments and offer others.	-	These comments are provided by SSAC as part of the normal public comment period on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal and that SSAC intends for those comments to be folded into a staff action report or staff briefing. If Board action is required, then that action will happen only in accordance with the normal public comment process from various stakeholders.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-1 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	Outreach to the CA/B forum7 and CAs, requesting that they treat applied for new gTLDs as if they were delegated TLDs as soon as possible, as well as discussing the broader implications and mitigation steps. (conducted confidentially)	-	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.

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)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-2 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A Disclosure Policy as informed by industry best practices for vulnerability disclosure (e.g. CERT / CC vulnerability disclosure.8 Such a policy should take into consideration that once the disclosure is public, it is trivial to exploit the vulnerability.	-	This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser Forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-3 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A communication plan on informing affected parties as determined by the disclosure policy.	-	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 .
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC057	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-057-en.pdf	R-4 Advisory on Internal Name Certificates	1/27/16	A contingency plan to be executed if the vulnerability is leaked to the public prematurely, as well as a proactive vulnerability disclosure plan.	-	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 .
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC016	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-workshop-07jan16-en.pdf	RSSAC016: RSSAC Workshop 2015 Report	1/7/16	During September 23?24, 2015, the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) conducted its first workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on a foundation for the future evolution of the root server system (RSS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RSS.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC016 is RSSAC's report on its first workshop in which it discussed the evolution of the Root Server System as well as accountability, continuity and evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC015	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-ccwg-accountability-ws1-draft-22dec15-en.pdf	RSSAC015: RSSAC Statement on CCWG-Accountabiltiy Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1	12/22/15	The RSSAC, composed of the root server operators and others closely involved in the operations of the DNS root services, has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 1) [1] and observed the ICANN community process.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC015 is RSSAC's comment detailing that the RSSAC has no position on the CCWG Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC075	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf	SSAC Comments to ITU-D on Establishing New Certification Authorities	12/9/15	As it relates to webPKI, the SSAC has been following and encouraging the evolution and deployment of the DNS, DNSSEC, and DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE). The SSAC believes standards based on DANE, possibly in combination with independent industry-developed solutions such as Certificate Transparency, are the future. As such, we encourage interested parties to cooperate closely with the CA/Browser (CAB) Forum and Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).	-	This advice is that is not directed at the ICANN Board, but that it the SSAC's response to the 11 September 2015 liaison statement from ITU-D Study Group 2 Question 3/2. We note that the SSAC encourages interested parties to cooperate with the CAB Forum and IETF on their work related to DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE). As such, we do not believe that there are any actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 1	11/3/15	Item 1: The ICANN Compliance Department should publish data about the security breaches that registrars have reported in accordance with the 2013 RAA.	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 2	11/3/15	Item 2: A provision similar to 2013 RAA paragraph 3.20 should be incorporated into all future registry contracts, with similar statistics published.	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 3	11/3/15	Item 3: Future RAA deliberations should encourage stronger authentication practices, specifically the use of multi-factor authentication.	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4	11/3/15	Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registries based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable parties to learn practical operational practices for preserving security and stability of the credential management lifecycle. SSAC welcomes the opportunity to advise training staff in the creation of a curriculum.	Phase 4 | Implement	At GDD Industry Summit 2019 in Bangkok in May 2019 (https://www.icann.org/gddsummit), a session on Credential Management Lifecycle was conducted. A team of community experts presented an educational material that was shared with the SSAC prior to the session for input and guidance. A community wiki space has been established for the community to share good practices in credential management. The sharing of the good practices and community awareness will continue with the participation of the community.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC073	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf	SAC073: SSAC Comments on Root Zone Key Signing Key Rollover Plan	10/5/15	In this Advisory the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) addresses the following topics: - Terminology and definitions relating to DNSSEC key rollover in the root zone; - Key management in the root zone; - Motivations for root zone KSK rollover; - Risks associated with root zone KSK rollover; - Available mechanisms for root zone KSK rollover; - Quantifying the risk of failed trust anchor update; and - DNS response size considerations.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2018-10-15-en). See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC014	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-iana-stewardship-04sep15-en.pdf	RSSAC014: Comment to "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..."	9/4/15	The Root Server System Advisory Committee, composed of the root server operators and others closely involved in the operations of the DNS root, has reviewed the ICG plan and observed the ICANN community process that has led to it.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC014 is RSSAC's comment detailing support for the "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..." and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC003	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-003-root-zone-ttls-21aug15-en.pdf	RSSAC003: RSSAC Report on Root Zone TTLs	8/21/15	To address the DNSSEC problems identified in Section 6.4, the RSSAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners to increase the signature validity periods for signatures generated by both the KSK and the ZSK. KSK signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 13 days.	-	Closure notification letter sent to the Board on 23 April 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/davies-to-chalaby-23apr18-en.pdf). RSSAC notified via ARR Tool as well.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC013	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-root-servers-work-statement-09jul15-en.pdf	RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for "History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers"	7/9/15	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers. The document will: 1) Document the technical history of the names assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-SERVERS.NET zone; 3) Consider the impact on the priming response of including DNSSEC signatures over root server address records; 4) Perform a risk analysis, and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root zone management partners, and ICANN on whether changes should be made, and what those changes should be.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC013 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

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)	SAC072	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-072-en.pdf	SAC072: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Relating Functions Proposal	6/24/15	This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the ICANN community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC072 is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG Naming Relating Functions Proposal confirming that the proposal satisfies the recommendations in SAC069. There is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC071	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf	SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements	6/8/15	Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems". SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 10 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#2.c.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC012	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-ccwg-accountability-ws1-draft-05jun15-en.pdf	RSSAC012: RSSAC Public Comment on CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Draft Report	6/5/15	RSSAC Comments on the Accountability Draft Proposal	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC012 is RSSAC's comment on the Accountability Draft Proposal and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and a report was released on 19 August 2015 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-2015-05-04-en). ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-1 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 1: Recognizing alternatives to the PSL have been discussed (see Appendix A), the SSAC recommends the IETF and the applications community consider them for further specifications and possible standardization through the IETF process	-	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 2: The IETF should develop a consensus definition of "public suffix" and other associated terminology (e.g. ?"private suffix").	-	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-4b Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4b: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication protocols as specifications to this work.	-	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	R-4c Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mozilla PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 5).	-	ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 4a: The Internet community should standardize the current approach to PSLs. Specifically: Recommendation 4a: ICANN, as part of its initiatives on universal acceptance, should encourage the software development community (including the open source community) to develop and distribute programming and operating system libraries implementing robust (i.e. authenticated, timely, secure, accountable) distribution mechanisms for PSLs. These libraries should be written across all common platforms and operating systems in a way as to ensure consistent and standard interpretation of a given PSL across all platforms.	-	The ICANN organization understanding of SAC070 R-04a is that ICANN should request that the UASG encourage the development of software resources enabling or enhancing the effective use of the Mozilla PSL, with attention towards software developers. As part of this initiative, ICANN should provide funding for this initiative and monitor whether the UASG's effort is successful. ICANN notes that more specific description of this audience (beyond merely including open source) would further the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the promotion effort. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 4a is now closed, as the UASG considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: R-6 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists	5/28/15	Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.	-	The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the UASG to explicitly include the use of a PSL and actions related to a PSL as part of their work. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the UASG considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)	5/28/15	IANA should host a PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. Such a PSL would be authoritative for those domains. Such a list should include, at a minimum, all TLDs in the IANA root zone.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing IANA staff to host an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone as stated in recommendation 5 of SAC070.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD/Suffix Lists (R-3)	5/28/15	To close the knowledge gap between registries and popular PSL maintainers, ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation should collaboratively create informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN organization understands this recommendation to mean that ICANN, in concert with the Mozilla Foundation, prepare educational materials on the Mozilla PSL covering the meaning of the resource and the impact of the resource. ICANN org hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of December 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). On 18 May 2020, "The Public Suffix List: A Guide for TLD Administrators" was published, (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/octo-011-18may20-en.pdf) closing the knowledge gap between registries and popular PSL maintainers with the creation of informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request as of 5 June 2020.

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC011	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/iab-liaison-rssac-16feb15-en.pdf	RSSAC011: IAB Liaison to the RSSAC	2/12/15	Historically, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has provided a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). With the recent re-establishment of the RSSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC010	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/rssac-003-scope-11feb15-en.pdf	RSSAC010: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Root Zone TTLs"	2/11/15	This statement refers back to RSSAC003 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone TTL work party to produce RSSAC003 ? RSSAC Advisory on Root zone TTLs, with adherence to RSSAC caucus procedures.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Root Zone TTLs" (RSSAC003) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC009	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/rssac-dnssec-validity-root-zone-17dec14-en.pdf	RSSAC009: RSSAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone	12/17/14	In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009 provides RSSAC's "Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone". Per the Statement: "Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays. RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone.? The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 1: The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have been invited to submit proposals should determine 1) whether or not the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and if so which ones; 2) whether or not additional external controls are necessary for requirements that should be retained; and 3) if additional external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 5: Noting the stability and efficiency of existing structures, processes, and mechanisms for the management of the root zone, the SSAC recommends that any proposal to replace NTIA?Âôs final authorization of root zone changes with an alternative be at least as reliable, resilient, and efficient as the current process.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 4: As part of the transition process, each of the affected communities should consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of the IANA Functions might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 2a: Each of the communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms outside of the IANA Functions Contract are sufficiently robust to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable to the affected communities for the proper performance of the IANA Functions after the IANA Functions Contract expires; and if they are not, the communities should determine what additional accountability mechanisms will be needed.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 7: NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer after transition.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 3: Each of the communities should investigate and clarify the process for handling the possibility of governmental sanctions and restrictions (e.g., the protocol for obtaining OFAC2 licenses where U.S. sanctions might interfere with the ability to execute proper instructions to IANA) following the stewardship transition.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 2b: Each of the communities should review and (if necessary) enhance its policy development process to ensure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA Functions Operator are clear and implementable.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC069	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition	12/10/14	Recommendation 6: Effective arrangements should be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the root zone management process post-transition, including inter-organization coordination if the post-transition RZM process involves more than one root zone management partner.	-	In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC001	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-001-draft-20nov14-en.pdf	RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers	11/20/14	A defined set of service expectations that root server operators must satisfy including Infrastructure, Service Accuracy, Service Availability, Service Capability, Operational Security, Diversity of Implementation, Monitoring and Measurement, and Communication (both Inter-Operator and Public Communication).	-	ICANN, as operator of L-Root, has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its compliance at https://www.dns.icann.org/rssac001-response/index.html.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC002	https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rssac-publications-2014-05-12-en	RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System	11/20/14	A an initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server system. 1: The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. 2: The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3: Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.	-	ICANN, as operator of L-Root, has implemented the advice from v1- v3 and has advised RSSAC on the implementation. RSSAC002 data has been published at: http://stats.dns.icann.org/rssac/.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC068	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-068-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the IANA Functions Contract	10/10/14	No recommendations	-	There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC008	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-igf-icann-accountability-02sep14-en.pdf	RSSAC008: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall During IGF 2014	9/2/14	RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | Istanbul, Turkey	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's "Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum" in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC067	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf	SSAC Overview and History of the IANA Functions	8/15/14	No reccomendations	-	There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC005	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-stewardship-coordination-guidance-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC005: RSSAC Guidance to Representatives on the "NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group"	7/10/14	The RSSAC give guidance requested by its representatives on the "NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group"	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC's guidance to the Representatives on the ?NTIA IANA Functions? Stewardship Transition Coordination Group? and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC006	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-001-scope-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC006: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Service Expectations of Root Servers"	7/10/14	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Service Expectations of Root Servers"	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Service Expectations of Root Servers" (RSSAC001) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC007	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-002-scope-10jul14-en.pdf	RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Measurements of the Root Server System"	7/10/14	The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System.?"	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System" (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	'The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-38)	6/26/14	R-38. ICANN should ensure that its Beginner Guides are easily accessible.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Beginner Guides are available for download on icann.org here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/beginners-guides-2012-03-06-en. ICANN is continually working to update the guides. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-10)	6/26/14	R-10. The next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of live scribing for all meetings and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes and make translation available in a timely manner.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e ICANN's Language Services team has worked to extend the interpretation and translation processes and services. See the ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+10
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)	6/26/14	R-11. ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender; cultural diversity) and user needs (disabilities, etc).	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The At-Large Accessibility Taskforce conducted a survey on accessibility to senior ICANN staff in 2015, the results of which were discussed at ICANN53 in Buenos Aires (June 2015). The implementation of a range of services is part of ICANN's strategic objectives: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10oct14-en.pdf. This is part of the Global Stakeholder Engagement team's ongoing work.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-12)	6/26/14	R-12. In collaboration with At-Large Structures, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend education programmes across underrepresented regions.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+12
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-13)	6/26/14	R-13. ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and relevance.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board?material/resolutions?2014?09?09?en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG?Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+ +Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-14)	6/26/14	R-14. ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-15)	6/26/14	R-15. ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure befitting a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-16)	6/26/14	R-16. ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+16
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- 'The Globalization of ICANN (R-9)	6/26/14	R-9. ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of day-to-day work of ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Several ICANN offices have been opened over the past years, most recently the Engagement office in Nairobi. See ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+9
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-26)	6/26/14	R-26. Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SO/ACs, in order to: enhance Knowledge Management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activity, enhance policy development metrics,facilitate multilingual engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of ICANN's ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-27)	6/26/14	R-27. The Board must implement ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation work is underway on the ATRT2 recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program and here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/Rec+%239). In addition, this work is part of CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-28)	6/26/14	R-28. The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.	-	There are no actionable items for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-29)	6/26/14	R-29. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC website has been redesigned and was rolled out 24 February 2016, meeting this recommendation. This site is automatically fed with new public comment procedures, and provides a forum for ALAC members to collaborate and if desired draft statements in response to the public comment proceedings. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-30)	6/26/14	R-30. For each Public Comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-31)	6/26/14	R-31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See the ALAC Workspace for more information: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-32)	6/26/14	R-32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simpler terms.	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)	6/26/14	R-33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Webinars.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+3
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)	6/26/14	R-34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest. (R-34)	-	There are no actionable items for ICANN.

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-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)	6/26/14	R-35. The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e There has been significant increase of communications between the ALAC and the ICANN Board since the conclusion of the 2nd At-Large Summit. Board members attend meetings/teleconferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-36)	6/26/14	R-36. The At-Large Community should envisage conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en This specific advice item is in the remit of the ALAC. No action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which began on 9 Jan 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. See the meetings page here: https://community.icann.org/display/soaceinputfeedback/Event+Calendar. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+36
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-37)	6/26/14	R-37. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki.	-	Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to rework the website and Wiki to ensure that our "Policy Advice" pages are accurate and understandable. This will continue as volunteer and staff resources allow. We will also ensure that as documents are published, the classification of the document is clear. The goal is to address two issues: • Confusion about the type of document (ie "Advice" vs "Comment") • The "End user" justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff together with At-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (as advice, public comment, correspondence, etc.) in a more granular fashion and provided enhanced tools with which to filter search results based on these categories. Furthermore, staff will create a new field in the database for "End User Issue" and At-Large leadership will populate this field both in current documents and those generated going forward. The following items have been created to satisfy these goals: • An Executive Summaries: ALAC Policy Comments & Advice resource page has been created to address "type" of document (#1). • The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) meets weekly to discuss "end user" justification for intervention (#2). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a Wiki visitor to peruse the work of the At-large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-39)	6/26/14	R-39. ICANN should encourage open data? best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TTF.pdf?api=v2
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)	6/26/14	R-40. ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP), but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e On an annual basis, the CROPP program is reviewed and adjustments are made based on community input. Annual community special budget request process is also used to address these types of requests. This recommendation has led to greater collaboration between ALAC leadership and ICANN staff regional engagement teams. See the CROPP Page here: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=41900609. See ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+40
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)	6/26/14	R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget (https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-05mar16/msg00013.html), which was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board Finance committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on this topic.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)	6/26/14	R-42. ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)	6/26/14	R-43. RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.	-	There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+43
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-1)	6/26/14	R-1. ICANN should continue to support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Work has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN55. The Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/Marrakech+AFRALO+NGO+Program

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-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-2)	6/26/14	R-2. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programmes having brought valuable members to the community.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)	6/26/14	R-3. ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model reaching not only Board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2; WS1 proposal has been provided to the NTIA. WS2 still in progress: https://features.icann.org/proposal-ccwg-enhancing-icann-accountability
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)	6/26/14	R-4. ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of Liaisons between its different Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (AC/SOs) to do away with the ?Äúsilo culture?Äù.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Work specific to this advice item is complete. There is ongoing work being conducted by task forces, and there are ongoing discussions about establishing a liaison to the GAC. For updates, see the ALAC workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+4
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-5)	6/26/14	R-5. ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end-users remain at the heart of the accountability process in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-6)	6/26/14	R-6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts-of-interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC has taken steps to establish a practice for declaring conflicts of interest. See the ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+6
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-7)	6/26/14	R-7. A periodic review of ICANN's MSM should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN's constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirements in the Corporation.		The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was discussed by the Board Organization Effectiveness Committee (OEC), which subsequently added the item to the OEC workplan: "Holistic Assessment of ICANN structures". The OEC agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2-Accountability should progress further, before the topic of "holistic assessment of ICANN structures" is to be addressed. Updates on OEC's progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 :https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/oec-activities-19jan18-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC's consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en).
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)	6/26/14	R-8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.		There are no actionable items for ICANN.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)	6/26/14	R-17. ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries and, in conjunction with technical bodies, promote credible alternatives.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e ICANN's social media universe has expanded to include accounts in multiple languages and region-specific social platforms. ICANN has also revamped monthly and regional newsletters to share content in Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Turkish. Primary platform for content sharing remains icann.org, with parts of the site available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+17
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-18)	6/26/14	R-18. Support end-users to take part in policy development.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-19)	6/26/14	R-19. Eliminate barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Much has been accomplished on this specific advice item and is part of day-to-day operations at ICANN. For example, there is a new ALAC Website, there have been public comment improvements, expanded working group onboarding program, capacity building webinars, as well as RALO webinars. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)	6/26/14	R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

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-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-22)	6/26/14	R-22. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC website has been redesigned and put online, addressing this recommendation (atlarge.icann.org). In addition, ICANN is in the final stages of publishing an updated Style Guide, which formalizes ICANN's commitment to creating content in plain English style. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+22
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-23)	6/26/14	R-23. The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-25)	6/26/14	R-25. To enhance ICANN's community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as called for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board's decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: https://community.icann.org/display/WEIA/WS2+-+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability R-24(a)	6/26/14	R-24(a). Both the areas of the (a) Ombudsman and (b) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Updates, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings. ICANN continues to improve the reporting data based on community feedback and mostly based on working group requests to support policy development or policy evaluations. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN	http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf	The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability R-24(b)	6/26/14	R-24(b). Both the areas of (a) Ombudsman and (b) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.	-	The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Information on the Ombudsman and the work of the Ombudsman can be found here: https://www.icann.org/ombudsman. This site also contains reports made by the Ombudsman. Reporting on compliance complaints can be found on the ICANN website: https://features.icann.org/compliance. Reporting is provided via the dashboard, the Quarterly Updates, the Annual Report and presentations made during the International ICANN Meetings. ICANN continues to improve the reporting data based on community feedback and mostly based on working group requests to support policy development or policy evaluations. See also the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was accepted and included in the framework. See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should in due course publish information about not yet disclosed issues.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. The Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Strategic Recommendation 1: ICANN should consider not taking any actions solely based on the JAS Phase One Report. If action is planned to be taken before the entire report is published, communications to the community should be provided to indicate this clearly.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. This recommendation was not accepted, and the Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 5: ICANN should provide clarity to registries on the rules and the method of allocation of blocked names after the conclusion of the test period.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 4: ICANN should implement a notification approach that accommodates Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)-only hosts as well as IP Version 4 (IPv4)-only or dual-stack hosts.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 3: ICANN should perform an evaluation of potential notification approaches against at least the requirements provided by the SSAC prior to implementing any notification approach.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. Please see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 2: 'Instead of a single controlled interruption period, ICANN should introduce rolling interruption periods, broken by periods of normal operation, to allow affected end-user systems to continue to function during the 120-day test period with less risk of catastrophic business impact.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC066	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf	SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions	6/6/14	Operational Recommendation 1: 'The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) should expand the range of situations that would trigger an emergency response, for example national security, emergency preparedness, critical infrastructure, key economic processes, commerce, and the preservation of law and order.	-	The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NGPC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advice Item Status
As of 30 November 2020

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC004	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-iana-stewardship-transition-08may14-en.pdf	RSSAC004: Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Input on "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions"	5/8/14	RSSAC provides 4 comments regarding the draft proposal	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC's comments on the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-2	2/18/14	Recommendation 2: All types of network operators should take immediate steps to prevent network address spoofing. This involves: a. Implement network ingress filtering, as described in BCP38 and SAC004, to restrict packet-level forgery to the greatest extent possible; b. Disclose the extent of their implementation of network ingress filtering to the Internet community as a means of encouraging broader and more effective use of ingress filtering.	-	SAC065 R-2 is directed towards network operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3	2/18/14	Recommendation 3: Recursive DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure open recursive DNS servers. This involves: a. Identify unmanaged open recursive DNS servers operating in the network and take immediate steps to restrict access to these servers in order to prevent abuse. b. Follow SAC008 Recommendation 3 to (1) disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and (2) only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to assist in reducing amplification vectors for DNS DDoS attacks. c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abusive use of their open resolvers so that they are not targets of abuse. This would include continuous monitoring for anomalous behavior, limiting or blocking known abuse queries (e.g., ripe.net ANY); tracking likely target victim IPs (attacks reported or addresses of heavily targeted servers) and restricting or disallowing responses to those IPs; and sharing information with similar operators to coordinate efforts to quell such attacks.	-	SAC065 R-3 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4	2/18/14	Recommendation 4: Authoritative DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response rate limiting. This involves: a. Investigate mechanisms to deter DNS amplification attacks (e.g., Response Rate Limiting (RRL) in DNS server software), and implement those that are appropriate for their environment; b. Encourage DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; and c. Frequently review the state of the art of such mechanisms and update their environment as necessary.	-	SAC065 R-4 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5	2/18/14	Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicate with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational practices as necessary to ensure that a process is in place to systematically perform DNS software updates on both an on-going and an emergency basis; and b. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities at reasonable cost in system resources.	-	SAC065 R-5 is directed towards DNS operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6	2/18/14	Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurators of customer premise networking equipment, including home networking equipment, should take immediate steps to secure these devices and ensure that they are field upgradable when new software is available to fix security vulnerabilities, and aggressively replacing the installed base of non-upgradeable devices with upgradeable devices. This minimally involves: a. Ensuring that the default configuration on these devices does not implement an unmanaged open recursive DNS resolver; b. Providing updates and patches for their equipment to keep the installed base of networking equipment up-to-date to address current security threats, or as a necessary alternative replacing non-updatable equipment with appropriately configured devices; c. Ensuring that large-scale participants in purchasing of customer premise networking equipment (e.g., ISPs, government procurement, large enterprises) insist that networking equipment meet the standards discussed in this document.	-	SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurators of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-1)	2/18/14	ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN organization understands that SAC065 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC065 Recommendations 2-5. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing - R-1	2/13/14	Recommendation 1: The SSAC invites all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community to consider the following proposed behavior for search list processing and comment on its correctness, completeness, utility and feasibility. a. Administrators (including DHCP server administrators) should configure the search list explicitly, and must not rely on or use implicit search lists; Where DNS parameters such as the domain search list have been manually configured, these parameters should not be overridden by DHCP. b. When a user enters a single label name, that name may be subject to search list processing if a search list is specified, but must never be queried in the DNS in its original single-label form. c. When a user queries a hostname that contain two or more labels separated by dots, such as www.server, applications and resolvers must query the DNS directly. Search lists must not be applied even if such names do not resolve to an address (A/AAAA). Therefore www.server is always a FQDN.	-	The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community to consider that behavior and to comment on it. ICANN acknowledges this invitation and will take the proposed behavior into consideration when discussing search list processing and when search lists are used within ICANN's IT systems. Beyond this, we do not believe that there is any action required from ICANN Board or staff to address SAC064 R-1.

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)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-2)	2/13/14	The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.	Phase 2 | Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-2 means that the SSAC recommends that ICANN organization work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior, beginning with the submission of an Internet-Draft to the IETF and advocating for its standardization within the IETF process. Updates to RFC 1535 and other RFCs related to this topic should be included within the Internet-Draft. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-3)	2/13/14	In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. b. Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly delegated top-level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.	Phase 4 | Deferred	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names delegated as new gTLDs from the 2012 application round for the New gTLD Program. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further action once the NCAP's work on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk	11/7/13	Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a viable and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid reversal of the delegation of a TLD	-	The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN's President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.d The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk	11/7/13	Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what choices have been made and why as part of its decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis: - Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? - Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it? - Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? - Termination of the trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)? What is to be done with the data collected? Who makes the decision on what the next step in the delegation process is?	-	The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that, "directs ICANN's President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated." (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.d) The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of clear and objective metrics for acceptable levels of "breakage" resulting from a key rollover.	-	This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the development of rollback procedures to be executed when a rollover has affected operational stability beyond a reasonable boundary.	-	This part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)	11/7/13	ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1	11/7/13	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) staff, in coordination with the other Root Zone Management Partners (United States Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and Verisign), should immediately undertake a significant, worldwide communications effort to publicize the root zone KSK rollover motivation and process as widely as possible.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2018-10-15-en). The communication plan is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 2	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative testbed for the purpose of analyzing behaviors of various validating resolver implementations, their versions, and their network environments (e.g., middle boxes) that may affect or be affected by a root KSK rollover, such that potential problem areas can be identified, communicated, and addressed.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2018-10-15-en). The test pass is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of as much information as possible about the impact of a KSK rollover to provide input to planning for future rollovers.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 15 October 2018 ICANN org determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic key that helps protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global Internet (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2018-10-15-en). The data collection program is part of the overall KSK Rollover Project. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ksk-rollover.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-1 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	The ICANN Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN's remit) directed at finding a 'solution' to 'the WHOIS problem' until the registration data policy has been developed and accepted in the community.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-3 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	SSAC recommends that the EWG state more clearly its positions on specific questions of data availability.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

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)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	R-4 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	The SSAC suggests that the EWG address this recommendation from SAC058: "SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation: As the ICANN community discusses validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered: What data elements need to be added or validated to comply with requirements or expectations of different stakeholders? Is additional registration processing overhead and delay an acceptable cost for improving accuracy and quality of registration data? Is higher cost an acceptable outcome for improving accuracy and quality? Would accuracy improve if the registration process were to provide natural persons with privacy protection upon completion of multi-factored validation?	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	SAC061: R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). Subsequently, on 2 August 2018 the SSAC contacted the ICANN org to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN org change SAC061 Recommendation 2's status from 'Closed' to 'Open.' Upon review of SAC061 and SAC101v2, the ICANN org has returned SAC101 to Phase 2 | Understand. SAC061 Recommendation 2 will be considered in conjunction with SAC101v2. 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 "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council."
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)	7/23/13	Regarding ICANN's Report on Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs, The root zone must use one and only one set of Label Generation Rules (LGR).	-	ICANN agrees with this recommendation. The implicit assumption of the current LGR work is that the root zone will use one and only one set of label generation rules. Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found below: IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations?language=es Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf Public Comment on Label Generation Ruleset for Root Zone Version 1 (LGR-1): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)	7/23/13	The current rights protection regime associated with the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) process is susceptible to homographic attacks. The roles of the involved parties, specifically registrars, registries, and TMCH, related to matching must be made clear.	-	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)	7/23/13	When registries calculate variant sets for use in validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.	-	This specific advice item is directed at Registries and contains no actionable advice for ICANN.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)	7/23/13	The matching algorithm for TMCH must be improved.	-	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en

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)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)	7/23/13	The TMCH must add support for IDN variant TLDs. Particularly during the TM Claims service, a name registered under a TLD that has allocated variant TLDs should trigger trademark holder notifications for the registration of the name in all of its allocated variant TLDs.	-	ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources: - General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse - Information on TMCH and Registrars and Registries: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/registries-registrars - Trademark Clearinghouse & Internationalized Domain Names Webinar: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/idns-19jun13-en.pdf IDN Variant Resources: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.	-	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the number of strings that may become activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)	7/23/13	Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.	-	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)	7/23/13	Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.	-	ICANN agrees with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the main considerations the Integration Panel has to take into account in each release of the IDN LGR. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being imposed by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)	7/23/13	Should ICANN decide to implement safeguards, it should distinguish two types of failure modes when a user expects a variant to work, but it is not implemented: denial of service versus misconnection.	-	This specific advice item is part of project 2.1 LGR Procedure. Information on Project 2.1 of the LGR can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label+Generation+Ruleset+Process+for+the+Root Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found at the links listed below: - IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en - IDN Variant Program information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations?language=es - Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/lgr-procedure-20mar13-en.pdf - - Public Comment on Label Generation Ruleset for Root Zone Version 1 (LGR-1): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/lgr-1-2015-12-04-en - Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (3 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should concentrate foremost on the rules for the root zone (versus rules for TLD registry operators).	-	Completion letter sent to Board on 12 June 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/namazi-to-chalaby-12jun18-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (2 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rules (LGR) calculations.	Phase 4 | Deferred	RZ-LGR-3 integrating 16 scripts is being released in July 2019. The inclusion of RZ-LGR to validate TLD labels and their variant labels has also been recommended as part of managing IDN variant TLDs. GNSO and ccNSO are currently considering this recommendation. The Study Group on Technical Utilization of Root Zone Label Generation Rules took up this item to discuss. Recommendation four (4) of their report suggests a way forward. This work has been released for public comment and will be finalized afterwards for further consideration of the ICANN Board. See report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/recommendations-rz-lgr-14may19-en.pdf and public comment at https://www.icann.org/public-comments/technical-rz-lgr-2019-05-15-en. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)	7/23/13	A process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.	Phase 4 | Deferred	ICANN org recently developed the Recommendations for Managing IDN Variant TLDs, published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en. These have been adopted by ICANN Board at their meeting at ICANN64, where the Board asked the GNSO and ccNSO to consider these in their policy and procedures. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) providers support variant TLDs, and that parity exists for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.	Phase 4 | Deferred	A detailed analysis has been published as part of recommendations for managing IDN variant TLDs, which has been approved by ICANN Board at ICANN64. The analysis has been forwarded to the GNSO and ccNSO for their consideration for relevant policy and procedure development. The analysis is avaialble at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en. Specifically see section 3 of the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-25jan19-en.pdf.

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)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (4 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines; - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second-level domain labels (2LDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions	Phase 4 | Implement	The IDN Guidelines were updated to version 4 in May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf). However, these Guidelines are currently being held for review of GNSO, following the request from GNSO to the ICANN Board. In March 2020, the Guidelines for Developing Reference Label Generation Rules (LGRs) for the Second Level Version 2 were published for public comment, and the public comment staff report was issued in May 2020. The IANA Repository of IDN tables is also now being updated to address any gaps.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-1 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC recommends those issues that previous public comment periods have suggested were inadequately explored as well as issues related to cross-functional interactions of the changes brought about by root zone growth should be examined.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The Org (OCTO) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 04 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: - Scaling the Root Report on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC believes the use of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding stubbornly unresolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.	Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider	The Org (OCTO) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059 ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 04 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: - Scaling the Root Report on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	R-1 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.	-	The adoption of this language is complete and extends beyond the ICANN community in which the ICANN WHOIS Expert Working Group (EWG), the Application Guidebook, the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate terminology used within SAC058.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	R-2 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	As the ICANN community discusses validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered	-	Many of these questions were addressed in the Expert Working Group's work and are part of the policy questions posed within a future PDP by the GNSO. The EWG delivered its Final Report: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf. Information on the public comment process can also be found here: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rds-prelim-issue-2015-07-13-en. The GNSO PDP process information can be found here: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	SAC058: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques to be used by registrars and registries for validating registration data. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC056	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-056-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System	10/9/12	SAC 056 concludes that "Governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content	-	SAC 056 is an Advisory that contains no recommendations that require Board action. The information in the conclusion of the Advisory has been disseminated through published articles referenced within SAC 056 and has been acted upon in various outreach and engagement with governments to help explain the technical implications of policies.

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)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-1 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	The Board should direct the CEO to create a registration data policy committee that includes the highest levels of executive engagement to develop a registration data policy which defines the purpose of domain name registration data, as described elsewhere in this document	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	R-3 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	The Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN?s remit) directed at finding a ?solution? to ?the WHOIS problem? until the registration data policy identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	Internationalized Domain Names: Internationalization MUST be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the IRD-WG final report.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a In response to recommendation 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group's (IRD-WG's) final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and transliteration of contact data, which addresses the submission of internationalized data. Board resolution 2016.03.10.06-7 requests GNSO to review policy implications of IRD Final Report and directs staff to incorporate IRD recommendations into Translation & Transliteration policy implementation as consistent with policy (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#1.e).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC055	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf	WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant	9/14/12	An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicate for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data.	-	This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a Implementation work on WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://whois.icann.org/en/whoisars. The expert working group is evaluating accuracy policies and a policy development process (PDP) on registration data policy by the GNSO will follow the EWG's work. The policy recommendations arising from the GNSO's work will then be sent to the Board for consideration.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC054	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)	6/11/12	The SSAC invites all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and in particular Registry and Registrar Stakeholder groups to (a) consider this data model and comment on its completeness, and (b) comment on the utility of the model in furthering the definition of a directory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SAC033 and SAC051.	-	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC054	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf	SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)	6/11/12	The SSAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.	-	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC053	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-053-en.pdf	SSAC Report on Dotless Domains	2/23/12	Recommendation: Dotless domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use o DNS resource records such as A, AAAA, and MX in the apex of a Top-Level Domain (TLD) be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases.	-	On 13 August 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) adopted a resolution affirming that "dotless domain names" are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en#1.

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)	SAC052	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2)	1/31/12	Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on user confusion/string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be disallowed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration ofpotential confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should invite comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN?Äôs advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each applied-for single-character TLD label must be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts. 4. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of singlecharacter TLDs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be relaxed if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a concise specification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs.11 6. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding its consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be PVALID according to IDNA2008. b) The code point is from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard.12 c) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non Lx-class code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. d) The script in which an exception is made and a single character IDN is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Greek/Cyrillic, Lao/Thai, etc.). e) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Denial of a single character TLD application does not imply blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. f) If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is	-	The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC052	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf	SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (2 of 2)	1/31/12	Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD label syntax is currently underway within ICANN, the IETF, and other bodies, ICANN should review the Findings of this report, and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.	-	Considerable work has been performed or is ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en A String Similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules (Project 5), but this project was deprioritized based on public comment, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC050	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf	DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms ?Äì An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System	6/14/11	Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain name or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organizations from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate connection to the named host, although circumvention techniques may enable connectivity to the intended system anyway (this includes simply accessing the site via IP address rather than via a Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN)). A DNS resolver or network operator could also rewrite a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether rewriting a Non-Existent Domain (NXDOMAIN) response or rewriting the DNS response for an existing FQDN, with potentially harmful effects on DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC)-supporting name servers and their users. A particularly coarse-grained approach is for an operator to silently discard DNS responses, although this results in non-deterministic behavior and may itself be problematic. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply these principles: 1. The organization imposes a policy on a network and its users over which it exercises administrative control (i.e., it is the administrator of a policy domain). 2. The organization determines that the policy is beneficial to its objectives and/or the interests of its users. 3. The organization implements the policy using a technique that is least disruptive to its network operations and users, unless laws or regulations specify certain techniques. 4. The organization makes a concerted effort to do no harm to networks or users outside its policy domain as a consequence of implementing the policy.	-	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-051-en.pdf	SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure	6/14/11	R-1 The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions, in particular: - Domain Name Registration Data (DNRD). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars or registries collects. - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNRD-AP). The components of a (standard) communications exchange - queries and responses - that specify the access to DNRD. - Doman Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNRD-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registries and registrars to implement the DNRD-AP and to provide access to DNRD-DSD. Additional terminology includes ?DNRDe,? ?DNRD Policy,? ?DNRD-DS Policy,? ?Internationalized DNRD,? and ?Localized DNRD.? The term ?WHOIS? should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 3912.	-	On 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of new directory service policy and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-28-en#5. Both the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC's terminology: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/registries/registries-agreements-en, https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/syste m/files/files/sac-051-en.pdf	SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure	6/14/11	R-3 The ICANN community should develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing DNRD that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of verification methods, credential services, and access control capabilities.	-	This specific advice item contains no action for the Board. The PDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) is currently considering this topic.

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)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-051-en.pdf	SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (R-2)	6/14/11	R-2 The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of Internationalized DNRD as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC 003, SAC 027 and SAC 033.	Phase 5 | Close Request	The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC051 be developed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2011-10-28-en#5). A roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-06-04-en. As of 26 August 2019 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC049	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf	SSAC Report on DNS Zone Risk Assessment and Management (1 of 1)	6/3/11	The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing [NINE] safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service: (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2: Design for resiliency; Recommendation (3) Actively manage DNS information; (4) Protect domain registration and hosting accounts against unauthorized access or misuse; (5) Monitor the health and well being of your name service; (6) Track operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully, and; (9): Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.	-	This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)	5/12/11	2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of "abuse prevention and mitigation" and we suggest that it be removed.	-	The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (1 of 3)	5/12/11	The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphaned glue is an ambiguous term for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has prepared a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for the proposed definition).	-	ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Specification 6, Section 4.2, which references the SSAC Advisory directly: "Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct." (See https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf.)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC048	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)	5/12/11	3. Finally, to mitigate the actual abuse of orphaned glue, registry operators should take action to remove these records when provided with evidence that the glue is indeed present to abet malicious conduct.	-	ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook?full?04jun12?en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Specification 6, Section 4.2, which references the SSAC Advisory directly: "Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct." (See https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement?approved?09jan14? en.pdf.)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC notes that in certain operating circumstances, registry functions, especially critical services such as DNS resolution and DNS security (DNSSEC), may be separable from other functions (registry database maintenance). The SSAC asks whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.	-	The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria.	-	SAC047 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition process, including the requirement for an emergency back-end registry operator (EBERO) to conduct failover testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en. A process for EBEROs was implemented into the New gTLD Program and accounted for in GNSO Policy (http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm), the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC emphasizes that in many if not most circumstances, restoring domain name system (DNS) resolution services will be the number one priority for registrants and gTLD users. This requires DNS zone files for gTLDs to be escrowed separately.	-	A process for Registry Data Escrow was implemented into the New gTLD Program in the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (4 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain ownership during a transition.	-	SAC047 was issued in response to the Explanatory Memorandum on Registry Transition Procedures as part of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook development process. ICANN considered this advice item, but ultimately this recommendation was not implemented as part of the Registry Transition process.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (6 of 7)	4/15/11	With respect to registration fees, the SSAC also notes that certain registrant information is not associated with or collected for the purpose of the public directory service, but is instead part of the administrative data that might be split between the registry and the registrar. If the registry is replaced, one of two conditions might exist: 1) The current registry operator has information on the payment cycle. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the billing and payment cycle to the successor registry along with each registrant registration information. 2) The registrar has payment information. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the sponsoring registrar information for each domain that is registered to the successor registry.	-	The payment cycle information is reflected by the expiration date of the domain name, which is included as part of the data escrow that the successor registry receives. Each gTLD Registry is required to escrow their registration data with an ICANN approved data escrow agent on a daily basis and this activity is monitored by ICANN contractual compliance and Technical Services. Additionally in the event of a transition the DNS Zone files continue to be escrowed daily. Registry Data Escrow requirements are noted here: Applicant Guidebook, Attachment to Module 2: Evaluation Questions and Criteria (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Spec 2: Data Escrow Requirements (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf). More information regarding New gTLD Registry Data Escrow Requirements and Process can be found here: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/data-escrow

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 /ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (7 of 7)	4/15/11	Lastly, the SSAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Explanatory Memorandum: 1) It should be footnoted with references to the AG. 2) It should reference and use defined terms from the Applicant Guidebook rather than crafting its own definitions. 3) It imposes requirements on various parties, but it is unclear if these have the stature of requirements stated in the Applicant Guidebook. Since its function is to be explanatory, the text should truly be explanatory as opposed to normative.	-	ICANN adopted these recommendations and clarified in the Registry Transition process that the Explanatory Memorandum is part of the Applicant Guidebook. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition process can be studied and if needed, improved.	Phase 5 | Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)	12/6/10	[...] the SSAC recommends the following steps be taken before launching additional gTLDs, in parallel with continued deployment of IDNs and IPv6. Recommendation (1): Formalize and publicly document the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling.	-	The Board requested the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators via RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c In a letter of 30 April 2013, ICANN's Chief Security Officer wrote to the SSAC Chair regarding the concerns raised in SAC046 and SAC047: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/moss-to-falstrom-30apr13-en.pdf RSSAC communications including advisories, reports, and statements are available on the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rssac-publications-2014-05-12-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (2): ICANN, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and VeriSign should publish statements, or a joint statement, that they are materially prepared for the proposed changes.	-	The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with NTIA and Verisign to explore publication of one or more statements regarding preparation for the proposed changes. https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c ICANN staff worked with NTIA and Verisign and the parties released a joint statement on 5 November 2012: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/icann-et-al-to-icann-board-ssac-05nov12-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (3): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including IDNs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates.	-	The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected growth rates of TLDs: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c As part of the implementation of the New gTLD Program, ICANN regularly published the expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs. For example, ICANN's estimates were published as part of a plan to utilize a drawing method to prioritize new gTLD applications (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-23jun12-en.pdf) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (5 of 5)	12/6/10	Recommendation (5): ICANN should commission and incent interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities who may implement strong assumptions about the number of TLDs or use local TLDs that may conflict with future allocations.	-	After submission of a letter to the SSAC from the ICANN Chairman on 25 September 2012 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-falstrom-25sep12-en.pdf), the SSAC formed a work party to provide a response to the ICANN Board. On 16 April 2013, the SSAC submitted SAC 059: SSAC Letter to the ICANN Board Regarding Interdisciplinary Studies to the ICANN Board. ICANN commissioned Interisle to study the namespace issue raised in SAC059 and further to JAS to provide a report on mitigating namespace collisions.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (R-4)	12/6/10	ICANN should update its "Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency," to include actual measurement, monitoring, and datasharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.	Phase 4 | Deferred	The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 04 December 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further action once the implementation of RSSAC037-038 and the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group is complete.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (1 of 6)	11/15/10	ICANN should educate users so that, eventually, private networks and individual hosts do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.	-	ICANN has developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups /ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (2 of 6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN promote a general awareness of the potential problems that may occur when a query for a TLD string that has historically resulted in a negative response begins to resolve to a new TLD. Specifically, ICANN should: ?Å¢ Study invalid TLD query data at the root level of the DNS and contact hardware and software vendors to fix any programming errors that might have resulted in those invalid TLD queries. The SSAC is currently exploring one such problem as a case study, and the vendor is reviewing its software. Future efforts to contact hardware or software vendors, however, are outside SSAC?Äôs remit. ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity.	-	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addressed the issues related to invalid top-level domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf It should be noted however that invalid TLD query data has not yet been studied and such a study would be required for future "subsequent procedures" for new gTLDs. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf

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)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 6)	11/15/10	ICANN should contact organizations that are associated with strings that are frequently queried at the root. Forewarn organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, so they may mitigate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NXDOMAIN responses from root servers.	-	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 6)	11/15/10	Recommendation (2): The SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new gTLD program. - Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. 4 ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606.	-	The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (5 of 6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the pre-existence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic observed at the root as the basis for such notification.	-	The NGPC resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	SAC045: Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (R-6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.	Phase 5 | Close Request	This advice item requires further policy determination. ICANN will refer this advice to the GNSO for consideration.