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### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisory Item Status**

As of 31 December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advisory Item</th>
<th>Advisory Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advisory Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: B. This data element should be displayed as part of the publicly available data.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: C. Registrants should be classified as either natural or legal persons. This should be required at the time of registration, for all new domain registrations. For existing registrations, the value can remain “Unclassified” until it is filled at a later time. Registrars should be required to ask at relevant times, such as upon domain renewal and/or the annual accuracy inquiry, whether the registrant is natural or legal, with the goal of eventually obtaining that data for all registrants, and reducing “Unclassified” to the lowest practical level.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: D. Registrants currently are able to and should continue to have the option of making their contact data publicly available. Legal person registrants should also have the ability to protect their data via privacy and proxy services.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: A. The two policy objectives—namely (1) the ability to quickly and effectively contact the registrant without disclosing personal data, and (2) A common identifier that helps investigators to correlate registrations with common contacts should be considered separately.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: B. To achieve policy objective (A1), registrars should deploy (or continue deploy methods to support) a registrant-based email contact (See section 2.1.2 discussion of the two methods). The SSAC further recommends uniform requirements for adequate and developed for the registrant-based email contact. The requirements should include maintaining the privacy of the registrant as appropriate and service level commitments to set up authentications for the use of the email services. These safeguards are independent of the method chosen (e.g., unique email addresses or web-based forms).</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding pseudonymous email contact: B. To achieve policy objective (A1), registrars should deploy (or continue deploy methods to support) a registrant-based email contact. To achieve policy objective (A2), additional research is needed on the methods, their efficacy, and their tradeg. We recommend the EPDP Phase 2A not specify a method for correlating registrations with a common contact at this time.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends the following regarding pseudonymous email contact: C. To achieve policy objective (A2), additional research is needed on the methods, their efficacy, and their tradeg. We recommend the EPDP Phase 2A not specify a method for correlating registrations with a common contact at this time.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC117</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-117-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC117: Report on Root Service Early Warning Systems</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report on Root Service Early Warning Systems of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SAC's comment on the Initial Report on Root Service Early Warning Systems of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the ICANN Board Status Advice Report, see Section 2.2.12 discussion of the two methods. The SSAC further recommends uniform requirements for adequate and developed for the registrant-based email contact. The requirements should include maintaining the privacy of the registrant as appropriate and service level commitments to set up authentications for the use of the email services. These safeguards are independent of the method chosen (e.g., unique email addresses or web-based forms).
**Advice Item**

1. In this report, the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) examines both measurable and subjective activities of a root server operator (RSO) that could be considered rogue to inform future Root Server System (RSS) governance bodies. Future RSS governance bodies may use this document to develop a more complete definition of rogue RSO actions and will ultimately be the authority in determining subjective factors such as intent, when judging the actions of an RSO. The audience of this report is the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), future root server system governance bodies, and, more broadly, the Internet community.

2. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC055 is the ICANN's Advice on Rogue DNS Root Server Operators. In this report, the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) examines both measurable and subjective activities of a root server operator (RSO) that could be considered rogue to inform future Root Server System (RSS) governance bodies. Future RSS governance bodies may use this document to develop a more complete definition of rogue RSO actions and will ultimately be the authority in determining subjective factors such as intent, when judging the actions of an RSO. The audience of this report is the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), future root server system governance bodies, and, more broadly, the Internet community. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 13 August 2021.

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

**Phase**

1. Phase 1: Understand Request
2. Phase 2: Understand Request
3. Phase 3: Understand Request
4. Phase 4: Understand Request

**Action(s) Taken**

1. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to consider addressing the matter in its ongoing review of the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name, an omission which the ICANN Board will consider.
2. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to consider addressing the matter in its ongoing review of the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name, an omission which the ICANN Board will consider addressing.
3. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to consider addressing the matter in its ongoing review of the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name, an omission which the ICANN Board will consider addressing.
4. The ALAC advises the ICANN Board to consider addressing the matter in its ongoing review of the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name, an omission which the ICANN Board will consider addressing.
In this review, we believe it is imperative for the ICANN Board to consider the following inputs: a) Prior-Advisory-DNS Advice; b) The SRoI Final Report recommendations touching on contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS Abuse; c) The SSAC’s proposal in SAC-14-Recommendation 3 regarding best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse; d) The SSAC’s proposal in SAC-15 for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to streamline abuse reporting and minimizing of abuse victimization, as well as the call to ensure much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties; and e) An expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the ICANN Public Safety Working Group (PSWG).

Furthermore, it is critical that ICANN does not renege on enforcement contract provisions that may exist in its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside of the Board’s remit must not displace the exigency for all provisions in contracts with ICANN to be enforceable and be enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance.

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30. The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s continued keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC’s Name Collision Resolution Program.

Therefore, while the ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board lead the pursuit of greater action towards UA adoption through specific measures such as, including a metric on UA adoption by third parties as a measure of success for the New gTLD Program, and encouraging increased promotion for UA-readiness by contracted parties and new applicants.

As such, the ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board not renege on enforcement contract provisions that may exist in its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside of the Board’s remit must not displace the exigency for all provisions in contracts with ICANN to be enforceable and be enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance.

We noted the ICANN Board’s expressed concern that ICANN may end up enforcing contract provisions that are not reenforceable until the NCAP studies are completed and recommendations are addressed in Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30. We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-011-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://alac.icann.org/alac/2021-02-16/">https://alac.icann.org/alac/2021-02-16/</a></td>
<td>SAC114: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Advice Item Status</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to (1) examine and define the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse stimulation; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>RZERC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The root zone maintainer and root server operators should verify and confirm that the addition of a ZONEMD resource record will not in any way negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>Developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default when the software is configured to locally serve root zone data.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-4</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>If the technical difficulties persist, the ALAC may jointly develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in the root zone, and make this plan available for review by RZERC.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-1)</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td>The SAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to increase the number of gTLDs is consistent with ICANN’s strategic objective to “enhance the unique identifier system in coordination and collaboration with relevant partners to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base.” This review should be considered as input towards updating ICANN’s strategic goals in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following lines of study by prior rounds of the New gTLD program: • Impacts on root server operations • Impacts on SRI issues • Impacts on overall DNS operations • Analysis of how all metrics for success were met • R&amp;D analysis</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td>The SAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses to, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td>The SAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses to, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/reports/en/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-4)</td>
<td>2/23/21</td>
<td>The SAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the root round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses to, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team’s relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be well written. However, the RSSAC has several comments on OCTO-15, which are discussed in RSSAC052.

The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the IANA Naming Function Review initial report, and

larger than just IMRS operations. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root

Recommendations for ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. This public comment

Do the risks of redirected query traffic outweigh the risks of increased operational complexity?

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of

ICANN org understands SAC114 to mean SSAC is requesting the Board to choose a TLD as described in

warning-root-scaling-2020-10-05-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent

consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/root-name-service-implementation-2020-10-27-

ICANN org understands that this is a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that

analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences as seen in the R55

since the time that RSSAC028 was published. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 17

March 2021 and received confirmation of understanding on 14 June 2021.

ICANN org understands that ICANN is determining its own criteria for evaluating the risks of redirected query traffic and its operational impact. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 20 January 2021. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 January 2021.

ICANN org understands the this is a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that

analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences as seen in the R55

since the time that RSSAC028 was published. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 17

March 2021 and received confirmation of understanding on 14 June 2021.

ICANN org understands this is a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that

analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences as seen in the R55

since the time that RSSAC028 was published. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 17

March 2021 and received confirmation of understanding on 14 June 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC053: Statement on IANA Naming

Function Review. The respective public comment period closed on 22 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments was due 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/inaa-naming-function-review-initial-report. There is no action for the RSSAC Board. This item is deferred.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC055: Statement on VNANaming Function Review Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 22 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/vnanaming-function-review-initial-report. There is no action for the RSSAC Board. This item is deferred.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC055: Statement on VNANaming Function Review Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 22 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/vnanaming-function-review-initial-report. There is no action for the RSSAC Board. This item is deferred.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC055: Statement on VNANaming Function Review Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 22 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due 22 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/vnanaming-function-review-initial-report. There is no action for the RSSAC Board. This item is deferred.
The ICANN organization understands 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.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ICANN’s comment on RSSAC038: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 May 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 May 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 May 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ICANN’s comment on RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee. 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.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ICANN’s comment on RSSAC038: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 08 July 2020.
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 metrics 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 operation 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.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

SAC109: The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ICANN on 23 March 2020.


Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System-2. The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is included for the record. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 23 May 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, which calls for implementing a prototype measurement system for RRSIGs, and thanks ICANN org for already developing such a system to assist with defining the metrics outlined in RSSAC047.

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)

RSSAC002v4: RSSAC Advisory on the Root Server System and 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 operation 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.

This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC defines terms related to root server operations for the ICANN Community. The RSSAC seeks to advance the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation 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.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System-1. 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 can then be transformed into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future versions of this document, if necessary.

Phase 1: Implement

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. On 23 May 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, which calls for implementing a prototype measurement system for RRSIGs, and thanks ICANN org for already developing such a system to assist with defining the metrics outlined in RSSAC047.

Phase 2: Implement

ICANN.org understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is included for the record. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 23 May 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.05 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2 to implement a more permanent measurement system after establishing and using the prototype measurement system from Recommendation 1, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to implement such a system.
The RSSAC, in collaboration with ICANN and the Internet community, should consider the following additional work: • For a holistic view of RSK performances, it may be desirable or necessary to measure RSK for all instances of each RSK. The only reasonable way to provide for such a view would be through public reporting. In the future, it should be considered to have each RSK perform self-reporting of the defined metrics to eliminate uncertainty of components not under the RSK's control, and it should probably be listed in an ICANN report for transparency. • Create a reference data set. • Explore the financial aspects of increased accountability and how it might relate to these metrics. • Keep with the principles of RSSAC2017 and RSSAC2018, publish a document that advises any bodies created as part of the ongoing evolution of RSK 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 an approach would distribute the vantage points by network topology or geographic location. Whereas the current work is based on a largely empirical model of the IETF, future versions of this document may want to take a more analytical and theoretical modeling approach.

Foremost of importance for the RSSAC is that future KSK rollovers be done in a consistent, predictable and reliable manner. The Registry Agreement must enshrine PIR prohibited practices such as bulk sales to commercial registrars. The Registry must provide 6 months prior written notice to its registrants of any increase in wholesale price without a political basis. The Registry must enshrine in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takedown demands of individual registrants. The designations of such nonprofits in the US is 501c(3) but a list of similar designations internationally should be generated. 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. Additionally, the Registry must receive and maintain B Corporation certification.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration phase.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on the New gTLD Auction Process. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 January 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.
ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advice Item Status
As of 31 December 2021

Advice Item: DNS Abuse (R-4)

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

Phase I | Evaluate & Consider
ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN to develop clear guidelines for identifying and taking action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 26 February 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-END</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (B-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Adopt an &quot;anti-crime, anti-abuse&quot; Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>ICANN Orlando 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 create AUP to include industry-wide best practices. We interpret &quot;abuse&quot; in this context to refer, for the time being, to harmful activity involving how a registrar interacts with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, spam, and spams when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of 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 &quot;abuse&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-END</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (B-8)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Implement the above in agreements with new and renewal domain registration agreements.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>ICANN Orlando understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contractual agreements with Contracted Parties to implement the above advice, and to include clear enforcement language to facilitate ICANN Contractual Compliance to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC005</td>
<td><a href="https://rsacc.icann.org/files/files/rad-reports/rad2019-04-09-rev2.pdf">https://rsacc.icann.org/files/files/rad-reports/rad2019-04-09-rev2.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC005: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System</td>
<td>12/29/19</td>
<td>At ICANN61 the ICANN Board and the RSSAC engaged in a discussion about threats to the Root Server System (RSS) and how the RSSAC Board could respond. The RSSAC Board made a plan to allocate resources to the RSS to support the RSSAC Board. The RSSAC Board took the issue 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 Board would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board consider the recommendations to the ICANN Board for review on 16 December 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 14 Dec 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Consider</td>
<td>ICANN understands that this item is in the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC Board would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC regrets the ICANN Board's request for input to the ICANN Board's request to the ICANN Board for review on 16 December 2019. This item is considered as the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 14 Dec 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC107-SSAC Committee on NSF on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms</td>
<td><a href="https://ssac.icann.org/files/files/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf">https://ssac.icann.org/files/files/statements/107-ssac-notice.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC107: SSAC Committee on NSF on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms</td>
<td>12/29/19</td>
<td>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 architectural and at least limits in the DNS, is that some of the post-quantum candidate algorithms may not be implementable in the DNS. ICANN understands that this item is in the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC Board would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC regrets the ICANN Board's request for input to the ICANN Board's request to the ICANN Board for review on 16 December 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 14 Dec 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Consider</td>
<td>ICANN understands that this item is in the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC Board would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC regrets the ICANN Board's request for input to the ICANN Board's request to the ICANN Board for review on 16 December 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 14 Dec 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
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<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-S3)</td>
<td>8/6/19</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-S3)</td>
<td>8/6/19</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-S3)</td>
<td>8/6/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that decisions of the GWG be made on a consensus basis, and that votes only be taken when a quorum is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-S3)</td>
<td>8/6/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board be included as an existing member in the Governance Working Group (GWG).</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC043</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-043-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-043-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC043: Report from the RSSAC April 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>6/19/2019</td>
<td>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 co-chairs attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Working Party. The RSSAC also discussed several matters related to its proposed governance model for the RSS from RSC-36. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC043</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-043-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rssac-043-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC043: Report from the RSSAC April 2019 Workshop</td>
<td>6/19/2019</td>
<td>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 co-chairs attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Working Party. The RSSAC also discussed several matters related to its proposed governance model for the RSS from RSC-36. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 2 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the RSS be provided with the capability of performing the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF). SAC106 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and is incorporating it into its proposal. The Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS GWG) is aware of this SSAC statement. The emerging proposal from the RSS GWG includes a community performing the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF). SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and is incorporating it into its proposal.
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 RRS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. 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 13 Jun 2019.


---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process

**Phase:** Phase 5. Implement

**Recommendation:** On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC104v2 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](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 service" is important to the ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf)). The Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS service" is important to the ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf)). On 23 April 2019 the ICANN org notified the ALAC this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.

---

### Joint Committee of the At-Large and GAC

#### SAC101v2: SAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-11)

**Phase:** Phase 4: Delivered

**Recommendation:** 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.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf)). In its rationale the Board states "in accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS service" is important to the ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf)). On 23 April 2019 the ICANN org notified the ALAC this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC105v2: SAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-18)

**Phase:** Not applicable

**Recommendation:** On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC105v2 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.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf)). In its rationale the Board states "in accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS service" is important to the ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-barcelona63-gac-advice-scorecard-27jan19-en.pdf)). On 23 April 2019 the ICANN org notified the ALAC this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee (SSAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-10)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must address long-deferred problems regarding domain name registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board overseeing the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-18)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/projects/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-28)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase/Implementation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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](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 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.” ICANN.org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN.org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf)). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en)). Additionally, the Board resolved ([https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c)) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.

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](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. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf)). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en)). Additionally, the Board resolved ([https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c)) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.

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](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.” ICANN.org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN.org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf)). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en)). Additionally, the Board resolved ([https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c)) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.

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](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. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf)). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policies-board-2021-02-08-en)). Additionally, the Board resolved ([https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c)) to direct ICANN.org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.
Follows with the SSAC’s comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.

SSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)

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

SSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)

The ICANN organization should continue to use the 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.

SSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)

The ICANN organization should document the intent of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.

SSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)

When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure that 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.

SSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)

At the conclusion of any organizational review, the ICANN organization should report on how the process was modified. If there are any lessons learned from the organizational review, the ICANN organization should demonstrate how the process will be modified.

SSAC041: RSSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report

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 Policy Development Process Working Group 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.
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Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC036: The SSAC is engaged in a collaborative discussion with the ICANN community regarding the risks and potential solutions for the continued operation of the ICANN DNS metadata service. The SSAC believes that this service should operate in a manner that is consistent with the principles of transparency, accountability, and security.

SSAC039: The SSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation. The SSAC is also considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

SSAC042: The SSAC is considering the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC033: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC036: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC038: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC040: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC042: The RSSAC is considering the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC044: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC054: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC058: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC061: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC063: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC064: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC065: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC068: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC069: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC071: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC072: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC073: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC074: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC075: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC076: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC077: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC078: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC079: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC080: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC081: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC082: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC083: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC084: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC085: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC086: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC087: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC088: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC089: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC090: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC091: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC092: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC093: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC094: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC095: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC096: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC097: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC098: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC099: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.

RSSAC100: The RSSAC is reviewing the draft final report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the 2018 DNS root zone evaluation.

RSSAC101: The RSSAC is discussing the impact of the recent Executive Order on the ICANN community and the implications for the operation of the ICANN DNS root zone.

RSSAC102: The RSSAC is considering the recommendations made by the SSAC to the ICANN Board of Directors.
The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final implementation based on RSSAC037. The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for RSSAC and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC recommends that 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). Recommend 6. The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to clarify that 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. Recommend 7. The RSSAC should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties. The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second GNSO Root System Addressing Review Committee (RSAC) on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. 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 RSAC037. ICANN submitted this understanding to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. 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 ICANN 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." The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RSAC037. ICANN submitted this understanding to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. 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 ICANN 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." 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 RSAC037, based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. Phase 4 | Evaluate & Consider The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 4 is for the ICANN Board to develop a timeline for costing the Model for implementation based on RSAC037. ICANN submitted this understanding to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. 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 ICANN 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." The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 5 is for the ICANN Board to develop a final governance model for the Root System and to develop a timeline for implementing the Model based on RSAC037. ICANN submitted this understanding to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. 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 ICANN in SAC101v2, "Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative."
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

As of 31 December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC, May 2018 Workshop</td>
<td>RSSAC034</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-034-05may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-034-05may18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>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 outcome from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by VeriSign in early May.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcome of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) with 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>RSSAC033</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>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 these two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted.</td>
<td>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 RSSAC. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 5 June 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC032: Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation</td>
<td>RSSAC032</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcome from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by VeriSign in early May.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that RSSAC032 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 review the 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC031: RSSAC Report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop</td>
<td>RSSAC031</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-23mar18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-23mar18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcome from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by VeriSign in early May.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that RSSAC031 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 outcome from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by VeriSign in early May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/f2f001-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/f2f001-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC098</td>
<td>11/2/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/099-ssac029-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/099-ssac029-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC029: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 workshop</td>
<td>10/17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/099-ssac029-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/099-ssac029-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC029: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop</td>
<td>10/17/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 means that the ICANN Board 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, the ICANN organization would recommend that the new scenarios be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board.

Upon further review of our original understanding, the org would like to revisit. 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 RSAC on 13 September 2020. ICANN received confirmation of the understanding on 23 September 2020.
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**Committee (RSSAC) Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**
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**Link to Advice Document**
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**Issued Date**

**Advice Document Recommendation**

**Trade(s) Taken**

---

**Recommendation 6:** Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.5 generates 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 to the query that has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider: • Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name • Testing the consequence of all large responses having the TC bit set • Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a priming specific single signature over the entire priming set (RI, A, AAAA, DNSKEY) Further, more speculative studies about how to reduce the response size might include: • Using different cryptographic algorithms • Advertising what is expected in the Additional section (this would require modifying the DNS protocol) • Having a single key for the root zone instead of the current RSA-256 scheme • Effects of varying the Additional section in priming response empty

---

**Recommendation 2:** Conduct a study 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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.02 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

---

**Recommendation 3:** Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks. Phase 4 | Implement

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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 3, relating to conducting a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

---

**Recommendation 4:** No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. Phase 5 | Close Request

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 4, calling for the current naming scheme used in the root server system to remain unchanged until more studies have been conducted.

---

**Recommendation 5:** 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.

**Recommendation 2:** Conduct studies 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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.02 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

---

**Recommendation 3:** Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks. Phase 4 | Implement

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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 3, relating to conducting a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

---

**Recommendation 4:** No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. Phase 5 | Close Request

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 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 17/03/2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 4, calling for the current naming scheme used in the root server system to remain unchanged until more studies have been conducted.

---

**Recommendation 5:** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Interpretation for Human Rights**

SAC096: SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights

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 (WS2) Report (CCWG-WS2: Human Rights: SSAC input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability (WS2)) and thanks the CWG 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 26 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/board-meetings/committees/comments/2017-08-16-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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC095</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/wg/">https://www.icann.org/wg/</a> cc-tlds/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf</td>
<td>SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Group In Domain Names R-2</td>
<td>5/25/17</td>
<td>Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to &lt;emoji&gt; or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC095</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/wg/">https://www.icann.org/wg/</a> cc-tlds/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf</td>
<td>SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Group In Domain Names R-2</td>
<td>5/25/17</td>
<td>Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to &lt;emoji&gt; or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrars of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-mats/2017-11-02-wk4-s.doc). The ICANN org has also taken the advice to increase the understanding of terms commonly used to discuss the root server system evolves. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) Working Group Community Comment 2. This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) 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 Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) 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. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) Working Group Community Comment 2. This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) Working Group Community Comment 2. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) Working Group Community Comment 2. This is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDFP) Working Group Community Comment 2.

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands that SAC088 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.

On 12 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).

The ICANN organization understands 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 the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers.” There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SAC on 15 May 2017.

On 14 June 2017, the ICANN organization understands SAC092 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands SAC093 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.
The ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

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 IANA root server operators. RSSAC024 and RFC 7779 are considered as starting points; alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethics, etc.) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not addressed herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 to 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: RSSAC October 2016 Workshop Report

11/4/16

Overview of RSSAC's third workshop (October 21-22, 2016). The RSSAC took the fist map constructed during the previous two workshops and branched into affinity groups of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 to RSSAC's workshop report 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)

SSAC083: SAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement

10/19/16

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 SAC083 is the SSAC's response to the ICANN Board and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input on the review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs).

The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is the SSAC's response to the ICANN Board and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input on the review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs).

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC085: SAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures – Seeking Community Comments

10/19/16

Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures – Seeking Community Comments

The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC087: SAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services 2nd Second Outreach

10/19/16

Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services 2nd Second Outreach

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDP on Next Generation Registration Directory Services. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New Generic Top Level Domains (gTLD) Subsequent Procedures

10/19/16

Response to 9 June 2016 Input Request from PDP Working Group on the new gTLD 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 identifies root zone management partners and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of any root name service. Similarly, ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registrars so that it can delay their addition to the root zone in case of root name service instability.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Procedure 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.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC084: SAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to the ICANN Board of Directors' ICANN Bylaws

9/8/16

SSAC084: SAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to the ICANN Board of Directors' ICANN Bylaws

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)

SSAC086: SAC Response to the GNSO PDP on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure for Input

9/8/16

SSAC086: SAC Response to the GNSO PDP on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure for Input

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure for Input. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure and gives the community a chance to provide input. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

SSAC085: SAC 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)

9/8/16

SSAC085: SAC 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 ICANN Board and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input 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 ICANN Board and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs).

SSAC087: SAC Response to the GNSO PDP on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure for Input

9/8/16

SSAC087: SAC Response to the GNSO PDP on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure for Input

The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC's response to the ICANN Board and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the SSAC requests for input on the New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Procedure and gives the community a chance to provide input. 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: RSSAC Statement Concerning the Impact of the Unavailability of a Single Root Server

9/16/16

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 system. Based on information available as of this 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)

SSAC083: SAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement

7/11/16

SSAC083: SAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement

The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is the 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-amendment-new-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en) closed on 20 July 2016. ICANN and the Working Group established by the Registry Stakeholder Group are considering the comments received, and plans to submit a proposed final version of the amendments for approval of the Registry Stakeholder Group according to the process defined in Section 7.d 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: RSSAC Statement on Client Side Reliability of Root DNS Data

8/28/16

RSSAC confirms that the operators of the root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace. The RSSAC fully supports the IANA's viewpoints expressed in RFC 2826. The RSSAC reiterates its support for integrity protecting protocols such as DNSSEC.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC20 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: RSSAC Workshop J Report

8/28/16

Overview of RSSAC's second workshop (May 1-2, 2016). The RSSAC continued upon its previous workshop and deliberated those, including accountability, continuity, operational and organizational evolution. The work was framed around Architecture, Evolution and Reforming 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 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.
The ICANN organization understands SSAC007 describes the scope of the RSSAC's work as related to the DNSAC. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. 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.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC016 describes the scope of the RSSAC's work as related to the Domain Name System (DNS). This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Phase</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC015</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/davies-to-chalaby-23apr18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/davies-to-chalaby-23apr18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC072: SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2014-10-15</td>
<td>10/15/15</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the 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 Proposal on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC015: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2014-10-15</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC072 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC072</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/072-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/072-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC015: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2014-10-15</td>
<td>10/15/15</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the 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 Proposal on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC015: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2014-10-15</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC072 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC073</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/073-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/073-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC013: SAC Comment on Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2015-09-10</td>
<td>9/10/15</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC013: SAC Comment on Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2015-09-10</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC073 is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG’s Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group. The SSAC believes the proposal should include the full context of the naming security and stability risks and that there are actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN received the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC075</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/075-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/075-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC015: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 2 2015-09-10</td>
<td>9/10/15</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC015: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 2</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC075 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC076</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/076-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/076-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC016: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 3 2016-06-22</td>
<td>6/22/16</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC016: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 3</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC076 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC077</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/077-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/077-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC017: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4 2017-01-05</td>
<td>1/5/17</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC017: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC077 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC078</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/078-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/078-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC020: SSAC Comments to ITU-D on Establishing Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 2 2020-02-05</td>
<td>2/5/20</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC020: SSAC Comments to ITU-D on Establishing Accountability Draft Proposal on Work Stream 2</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC078 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC079</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/079-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/079-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC021: SSAC Comment on Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2019-06-05</td>
<td>6/5/19</td>
<td>This is a Comment to the ICANN Board, the CCWG, the community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Request to the IANA-Stewardship Transition Coordination Group for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions.</td>
<td>SAC021: SSAC Comment on Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal 2019-06-05</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC079 is the SSAC’s comment directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the SSAC’s response to the 11 September 2014 request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-dnssec-validity-root-zone-17dec14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-dnssec-validity-root-zone-17dec14-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)</td>
<td>12/17/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include actions related to a PSL, as part of the work related to universal acceptance.</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC070 requirement (as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the IANU 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 it per the ICANN organization's recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the UASG considered the SAC advice in its document UASG007 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/569018053/UASG007-ver0-2016-05-05.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/569018053/UASG007-ver0-2016-05-05.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iab-liaison-rssac-statement-about-the-mozilla-psl.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iab-liaison-rssac-statement-about-the-mozilla-psl.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)</td>
<td>12/17/14</td>
<td>SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.10)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC070 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on “Measurements of the Root Server System.”

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-operator 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/en/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency). This proposal was then approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Measurements of the Root Server System.”

The RSSAC give guidance requested by its representatives on the “NTIA IANA Functions’ Stewardship Transition Coordination Group” (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC’s guidance to the Representatives on the “NTIA IANA Functions’ Stewardship Transition Coordination Group”.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC002 data has been published at: http://stats.dns.icann.org/rssac/.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC001 data has been published at: http://stats.dns.icann.org/rssac/.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003 data has been published at: http://stats.dns.icann.org/rssac/.
Advice Item | Action(s) Taken
--- | ---
R-10. The next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of live scribing for all meetings and generally extend the 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 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
R-11. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) 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 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
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 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
R-13. ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all voices, 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
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 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
R-17. The Board must implement ARF12 Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees. | 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
R-22. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) should ensure 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 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/CCWG/Accountability+Home
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Identifier</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No Action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which began on 3 Jun 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. The ALAC website has been redesigned and was rolled out 24 February 2016, meeting this recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-29. The ALAC should implement an accelerated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ICANN 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ICANN 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Workshops.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new ICANN 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-35. ICANN should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) There has been significant increase of communications between the ALAC and the ICANN Board since the conclusion of the 2nd At-Large Summit. Board members attend meetings/debate/conferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) There has been significant increase of communications between the ALAC and the ICANN Board since the conclusion of the 2nd At-Large Summit. Board members attend meetings/debate/conferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-37. The At-Large community should store conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) There has been significant increase of communications between the ALAC and the ICANN Board since the conclusion of the 2nd At-Large Summit. Board members attend meetings/debate/conferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/35+5+ALAC+Minutes+2016+and+2017+Updated+0TTF.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-00)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-38. ICANN staff should encourage open data. Best practices that foster reuse of the information by the third party.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>) This is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52801538/Discussion%20on%20%20%20Large%20Type%20TopLevel%20TLD.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52801538/Discussion%20on%20%20%20Large%20Type%20TopLevel%20TLD.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-00-EN - The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Declaration - At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> Work specific to this advice item is complete. The ICANN Board considered the ICANN Accountability Framework (CROPP) Program has been approved in Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 slots for Meeting A &amp; C; 30 for Meeting B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-17. ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries and, in conjunction with technical bodies, promote credible alternatives.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-19)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-19. Eliminate barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-22)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-22. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> The ALAC website has been redesigned and put online, addressing this recommendation (plague on AICAN). 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 ICANN Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ICAN/Style+Guide">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-23)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-23. The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsmen should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> The ALAC website has been redesigned and put online, addressing this recommendation (plague on AICAN). 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 ICANN Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ICAN/Style+Guide">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>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 review.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WS2+WS2-Accountability+Home">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-26(a))</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-26(a). Both the roles of the Ombudsmen and the Ombudsman Complaints Ombudsman are vital. The Ombudsmen complaints Ombudsman is provided with complaints reported regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>The Board in its VI September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">Link</a> This specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Committee (SSAC)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-3)

3/14/14 ICANN should help facilitate an internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.

Resolution was considered by the Board based on SAC065 Recommendation 1. The Board found that ICANN org acted upon SAC065's Recommendation 1. The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
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SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-3)

3/14/14 ICANN should help facilitate an internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Authoritative DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response rate limiting (ARR) in their DNS server software, and implement those that are appropriate for their environment: a. Encourage DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; and b. Frequently review the state of the art of such mechanisms and update their implementation as necessary.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>SAC065 R-4 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicated with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational practices as necessary to ensure that a process is in place to systematically perform DNS software updates on both an ongoing and an emergency basis; and b. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities as the reasonable cost in system resources.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>SAC065 R-5 is directed towards DNS operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the ICANN organization recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take further action once the NCAP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3A)</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the ICANN organization recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take further action once the NCAP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the ICANN organization recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take further action once the NCAP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3C)</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the ICANN organization recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take further action once the NCAP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3D)</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the ICANN organization recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matters/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take further action once the NCAP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/docs/advisory-sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC062: Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>1/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN should work with the Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to systematically look at what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.08), the Board finds that ICANN.org has implemented all of SAC062’s recommendations, and considers SAC062 to be completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be provided to natural persons with privacy protection upon completion of multi-factored validation? Would accuracy improve if the registration process were to execute when a rollover has affected operational stability beyond a reasonable boundary.

SSAC recommends that the EWG state more clearly its positions on specific questions of data availability. 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 adopted 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/system/files/ef✆隆-14-en.pdf. This 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-materhttp://2016.05.12.16, the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC062, and SAC061, as evidenced by the successful first KSK rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC062, and SAC061 to be completed.

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/system/files/ef滔隆-14-en.pdf. This 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-mater
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---

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

**Advice Item:** SAC060


**Issue Date:** 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

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).


---

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

**Advice Item:** SAC060


**Issue Date:** 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

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.


---

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

**Advice Item:** SAC060


**Issue Date:** 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

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.


---

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

**Advice Item:** SAC060


**Issue Date:** 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.


---

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

**Advice Item:** SAC060


**Issue Date:** 7/23/13

**Advice Document Recommendation:**

Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Committee (SSAC)**

**As of 31 December 2021**

**Advice Item Status**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**SAC060**

**Reference**


**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

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/IAPP/2.1](https://community.icann.org/display/IAPP/2.1)

The specific advice item is the Label Generation Rules (LGR) procedure. Note that the following work related to IDN TLDs is still at the conceptual stage:

- Label Generation Rules 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](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en) - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and Use Experience Study Recommendations: [https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-use-experience-study-recommendations](https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-use-experience-study-recommendations)

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

ICANN should concentrate foremost on the rules for the root zone (versus rules for TLD registry operations).


**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

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.


Additional 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. ICANN.org has already established that the relevant script community can review their decision within the existing process and propose an updated version. The Technical Study Group on RZ LGR supported this solution. This process is being considered by both GNSO and ccNSO in their respective policy development processes for IDN TLDs. This advice will be addressed through these PDPs.

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

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

ICANN.org recently developed the Recommendation for Managing IDN Variant TLDs, published at [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en). These have been adopted by ICANN Board at their meeting at ICANN64, where the Board asked the GMO 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 GMO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work. This has already been proposed by SubPro WG for gTLDs with more details being developed by the IDN EPDP underway. ccNSO is also working on a solution for variant TLDs through its ongoing IDN ccCPDN.

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EERO) providers support variant TLD, and that parties with variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.

A detailed analysis has been published as part of recommendations for managing IDN variants TLDs, which has been approved by ICANN Board at ICANN64. The analysis has been forwarded to the GMO and ccNSO for their consideration for relevant policy and procedure development. The analysis is available at [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-2018-08-06-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-2018-08-06-en.pdf).

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

ICANN.org is currently developing new guidelines for the IDN Implementation Guidelines (LGRs) for the second level in consultation with the community and in line with the RZ-LGRs. SubPro WG has included a recommendation for IDNs to utilize reference LGRs when they design their IDN tables. This recommendation is now largely addressed. Additional reference LGRs will be developed against the RZ-LGRs for the second level in consultation with the community. The inclusion of RZ-LGR into validated 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-3-1may19-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/recommendations-rz-lgr-3-1may19-en.pdf) and public comment at [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/public-comments/technical-rz-lgr-2019-05-15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/public-comments/technical-rz-lgr-2019-05-15-en.pdf). An additional reference LGR has been developed.

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

ICANN must 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 label (LGL) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions

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/IAPP/2.1](https://community.icann.org/display/IAPP/2.1)

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://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label-Generation-Rules-Procedures-for-the-Root](https://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label-Generation-Rules-Procedures-for-the-Root)

**SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)**

**Advisory Item**

7/23/13

**Issued**

**Advisory Document Recommendation**

**Phase**

**Action(s) Taken**

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/IAPP/2.1](https://community.icann.org/display/IAPP/2.1)

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://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label-Generation-Rules-Procedures-for-the-Root](https://community.icann.org/display/VIP/P2.1-Label-Generation-Rules-Procedures-for-the-Root)

The specific advice item is the Label Generation Rules (LGR) procedure. Note that the following work related to IDN TLDs is still at the conceptual stage:

- Label Generation Rules 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](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en) - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and Use Experience Study Recommendations: [https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-use-experience-study-recommendations](https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-use-experience-study-recommendations)
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Advice Item

SAC058: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation

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 expansion should be examined.

Phase 3
Deferred

Advice Item

SAC058: R-1 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation

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
Deferred

Advice Item

SAC058: R-2 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation

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 to which the ICANN WHOIS Expert Working Group (WHOIS), the Application Guidebook, the New gTLD Registry Agreement and the ICANN Board Resolution on Accreditation Agreement incorporation language apply.

Phase 5
Close Request

Advice Item

SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of expanding the root zone

ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.

Phase 3
Deferred

Advice Item

SAC059: R-1 Interdisciplinary studies of expanding the root zone

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 the root zone or 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 would send this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been being considered through other means, including the 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/file/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf
- Continuous DataDriven Analysis of Root System Server Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rods-system-stability-study-plan-2015-12-en ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.

Phase 3
Deferred

Advice Item

SAC056: R-3 SAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System

SAC 056 concludes that “Governments and others should be aware of the discussion and use discriminatory policies when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise affect Internet content.”

Phase 2
Deferred

Advice Item

SAC055: R-1 WHISKS: Blind Men And An Elephant

The board passed a resolution clearly stating the optimism of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data

Phase 1
Closed Request

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

R2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant

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:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

R3 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant

The Board should explicitly direct any other activity within ICANN not listed above at finding a resolution to this WHOIS problem until the registration data policy is identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC054

ICANN Board Status Advice Report


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)

SAC054

SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)

The Board should explicitly direct any other activity within ICANN not listed above at finding a resolution to this WHOIS problem until the registration data policy is identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC055

SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)

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:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC055

SAC055

WHODIS: Blind Men And An Elephant

1/31/12

Internationalized Domain Names: Internationalization Need be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the ROD-WG final report.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC055

WHODIS: Blind Men And An Elephant

1/31/12

An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indexed for each data element as part of determining the level of accuracy of the data.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period:

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC054

SAC054

SSAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)

6/11/12

The SSAC notes 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 advisory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SA2013 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

SAC054

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)

SAC054

SAC054

SSAC Report on Domainless Domains

2/23/13

Recommendation: Domainless domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As an example, the SSAC also recommends that the use of 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.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC053

SAC053

SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2)

2/13/13

Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfulfilled work on strong 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 confusing/confusing 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/review/reexamination by both within and across scripts. Such consideration should invite comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN/SSAC 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 single-character TLDs, and how 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. 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

On 31 August 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NAPCO) adopted a resolution affirming that "domainless names" are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en

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

**Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD label equivalence is currently underway within ICANN, the Committee would like to see a follow-up to the findings of this report, and any policies it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, be not later than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.**

**ON THE ADVICE OF THE SECURITY AND STABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SSAC), Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined in this report) from their WHOIS databases.**

**Rationale:** 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. The ICANN Board also stated that it did not support the implementation of this advice item, which addressed the implementation of orphan glue records in WHOIS databases. The ICANN Board concluded that 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. Therefore, this advice item is closed as of 7 July 2017.
The SSAC recommended that ICANN define a failover 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 (BBERO) to conduct failover testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transitions-processes-2012-04-22-en. A process for Registry Data Escrow was implemented into the New gTLD Program in the Applicant Guidebook (https://www.icann.org/en/applicants/apply/gtld/applicant-guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/en/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf).

SSAC also issued advice on 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.

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 GTRI 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://www.icann.org/en/applicants/apply/gtld/applicant-guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf). New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/en/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://www.icann.org/en/applicants/data-escrow.

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.

SSAC also issued advice on 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.

The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a failover process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria. 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/en/system/files/pages/transitions-processes-2013-04-22-en.pdf.

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.

The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about registrants, 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 improved. 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/en/system/files/pages/transitions-processes-2013-04-22-en.pdf.

The SSAC recommended the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and ICANN to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone escrow. The Board requested the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators and ICANN to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone escrow: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en.pdf. In a letter of 30 April 2013, ICANN’s Chief Security Officer wrote to the SSAC Chair regarding the concerns raised in ICANN’s and SAC047’s https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/communique-notice-to-failover-30apr13-en.pdf. ICANN communications including advisories, reports, and statements are available on the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/publications-2014-05-12-en.pdf.

The SSAC 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.

The SSAC recommends that ICANN define a failover process that emulates a full failover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria. 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/en/system/files/pages/transitions-processes-2013-04-22-en.pdf.

The SSAC 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.
The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, including DNS 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 SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the prior existence of invalid TLD queries at the root as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to that TLD. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as a metric for such re-use.

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 actually in use, so they may take steps to eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NODNSRN responses from root servers.

ICANN should educate users so that, eventually, private networks and domain names do not attempt to resolve local names via the root system of the public DNS.

ICANN should update its “Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resilience,” to include the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.

Recommendation (5): ICANN should commission and incentivize 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 sub-TLDs that may conflict with future allocations.

The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected growth rates of TLDs. https://www.icann.org/resources/briefing-materials/resolutions-2021-09-13-en.pdf. As part of the implementation of the New gTLD Program, ICANN regularly published the expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs. For example, ICANN estimates were published as part of a plan to utilize a drawing method to prioritize new gTLD applications (https://newgtds.icann.org/en/files/files/round-57-briefing-01aug14-en.pdf) as well as in other regular New gTLD updates.

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/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-30jul14-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-30-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/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/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. ICANN should be noted however that invalid TLD query data has not yet been studied and such a study would be required for future “subsequent procedures” for new gTLDs. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf.

The SSAC recommended 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,” contains prohibit lists of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. - ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as a metric for such re-use.

The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the prior 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 an alert.