<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-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for .GR should be organized as either a charitable non-profit (501(c)(3) in the US) or a 'Benefit Corporation' (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must receive the B Corporation certification.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISO/PIR Issue (R-1) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Board member selected by the ALAC, ideally, at least one member or small group of members of the Corporate Board should have the explicit mandate to focus on the overall public interest and specifically the interests of individual end users.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for .GR must define in its bylaws that the principal focus of the domain is nonprofits and individuals and not commercial interests.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for .GR must define in its bylaws that the principal focus of the domain is nonprofits and individuals and not commercial interests.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry must define in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takedown demand with a political basis.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-6)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry must provide 6 months prior written notice to its registrants of any increase in wholesale price of their domain names registration renewal fees and the option of a 20 year renewal itself at the pre-increase price.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISO/PIR Issue (R-6) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759</a></td>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-7)</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry Agreement must enshrine a &quot;no-prohibited-practices&quot; such as a bulk sales to commercial registrants.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: ISO/PIR Issue (R-7) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>AL2189</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/doc/al2189-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/doc/al2189-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC358: SSAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollers</td>
<td>1/19/20</td>
<td>This publication represents the full SSAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The CC was sent to the SSAC on 05 February 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root System Advisory Committee (RSAC)</td>
<td>R52A046</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/doc/r52a046-20en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/doc/r52a046-20en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSAC346: RSAC Statement on ICANN’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollers</td>
<td>1/28/20</td>
<td>Foremost of importance for the RSAC is that future KSK rollers be done in a consistent, predictable and deliberate manner. Thus, the RSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on subsequent KSK rollouts, and would like to thank IANA for preparing this plan and submitting it for public comment.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSAC’s comment on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The CC was sent to the RSAC on 05 February 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The GNSO has already produced consensus definitions of &quot;abuse&quot; and &quot;malicious use of domain names&quot; that are more expansive. According to that definition, &quot;abuse&quot; is an action that: 1) causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm; and 2) is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intent and design of a stated legitimate purpose, for such a purpose is disclosed. The GNSO also recognized that &quot;malicious use of domain names&quot; include, but are not limited to: 1) spam, 2) malware distribution, 3) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, 4) phishing, 5) botnet command-and-control, 6) ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of &quot;abuse&quot; before further work is done to define DNS abuse. One those purposes are identified, ICANN would determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as references for the ICANN community, whether or a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1) on 31 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN organization understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct IANA to establish a clear definition of &quot;abuse&quot; that is within ICANN’s remit. We assume that any such definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity insular as they intersect with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (where it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse). ICANN has no action for the ICANN Board. The CC was sent to the RSAC on 05 February 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to clarify the definition of DNS abuse (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to adopt an “anti-crime, anti-abuse” Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to use WHOIS to identify operators with high concentrations of malware, botnets, phishing, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abusive behaviors within ICANN’s remit once, with respect to the latter, agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out “systemic” abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforcement.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to identify registrars that sponsor or facilitate DNS abuse (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties), other such behaviors. We understand that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of compliance with resulting obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payer is or is the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the white-listing process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payer is or is the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of compliance with resulting obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN Org to prohibit Contracted Parties to access publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC’s expectations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the white-listing process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payer is or is the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of compliance with resulting obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN Org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payer is or is the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to adopt an “anti-crime, anti-abuse” Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out “systemic” abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforcement.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to use WHOIS to identify operators with high concentrations of malware, botnets, phishing, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abusive behaviors within ICANN’s remit once, with respect to the latter, agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out “systemic” abuse.

ALAC received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payer is or is the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDF, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDF process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties) to establish thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.
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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). Twenty root server operator (RDO) organizations, four liaisons to the RSSAC, four RSSAC Caucus members, and one ICANN research fellow attended the workshop. The RSSAC workshop also featured remote participation to facilitate broader RSSAC Caucus attendance. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Working Party. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.

A high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019, hosted by ICANN, is in the process of appointing a member to the GWG. This advice item will now be moved to Phase 5.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 4 to mean that the SSAC recommends the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article X, Section J. These Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article X, Section J. These Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document contains a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019, hosted by ICANN, is in the process of appointing a member to the GWG. This advice item will now be moved to Phase 5.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document contains a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019, hosted by ICANN, is in the process of appointing a member to the GWG. This advice item will now be moved to Phase 5.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document contains a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) seventh workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019, hosted by ICANN, is in the process of appointing a member to the GWG. This advice item will now be moved to Phase 5.
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN community. The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

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 RSO that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. As RSSAC042 does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board, the ICANN Org understands that there is no action for the ICANN Board and the item is closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that the aim of SAC102: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ISAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC102: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ISAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

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 RSO that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. As RSSAC042 does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board, the ICANN Org understands that there is no action for the ICANN Board and the item is closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that the aim of SAC102: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ISAC on 3 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

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 RSO that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS. As RSSAC042 does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board, the ICANN Org understands that there is no action for the ICANN Board and the item is closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this is the Joint GAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Jun 2019.

The ICANN org understands that the aim of SAC102: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN Org understands that the aim of SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ISAC on 3 Jun 2019.
ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advisor Item Status
As of 31 January 2020

Advice Provider | Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. | Phase 4 | Deferred

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#2). 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 IDPs.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. | Phase 4 | Deferred

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#2). 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 IDPs.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-standing problems regarding domain registration data access to RDDS. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDP protocol. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Third WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism. | Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of IDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-28) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to the ICANN Community to: B. Set clear rate limiting expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. | Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to work with the community to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item 28 suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. In accepting advice item 28, the Board notes that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-24) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to the ICANN Community to: C. Develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements. | Phase 5 | Close Request

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item three suggests that the Board ask ICANN org to work with the community to clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. In accepting advice item 3, the Board notes that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3) | 12/11/18 | The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain-name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law. | Phase 5 | Close Request

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item three suggests that the Board ask ICANN org to work with the community to clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. In accepting advice item 3, the Board notes that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101v2 | https://www.icann.org/en/sysfo/ny/file/sac-101-v2-en.pdf | SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-5) | 12/11/18 | The SSAC reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061: "The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." These assessments should be incorporated in IDP plans at the GNSO. | Phase 5 | Close Request

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mediator/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that the ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." The advice further suggests that "These assessments should be incorporated in IDP plans at the GNSO." As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into IDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of IDPs, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of IDPs.
### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC040: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The RSSAC should continue to use its RFP process to select the RI. The process should be modified to ensure the RI are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover data. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Comment on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report</td>
<td>Requested for action</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Consider Evaluate &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC040: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The RSSAC should continue to use its RFP process to select the RI. The process should be modified to ensure the RI are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover data. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Comment on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report</td>
<td>Requested for action</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Consider Evaluate &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC040: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The RSSAC should continue to use its RFP process to select the RI. The process should be modified to ensure the RI are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover data. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Comment on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report</td>
<td>Requested for action</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Consider Evaluate &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC040: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>The RSSAC should continue to use its RFP process to select the RI. The process should be modified to ensure the RI are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan R-1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover data. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Comment on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report</td>
<td>Requested for action</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Consider Evaluate &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advice Document Recommendation

Recommendation 3: Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. It should be possible for an operator to publish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the AS of the original data. Such a table should be submitted for review by the ICANN Board when made due to AS values changing over time.

The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 3 is for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

Advice Item Status: ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Recommendations on Anonymization Policies for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-1

The ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root Server System (RNS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). This model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RNS.

The ICANN org understands that this is a detailed proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board for RSSAC037 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-037-15jun18-en.pdf). ICANN is seeking the understanding of the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-1

Recommendation 1: The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SAC41 recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the Board and the ICANN Organization staff. A ICANN policy making should result in a registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDP protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining TLD registries to move to thin status per the Thru WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014-02-07-08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support, and oversight of the technical access mechanism.

The ICANN Board should arrange updates to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and registry contracts as necessary to ensure compliance with A through D above.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC. This item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 19 July 2018.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3

Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should only allow a fee to be imposed for RDDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).

The ICANN org understands that this recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. SAC101 closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SAC in SAC101v2, Recommendation 3 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-6

Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN org understands that this recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. SAC101 closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SAC in SAC101v2, Recommendation 6 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is authoritative.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-7

Recommendation 7: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.

The ICANN org understands that this recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. SAC101 closed recommendations under Version 1 on 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SAC in SAC101v2, Recommendation 7 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 this is the ALAC statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment. The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee sixth workshop held from 1 May 2018 to 3 May 2018. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 17 May 2018.

The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC’s Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee (NomCom). The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Verisign in early May. 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.

The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC statement regarding Bake-off for Registration one. COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: D.COM. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops. ICANN has provided this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted. The document is informational only and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 5 June 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy. As presented, the strategy is: • The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years. In line with principle (i), • Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $115 million in total, in line with principle (ii). • A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $136 million, corresponding to the total amount of withdrawals from the Reserve Fund to finance the IANA stewardship transition. The remaining shortfall of US $17 million ($68 less than $105 and less than above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: 1. Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD program, if any; 2. Additional contribution from ICANN Org. VI. Additional contribution from the Auction Proceeds. The ALAC supports this overall strategy but with the following conditions and additions:

The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.3.5 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.

The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom).

The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC’s Report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Verisign in early May.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee submitted during the public comment period to the independent examiner. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 May 2018.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment. The ICANN org is working on a methodology for estimating the costs of the RSS. ICANN org will also work proactively with the GWG to estimate the costs of the final governance model. The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy. As presented, the strategy is: • The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years. In line with principle (i), • Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $115 million in total, in line with principle (ii). • A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $136 million, corresponding to the total amount of withdrawals from the Reserve Fund to finance the IANA stewardship transition. The remaining shortfall of US $17 million ($68 less than $105 and less than above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: 1. Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD program, if any; 2. Additional contribution from ICANN Org. VI. Additional contribution from the Auction Proceeds. The ALAC supports this overall strategy but with the following conditions and additions:

The RLG recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The RLG recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.3.5 to estimate the costs of the RLG and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RLG estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.

The RLG recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The RLG welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10497">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10497</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN-proposed Interim Model</td>
<td>4/2/18</td>
<td>Following discussions over the last months, in an effort to address the issue of Name Collisions as it remains an area of some urgency. The ALAC urges the SSAC to proceed with the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) Work Party’s project plan and allocate enough time to do it right. We believe it is important to minimize the unintended consequences for end users. Name Collision occurs when a user, attempting to reach a private domain name, unintentionally reaches a public domain name end, as such, to the care of end user trust of the internet and could pose potential security issues. The ICANN Work Party’s project plan, as it currently stands, seems adequate without being excessive. We urge the SSAC to stay the course and not expedite the process for the benefit of any subsequent procedures. There is great anticipation, from parts of the community, for new applications but not only is a specific delay unlikely, given other factors, we believe it would be prudent for the SSAC to execute the project plan as submitted to provide the ICANN community with a holistic assessment of the risks.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN-proposed Interim Model. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13235">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13235</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Root Key Signing Key (RKS) Rollout Process</td>
<td>3/10/17</td>
<td>The ALAC thanks the ICANN organization for the extended opportunity to provide comments to the Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests 31 January 2018 (&quot;Draft Procedure&quot;) for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community gTLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The ALAC recommends approval of the ICANN-SSAC gTLD Change Requests project. This project should include them current information related to the RFC 8145 trust anchor reports, the prognosis for availability of the in-development IETF &quot;sentinel&quot; mechanism and the potential for using the sentinel mechanism to create a greater level of comfort prior to the RKS rollout.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Root Key Signing Key (RKS) Rollout Process and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13155">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13155</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests</td>
<td>4/2/18</td>
<td>The ALAC thanks the ICANN organization for the opportunity to provide comments to the Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests 31 January 2018 (&quot;Draft Procedure&quot;) for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community gTLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large stakeholders. The ALAC recommends approval of the ICANN-SSAC gTLD Change Requests project. This project should include them current information related to the RFC 8145 trust anchor reports, the prognosis for availability of the in-development IETF &quot;sentinel&quot; mechanism and the potential for using the sentinel mechanism to create a greater level of comfort prior to the RKS rollout.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10497">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10497</a></td>
<td>Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/recommendations-on-icann-jurisdiction-2017-11-16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/recommendations-on-icann-jurisdiction-2017-11-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/21/17</td>
<td>This is the ICANN statement on Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction, submitted as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf</a>. As this statement was submitted as part of a public comment, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Recommendations on ICANN Jurisdiction: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-0118-0502-01-01-EN.pdf</a>. As this statement was submitted as part of a public comment, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisor Item Status**

**As of 31 January 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>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC-SAC099</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC099: Response to the New gTLD Operational Procedures Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling</td>
<td>12/17/17</td>
<td>Response from the SSAC to the ICANN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 July 2017 letter that raised a question around “non-authoritative” records constrained to comply with DNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The SSAC recommends that for normal infrastructure records and other records-identifying hosts: it should be either: (i) a traditional label, A-labels, digits, and the hyphen with the further restrictions that a hyphen cannot appear at the beginning or end of the string or adjacent to another hyphen or (ii) a valid A-label complying with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 (also known as IDNA2008) and their successors, and not in any way dependent on mapping these records should be used without delegated variants, other variations, and, if so as can be construed, any infrastructure records that create a referral, such as CNAME or CNAME records pointing into or out of the Fully Qualified Domain Name, even if the DNS protocol or other procedures allow those mechanisms.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that SAC099 is a response from the SSAC to the ICANN Guidelines Working Group (WG) regarding the WG's 27 July 2017 letter that raised a question around “non-authoritative” records constrained to comply with DNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The ICANN Guidelines Working Group has opened a second public comment to get general feedback as well as the response to some specific queries: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-10-19-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/idn-guidelines-2017-10-19-en</a>. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 1 January 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 18 January 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC-RSSAC029</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-029-28oct17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC029: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop</td>
<td>10/23/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes of the fifth RSSAC workshop held hosted by the University of Maryland in early October.</td>
<td>CANN understands that RSSAC029 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions necessary for identifying the DNS root servers. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### ICANN Information Transparency Initiative (ITI)

The ITI team previewed new Announcements and Blog pages on feedback.icann.org in October 2018. Work on the authoring and content model in the document management system has begun and several content types have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project. On 10 October 2019, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposal for an improved search experience for Board Meeting content for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improved searchability, which is core to ITI, includes: filters to narrow search by document type (Resolutions, Minutes, Agenda). Board Committees (current and former), and Board Meeting type; a date range filter; an expandable and collapsible table structure; jump-to-into for upcoming Board Meetings, Year, and Month/Year-keywords search within Board Meeting content with results available by relevance (number of instances of the keyword(s)) or (rewind) (search results ordered by publish date). Also, the ITI team is developing an improved Public Comment feature based on invaluable input from members of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. This new feature will be available for testing in early January 2020. ITI is aiming for an April 2020 soft launch of the new site. In September 2019 and October 2019, blogs were published to https://icann.org, which provided the community with an update on the project's status.

---

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

- **RSSAC-RSSAC030**
  - **Statement from ALAC and GAC**
  - **RSSAC-RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Existential Threats in DNS Root Sources**
  - **Issued Date**: 11/4/17
  - **Phase 4 - Implement**
  - **Action(s) Taken**

- **RSSAC-RSSAC031**
  - **Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC**
  - **RSSAC-RSSAC031: Enabling Inclusion, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN. A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC**
  - **Issued Date**: 11/2/17
  - **Phase 4 - Implement**
  - **Action(s) Taken**

---

### ICANN Board Status Advice Report
RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Servers R-2 Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-4

4/3/17

Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.6 generated the smallest possible size, as expected. However, some implementations would become brittle if this naming scheme was adopted. Future work in this area could include modeling and proposing protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider: • Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name • Testing the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set • Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using EDNS0 to support a priming specific single signature over the entire priming set (e.g., 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 KEK + ZSK scheme • Effects of leaving the Additional section in priming responses empty

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenarios, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 1/17/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8

8/3/17

No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted.

Phase 1 | Close Request

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8.1

8/3/17

Contact studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviours.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as the DO bit are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8.3

8/3/17

Conduct a study to understand the flexibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that proof-of-concept code for testing these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-8.5

8/3/17

The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is not to change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable resolver to authenticate root nameserver responses. The root server addressing should be in a way that reduces the potential for operational breakage. • Because the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. This can be done using delegation or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root servers’AAAAA Records and the root zone should be hosted on the root servers. • Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (3.3), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (3.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands that the RSSAC has also provided an additional, speculative recommendation, which states that if node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following should also be considered: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. • Because the root server address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. • Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (3.3), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (3.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-OI-0717-02-01-ru

7/2/17

This is the ALAC Statement on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the comments of our members as well as others looking for a truly implementable solution were adequately taken into consideration by the IAG and the ICANN staff in the final now under public consultation.

Phase 3 | Close Request

The ICANN organization understands the ALAC Statement on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. The respective public comment period closed on 7 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/whois-prvicy-law-2017-05-00-en). This statement was included in the report of public comments, which was published on 28 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-whos-privacy-law-28jul17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework for Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. This statement will be included in the report of public comments, which will be published on 16 June 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?faa/hr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework for Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 30 June 2017. This statement will be included in the report of public comments, which will be published on 16 June 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?faa/hr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 26 July 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 14 August 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?faa/hr-2017-06-23-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 26 July 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 14 August 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?faa/hr-2017-06-23-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 23 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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 SAC024: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights and thanked the CCWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are no associated security and stability aspects, the SSAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC notes that, as a Chartering Organization of the CCWG-Accountability, formal SSAC approval of the final version of the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 18 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 18 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/fci-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

Due to the finding of a better outcome of the review when it is performed, this is a win-win situation. If the ccNSO believes that a deferral will be beneficial to their use of volunteer resources and will changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations.

This is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC092 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with DNSSEC and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en.html). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs.

The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone Labels is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at CCN044 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Final work on the recent work on the technical use of Root Zone Labels by the study group also recommended the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf.

Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up future work once the ccNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC092 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with DNSSEC and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en.html). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs.

The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone Labels is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at CCN044 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Final work on the recent work on the technical use of Root Zone Labels by the study group also recommended the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf.

Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up future work once the ccNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC092 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with DNSSEC and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en.html). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs.

The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone Labels is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at CCN044 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Final work on the recent work on the technical use of Root Zone Labels by the study group also recommended the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf.

Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up future work once the ccNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC092 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with DNSSEC and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en.html). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs.

The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone Labels is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at CCN044 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Final work on the recent work on the technical use of Root Zone Labels by the study group also recommended the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf.

Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up future work once the ccNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC092 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with DNSSEC and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en.html). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDN2008 which does not allow for emojis (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDN2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs.

The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone Labels is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at CCN044 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Final work on the recent work on the technical use of Root Zone Labels by the study group also recommended the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-20mar19-en.pdf.

Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2017 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up future work once the ccNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

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

5/18/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that clearly went into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT’s) analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on the outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the recommendations on the interests of end users of the Internet. Specifically, while increased competition may be considered an important outcome of the new gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 15 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 10 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-rt-recommendations-comment-report-2017-05-07-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s Public Comment on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The ALAC notes the efforts made to carry out the first use of the Empowered Community powers in an open and inclusive manner by calling for input from the different Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees that form ICANN. Recognizing the power the Board has to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes the effort made to carry out this first use of the Empowered Community powers in an open and inclusive manner by calling for input from the different Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees that form ICANN. The ALAC recognizes that there is the need to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes that there is the need to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes that there is the need to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes that there is the need to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee

4/28/17

This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. The ALAC recognizes that there is the need to establish Committees as it will best suit the Board’s needs, the ALAC would like to have a deeper knowledge on the scope of the proposed new Committee as the Draft Charter leaves room for ambiguity.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Reconsideration Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee. A Report of Public Comments has been published on 14 July 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soac-accountability-2017-06-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0117-01-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9919
ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment
3/3/2017
[Public Comment Statement] This paper sets out the ALAC response to the various recommendations proposed by the ITESMS Review of the At-Large Community. Those recommendations include steps ITESMS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the Independent Review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-24mar17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC026
RSSAC026: RSSAC Lexicon
1/11/17
The precise technical language often found in RFCs, while often providing consistency and clarity to technical communities, can sometimes be incomprehensible or misleading when used in a non-technical setting. The purpose of this document is to increase the understanding of terms used commonly when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community. It is not to redefine or provide guidance on any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be useful to anyone discussing the DNS-root server system. This includes RSSAC members, RSSAC Caucus members, ICANN staff, and the larger ICANN community. It will be updated by the RSSAC as the vocabulary used to discuss the root server system evolves.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC’s documentation of the terms commonly used when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org received confirmation of this understanding on 1/21/17.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
SSAC092
SSAC092: SSAC Input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights
1/22/17
The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) as a chartering organization of The Cross Community Working Group On Enhancing ICANN Accountability (ECWGAccountability), wishes to ensure that discussions concerning Human Rights are scoped within the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN) remit during discussions on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Stewardship Transition (IANA’s remit is limited to coordinating the allocation and assignment of Domain names, Internet Protocol(II) addresses, Autonomous System (AS) numbers, and protocol port and parameter numbers)

The ICANN organization understands SSAC092 is the SSAC’s comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9933
ALAC Statement on the Identifier Rights
1/10/17
ALAC recommends that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvement.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Identifier Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 February 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ithi-definition-15feb17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0117-03-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9931
ALAC Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP)
1/22/17
[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC recognizes the continued effort to maintain an up-to-date set of rules and procedures applicable to the IRP day to day operations in a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus driven process. 2. The ALAC appreciates that details that have been carefully addressed to avoid any lasting situations between the IRP Supplementary Procedures being updated and those proposed as new IRP Supplementary Procedures. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0117-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Updated Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 1 February 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 1 February 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments did not act on the IRP Supp Procs Draft Report. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/2019
ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICAAN Community Anti-Harassment Policy
12/23/16
[Public Comment Statement] The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy. On the whole, the document is well written, although there are several instances where the extensive listing of details usable to counter production, as it makes the IRP look like an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list, is actually acceptable. Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN acknowledges the diversity of our global community and the acceptance of or otherwise of what are society accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of cross community interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but to also emphasise that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behavior or not. The other main concern is that this policy could be misused as a weapon against someone. This policy is best produced by professional HR persons who are familiar with the language and legal implications.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed ICAAN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harrassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-1216-05-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/2013
12/23/16
[Public Comment Statement] The concept with the report’s recommendations including gradual delegation of new gTLDs, continuous monitoring of the impact of new gTLDs, and continuous monitoring of the identified risk parameters as well as its recommendations regarding areas of potential risk. Additionally, special note should be taken of the report’s warning about the impact on stability of removing new gTLDs from the root. This may be an area of future research. Finally, the report notes that the report was unable to identify causes for a number of related phenomena such as the growth in the total number of queries that are sent to the root, specifically in the growth of the invalid queries which we believe should pose a concern. We acknowledge the complexity of the DNS root system, nevertheless these problems merit further research including but not limited to referral to SSAC and RSSAC as appropriate. We would recommend to explore possible provisioning of a dedicated space on the ICANN website that tracks the performance status/health of the root going forward.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-05-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Cross Community Analysis of Root Server System Stability Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 February 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cross-community-data-draft-report-09feb17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017.
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The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is SAC's Statement on the Draft PDP 18 Operating Plan and Budget. The negative public comment period closed on 31 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/draft-pdp-18-op-plan-budget-23janev17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en14).

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en14).

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en14).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is SAC's Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en14).

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1116-03-01-EN is SAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The negative public comment period closed on 17 November 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 November 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/comments-middle-strategy-25nov16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AS-ALAC-ST-1116-03-01-EN is SAC's Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en14).
<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 (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9917">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9917</a></td>
<td>The ATLAS II Recommendations Implementation Report</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>Endorsed by the ATLAS II Committee as a policy for wide-scale adoption.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this ATLAS II Report is a supplement to its ATLAS II Implementation Report. The report was provided to the ICANN Board on 7 November 2016, at ICANN57 (<a href="https://icann.org/en/sched/current">https://icann.org/en/sched/current</a>). There is no further action required of the Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC088</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC088: SSAC Response to the ccNSO Evaluation of SAC084</td>
<td>10/30/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC088 is the SSAC’s response to its evaluation of SAC084 and has been added to the SSAC’s collective repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC024</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>An advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. This advisory identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. If root server operators cannot demonstrate these technical elements, the RSSAC reserves the right to impose restrictions on the root server operators.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's response to the community on the organization's historical roots and future directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC025</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC-October 2016 Workshop Report</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>Overview of RSSAC’s third workshop (October 11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the mind map constructed during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC's report on its third workshop, which it discusses 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 SSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC086</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC086: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedure – Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedure – Seeking Community Comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure (PDP) request for input and invites the Community to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-sac086-06oct16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-sac086-06oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on the new Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td>10/30/16</td>
<td>Response to 3 June 2016 input request from PDP Working Group on the new gTLDs Subsequent Procedures regarding overarching questions (as part of the Group's first Community Comment process). RSSAC does not have any input on those overarching questions. RSSAC does not foresee any technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 February 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, for which the RSSAC has no 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 SSAC for review on 18 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-03-01-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketpace Health Index (Brie)</td>
<td>9/2/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC welcomes the publication of this first set of gTLD Marketpace Health Index. This is a natural progression based on the work of ICANN Community into Competitions, Consumer Trust and Consumer Confidence in new gTLDs. The ALAC proposes a number of additions/improvements. Competition: All in all, consumers (registrars) are the factors that move the market. 7% of the users pay 1% of the users who say they want to see us find ways to get more insight on their needs and behaviors. This should be taken into account for future developments. Marketability: The metric presented are very useful. However, as seen in the &quot;Competition&quot; section, it is not just how many new players do we have (registrars and registrators) but the market share of each one, different TLDs or families of TLDs. And symmetrically, the count of the number of TLDs should include their market share too. In addition, statistics per country/region will be useful in figure 13. Trust/Accuracy of WHOIS Records: Rather than as a pie chart, rather as a bar chart showing the accuracy (on a quarter by quarter basis) would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per top level domain basis. A line/bar graph, rather than a pie chart, would be more helpful for the percentage of UDRP and URS Decisions against .gTLD Registrars. Furthermore it would be interesting to note why registrars are, voluntarily or involuntarily, disclaimed. Was that due to high ICANN fees, noncompliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc? The ALAC absolutely supports the further proposals of metrics on page 14 and 15 of the report.</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-03-01-EN is a ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketpace Health Index (Brie). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 September 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtd-marketplace-health-brie-23sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtd-marketplace-health-brie-23sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Policy Issue Report</td>
<td>9/15/16</td>
<td>The purpose of this document is twofold. Firstly, it outlines the key policy issues of the At-Large community. Secondly, it sets out why end users should care about the specific policy issues. WHOIS/Registrations Directory Services - WHOIS Functions &amp; Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDN - New gTLD - Public Interests - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability &amp; Transparency - ICANN Operations/Finances - Reviews at ICANN - Engagement &amp; Outreach.</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands the ALAC Policy Issue Report is ALAC’s report on the At-Large Community Policy Issues. The report was provided to Rinalda Abdulrahim on 10 September 2016 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+At-Large+Community+Policy+Issues+-+Why+End+Users+Should+Care">https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+At-Large+Community+Policy+Issues+-+Why+End+Users+Should+Care</a>). There is no further action required of the Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC020</td>
<td>RSSAC Statement on Client Side Agreement Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement</td>
<td>9/10/16</td>
<td>The RSSAC’s answer of whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system. Based on information available as of the statement, loss of a single root server would not cause immediate stability issues for the root server system and the Internet that depends on it.</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC020 is RSSAC’s statement confirming that operators of root servers are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace and that there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>Committee (RSSAC)</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>SAC082</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-082-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-082-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC082: SSAC Response to the Request for Input on the Next Generation RDS to replace WHOIS PDP</td>
<td>SAC082 is informational and there are no actionable items for the Board within that document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC081</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-081-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-081-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC081: SSAC Response to Request for Input on Next Generation gTLD RDS to replace WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP)</td>
<td>SAC081 is informational and there are no actionable items for the Board within that document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC080</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-080-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-080-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC080: ALAC Statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws</td>
<td>SAC080: ALAC Statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws. The ICANN organization understands SAC080 is ALAC's statement on the draft New ICANN Bylaws. The public comment period closed 21 May 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 25 May 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC079</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-079-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-079-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC079: ALAC Statement on the Draft ICANN’s Operating Plan and Budget for Five-Year Operating Plan Update</td>
<td>SAC079: ALAC Statement on the Draft ICANN’s Operating Plan and Budget for Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The ICANN organization understands SAC079 is ALAC’s statement on the draft ICANN’s Operating Plan and Budget for Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 June 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-plan-budget-19jun16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-plan-budget-19jun16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ALAC. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017, the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC078</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-078-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-078-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC078: ALAC Statement on the Final IABF17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update</td>
<td>SAC078: ALAC Statement on the Final IABF17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The ICANN organization understands SAC078 is ALAC’s statement on the draft ICANN’s Operating Plan and Budget for Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 June 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-plan-budget-19jun16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-plan-budget-19jun16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC077</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC077: ALAC Statement on the Final GNSO Review Working Group Report</td>
<td>SAC077: ALAC Statement on the Final GNSO Review Working Group Report. The ICANN organization understands SAC077 is ALAC’s statement on the final GNSO Review Working Group Report. The public comment period closed on 30 April 2016, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 16 March 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gnso-review-working-group-16mar16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gnso-review-working-group-16mar16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 7 November 2016. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC076</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-076-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-076-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC076: ALAC Statement on the Final ICANN At-Large Face-to-Face Meeting Proposals</td>
<td>SAC076: ALAC Statement on the Final ICANN At-Large Face-to-Face Meeting Proposals. The ICANN organization understands SAC076 is ALAC’s statement on the final ICANN At-Large Face-to-Face Meeting Proposals. The public comment period closed on 30 April 2016, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 16 June 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-at-large-face-to-face-meetings-16jun16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-at-large-face-to-face-meetings-16jun16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC075</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC075: ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regimes Review Working Group</td>
<td>SAC075: ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regimes Review Working Group. The ICANN organization understands SAC075 is ALAC’s statement on the final ICANN At-Large Face-to-Face Meeting Proposals. The public comment period closed on 24 April 2016, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geographic-regimes-review-working-group-13may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geographic-regimes-review-working-group-13may16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC074</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC074: ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability</td>
<td>SAC074: ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. The ICANN organization understands SAC074 is ALAC’s statement on the final ICANN At-Large Face-to-Face Meeting Proposals. The public comment period closed on 24 April 2016, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cross-community-working-group-on-accountability-13may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cross-community-working-group-on-accountability-13may16-en.pdf</a>), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0016-00-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596">https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596</a></td>
<td>SSAC018: RSSAC Statement of Work and Accountability 3rd Draft Proposal</td>
<td>2/4/16</td>
<td>SAC comments on the CCWG/ICG Proposal for the Domain Name System Security, Stability, and Resilience (DNSSEC) Case Management System. The SAC comments on the DNSSEC Case Management System.</td>
<td>SAC018</td>
<td>The ICANN Board considered this advice at ICANN56, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CTR) and the GNSO new gTLD Subsequent affiliating PDP Working Group (GNSO PDP WG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2013 application round of the new gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked the CTR and the GNSP PDP WG to review the concerns of ALAC in the course of their work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>AL-SSAC-0045-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596">https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596</a></td>
<td>SSAC017: RSSAC Statement of Work and Scope for RSSAC002 v2</td>
<td>4/20/16</td>
<td>The ICANN Board understood RSSAC017. The Board decided to ask that SSAC consider the implications of this advice prior to any action of the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>SAC017</td>
<td>The ICANN Board considered this advice at ICANN56, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CTR) and the GNSO new gTLD Subsequent affiliating PDP Working Group (GNSO PDP WG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2013 application round of the new gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked the CTR and the GNSP PDP WG to review the concerns of ALAC in the course of their work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC018: RSSAC Statement on the Transmission of the IC and CCWG- Accountability Proposals</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/files/system/files/rssac-002-scope-4apr16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/files/system/files/rssac-002-scope-4apr16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC018: RSSAC Statement on the Transmission of the IC and CCWG Accountability Proposals</td>
<td>3/1/16</td>
<td>The RSSAC congratulate the Internet community for their participation in the process of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) and the CCWG Accountability to the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration via the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>RSSAC018</td>
<td>The ICANN Board considered RSSAC018 at ICANN53, and determined that the advice was not actionable because the ICG and CCWG Accountability Proposals were not yet available for public review. The Board has asked the ICG to continue its efforts to develop the Accountability Proposals, and then to publish them for public review. The ICANN Board also requested that the ICG and CCWG provide a timeline for when the Accountability Proposals will be available for public review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC019</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/files/system/files/0079-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/files/system/files/0079-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on the Changing Nature of IPv4 Address Management</td>
<td>6/1/16</td>
<td>The SSAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPV4) addresses caused by the increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPV4 addresses.</td>
<td>SSAC019</td>
<td>The ICANN Board understood SSAC019. The ICANN Board noted that the SSAC considered the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPV4) addresses caused by the increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPV4 addresses. The ICANN Board also noted that the SSAC recommended that the ICANN Board should consider the implications of this advice prior to any action of the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC017</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596">https://atlarge.icann.org/icrrc/1358466596</a></td>
<td>RSSAC017: Statement of Work and Scope for RSSAC002 v3</td>
<td>3/25/16</td>
<td>The ICANN Board understood RSSAC017. The Board decided to ask that SSAC consider the implications of this advice prior to any action of the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>RSSAC017</td>
<td>The ICANN Board considered this advice at ICANN56, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CTR) and the GNSO new gTLD Subsequent affiliating PDP Working Group (GNSO PDP WG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2013 application round of the new gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked the CTR and the GNSP PDP WG to review the concerns of ALAC in the course of their work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-buchek-22mar16-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Security and Stability Advisory

Root Server System Advisory

Security and Stability Advisory

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

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) RSSAC016 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-workshop- 27jan16-en.pdf RSSAC016: RSSAC Workshop 2013 Report 1/27/16 © 2013, the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) conducted its first workshop, graciously hosted at the University of Maryland, and equally graciously supported by ICANN. The purpose of the workshop was to begin work on a foundation for the future evolution of the root server system (RSS). This involved identifying and expressing in clear terms the fundamental attributes for the current model of operation of the RSS.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0116-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

This understanding was sent to the CA/B Forum, which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC074</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4</td>
<td>11/5/15</td>
<td>Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrars based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable them to learn practical operational practices for preserving security and stability of the credential management lifecycle. SSAC welcomes the opportunity to advise training staff in the creation of a curriculum.</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN**

ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains - Item 1


**AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN**

ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains

- Public Comment Statement: The ALAC confirms its understanding of the “Soundness of the Cross Community Working Group’s use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains (CWG-UCTN)” report. The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. The primary concern the ALAC has for the CWG-UCTN is the level of community participation. The ALAC encourages the CWG-UCTN to: - Provide more transparency in its processes and actions. - Include more participation from communities, particularly those that are not English-speaking. - Consider the inclusion of more diverse perspectives in its decision-making. - Allow for a more iterative approach to developing the proposal. The ALAC is requesting that the CWG-UCTN address these concerns to ensure that the proposal is inclusive and represents the views of all communities. The ALAC is also requesting that the CWG-UCTN provide more details on the proposed changes to the current processes and procedures. The ALAC is not opposing the inclusion of the CWG-UCTN proposal in the ICANN Board’s 2018 review cycle. The ALAC looks forward to working with the CWG-UCTN to ensure that the proposal is inclusive and represents the views of all communities.

**AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN**

ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains - Item 2

- Public Comment Statement: The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. The ALAC believes that the proposal is needed to provide better protection for the public. The ALAC is requesting that the CWG-UCTN address the concerns raised in the comments, particularly regarding the level of community participation. The ALAC looks forward to working with the CWG-UCTN to ensure that the proposal is inclusive and represents the views of all communities.

**AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN**

ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains - Item 3

- Public Comment Statement: The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. The ALAC believes that the proposal is needed to provide better protection for the public. The ALAC is requesting that the CWG-UCTN address the concerns raised in the comments, particularly regarding the level of community participation. The ALAC looks forward to working with the CWG-UCTN to ensure that the proposal is inclusive and represents the views of all communities.

**AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN**

ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains - Item 4

- Public Comment Statement: The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. The ALAC believes that the proposal is needed to provide better protection for the public. The ALAC is requesting that the CWG-UCTN address the concerns raised in the comments, particularly regarding the level of community participation. The ALAC looks forward to working with the CWG-UCTN to ensure that the proposal is inclusive and represents the views of all communities.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-01-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9710

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auctions Discussion Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/15/15 (Public Comment Statement) - We recommend that the
  drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons par-
  ticipating 

  | 31 January 2020 |

  | ICANN Board Status Advice Report |

**AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-00-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9683

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/9/15 (Public Comment Statement) - ALAC provide community input into the
  Initial Report on the GNSO’s Working Group with regards to possible recommendations
  for the use of Data and Metrics for Policy Making The ALAC supports the need to
  simplify an independent third party in order to address any concerns
  relating to the collection, anonymization and aggregation of data.  The ALAC supports
  the introduction of a "plug" where working groups will be able to submit proposals
  or ideas whereby the collection and assessment of fact-based data and metrics can become
  the basis for the initial identification and analysis of issues and/or problems.  - Support the
  view that any funding required to implement the pilot should be
  considered an investment in the improvement of the policy process rather than a cost against budget.  -
  The ALAC supports the revisions of the templates for the Issue Report, Charter and Final Report to update earlier
  WG guidelines and also the development of a decision tree. Report of Public Comments:
| **AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-00-EN** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/9/15 (Public Comment Statement) - The ALAC strongly supports the research and recommendations in the
  Preliminary Issue Report. We are particularly impressed by the report’s clear, coherent summary of the
  Internet policy development activities, studies, and implementation efforts pertaining to WHOIS. Report of Public Comment:

**AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9682

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/9/15 (Public Comment Statement) - ALAC response to IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal: Answers questions
  concerning the Proposal as a Whole, the ICANN Criteria, and the ICG Report and Executive Summary List of
  Public Comments: (https://www.icann.org/advisory-committees-stewardship-transition-proposal-public-
  archive-of-submitted-comments/) including ICANN Board Comment on the ICG Proposal:

**AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9702

| ALAC Statement on the ICG Proposal regarding gTLDs and with implementation of IANA's new internet - Any charter reported
  broadly: 1) affirms the principles of openness and transparency, 2) embraces the concept that the use be in
  tune with the ICANN Strategic Plan; and 3) must favour extending the global public interest in concrete ways
  and endorsing the information of Committees and Name & Address Block of Public Comments:

**AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9683

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auctions Discussion Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7/14/15 (Public Comment Statement) - Response to the following questions of the Initial Report of the Privacy and
  Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report |

**AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-01-EN**
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9699

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7/14/15 (Public Comment Statement) - Response to the following questions of the Initial Report of the Privacy and
  Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report |

**Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report**
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gsps-initial-07jul15-en.pdf and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report**
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gsps-initial-07jul15-en.pdf and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). A Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) was released on 11 June 2015. (<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/en/posts/proposal-transition-iana-stewardship-06jun15-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/en/posts/proposal-transition-iana-stewardship-06jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no further action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 1 (draft proposal)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC Statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 1 (draft proposal) (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwgg-accountability-work-stream-1-draftproposal-sac071-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwgg-accountability-work-stream-1-draftproposal-sac071-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands as ALAC-ST-0615-01-00-EN is a statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for ALAC and Organizational Reviews. The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 July 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC070: SCAM comments on the Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Enhancements</td>
<td>This understanding was considered as part of a public comment period: see <a href="https://forum.icann.org/en/threads/crosscommunity-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/mg00072.html">https://forum.icann.org/en/threads/crosscommunity-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/mg00072.html</a>. On 10 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CWG's Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC011: Statement of Scope and Work for &quot;History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers&quot;</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC: SCAM comments on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal (Work Stream 1)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC: SCAM comments on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal (Work Stream 1) (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwgg-accountability-draft-proposal-sac071-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwgg-accountability-draft-proposal-sac071-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for ALAC and Organizational Reviews</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for ALAC and Organizational Reviews. The respective public comment period closed on 12 July 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 July 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAM Comments on Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Enhancements</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: see <a href="https://forum.icann.org/en/threads/crosscommunity-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/mg00072.html">https://forum.icann.org/en/threads/crosscommunity-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/mg00072.html</a>. On 10 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CWG's Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC012 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for &quot;History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers&quot;</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for &quot;History and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers&quot; (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ssac-organ-reviews-06aug15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegiant Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegiant Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC010: IAB liaison to the RSSAC</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010: IAB liaison to the RSSAC and provides a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). With the recent re-establishment of the RSSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC011: 148 liaison to the RAC</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011: 148 liaison to the RAC. The respective public comment period closed on 13 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC003: Recommendation on “Root Zone TTLs”</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003: Recommendation on “Root Zone TTLs” (RSSAC003) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s report of public comments (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC012: IRAC Statement of Scope for “Root Zone TTLs”</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC012: IRAC Statement of Scope for “Root Zone TTLs” (RSSAC012) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s report of public comments (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC's signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.

**Recommendation 1**: The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have been invited to submit proposals should determine if or not the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and if so which ones; 2) whether or not additional external controls are necessary for requirements that should be retained; and 3) if additional external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.

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

**Recommendation 5**: Noting the stability and efficiency of existing structures, processes, and mechanisms for the management of the root zone, the SSAC recommends that any proposal to replace NTIA's final administration of root zone changes with an alternative be at least as reliable, robust, and efficient as the current process.

**Recommendation 2a**: Each of the communities should determine whether or not existing mechanisms outside of the IANA Functions Contract are sufficiently robust to hold the IANA Functions Operator accountable to the affected communities for the proper performance of the IANA Functions Contract. In the event that they are not, the communities should determine what additional accountability mechanisms will be needed.

**Recommendation 7**: NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer after transition.
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Decision: The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 2) education at all levels is key; 3) No reccomendations.

2. The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3: An initial set of parameters that would be useful to monitor and establish a baseline trend of the root server system. 1: The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. 2: The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3: Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.

ALAC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions

ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions. This work and progress can be tracked here: https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability. In June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency), and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

In March 2015, the ICANN-IRG requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA’s administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/root-zone-management-transition-update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c).

No recommendations.

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

The ALAC salutes the Board’s continued effort on the implementation of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2. Notwithstanding, the ALAC is concerned that the proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice by the Board may deviate from an unbiased weight to the GAC’s advice compared to that of the other ACs or the policies proposed by each of the SOs. Moreover, the ALAC observes a trend in the Internet Governance ecosystem that the proposed Bylaw changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the GDR is already designed as “a process for consultations between the [Board] and the [SACs],” the ALAC calls the Board to reconsider the proposed Bylaw changes and continue to foster equal footing among all participants of the ICANN community. If the Board is to implement these Bylaw changes, the ALAC advises the Board to fully implement Recommendation 3.1 of the ATRT in the same round of Bylaw changes. This would preserve the delicate balance of advice coming from the ALAC, SSAC and RSSAC along the GAC. The ALAC is confident that the Board will continue to implement the Bylaw changes in a way that safeguards the principles of the multi-stakeholder model, more specifically those that help bring balance among parties.

The ALAC would like to echo the ICANN Board’s comments that the root zone accountability domain can and should be expanded beyond current stakeholders and their current implementations. Although the ICANN Board’s comments are not actionable items for the ICANN Board, they are relevant here as an expression of the ICANN Board’s views.
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The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) the second new gTLD round should give preference to applicants from developing economies and undertake an outreach program to ensure a better understanding of the benefits of gTLDs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider (ALAC)</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-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-29)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-29. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.</td>
<td>Final</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 ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See also the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-30)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-30. For each Public Comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.</td>
<td>Final</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 ALAC website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: atlarge.icann.org. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-32)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-32. ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology in its materials are clearly defined in simpler terms.</td>
<td>Final</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 specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendixa.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-35. The ICANN Board should host a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td>Final</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/teleconferences with the ALAC between meetings as requested/needed. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)</td>
<td>6/30/14</td>
<td>0:35. 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></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.f">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.f</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of the ALAC. No action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which began on 8 Jan 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. See the meetings page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AlLarge%20Outreach%20Workshop">https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AlLarge%20Outreach%20Workshop</a>. See also the AlLarge Meeting Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII%20Meeting%20Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII%20Meeting%20Workspace</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-37)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:37. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to reward the website and Wiki to ensure that our &quot;Policy Advice&quot; pages are accurate and understandable. This will continue as volunteer and staff resources allow. We will also ensure that as documents are published, the classification of the document is clear. The goal is to address two issues: • Confusion about the type of document (ie &quot;Advice&quot; vs &quot;Comment&quot;) • The &quot;End user&quot; justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff together with At-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (ie advice, public comment, correspondence, etc.) in a more granular fashion and provide enhanced tools with which to filter search results based on these categories. Furthermore, staff will create a new field in the database for &quot;End User Issue&quot; and At-Large leadership will populate this field both in current documents and those generated going forward. The following items have been created to satisfy these goals: • An Executive Summaries: ALAC Policy Comments &amp; Advice resource page has been created to address &quot;type&quot; of document (R-35). The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CWPWG) meets weekly to discuss &quot;end user&quot; justification for intervention (R-42). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a Wiki visitor to peruse the work of the At-Large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:39. ICANN should encourage open data? best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>. This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20staff+ICANN55.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20staff+ICANN55.pdf?api=v2</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:40. ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP), but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 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>. On an annual basis, the CROPP program is reviewed and adjustments are made based on community input. Annual community special budget request process is also used to address these types of requests. This recommendation has led to greater collaboration between ALAC leadership and ICANN staff regional engagement teams. See the CROPP Page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/blog/?page=41003025">https://community.icann.org/blog/?page=41003025</a>. See ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-%20Recommendation%2040">https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-%20Recommendation%2040</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>. The ALAC submitted a proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B.</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:42. The ALAC should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>. The 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.f">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.f</a>. The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B.</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:43. RALOs should encourage their inactive ALAC representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-%20Recommendation%2043">https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-%20Recommendation%2043</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:51. ICANN should continue to support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.d">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.d</a>. Work has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN55. The Outreach team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-Outreach%20Event%20Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/al2/AtLargeII-Outreach%20Event%20Workspace</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/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-1)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0:52. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programmes having brought valuable members to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board is in 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.d">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.d</a>. The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.f">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.f</a>. The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issue 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-II-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ALATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ALATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/2014</td>
<td>9.8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-17)</td>
<td>6/26/2014</td>
<td>9.17. 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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-II-DEL-01-01-01.pdf</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ALATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ALATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-9)</td>
<td>6/26/2014</td>
<td>8.8. ICANN has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: [https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e). This recommendation was discussed by the Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution: [https://community.icann.org/display/al2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+19](https://community.icann.org/display/al2/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+19).
As of 31 January 2020

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item

02/02/14
- The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.

02/25/14
- To enable ICANN community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as asked for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mix of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

02/25/14
- To enable ICANN community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as asked for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mix of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

02/25/14
- To enable ICANN community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as asked for in the recommendations of ATRT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mix of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

02/26/14
- Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

02/26/14
- Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

02/26/14
- Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

02/26/14
- Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.

03/04/14
- Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.
3/18/14 The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem particularly its conclusion that the "multistakeholder model is vital for reliable and should be elaborated and reinforced." The diagram on Governance, grouped into the Logical layer and Infrastructure layer is very a helpful way to conceptualise Internet governance issues. The Panel's discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN's new role in: Globally not international, Consolidation and simplification of root zone management, and a web of affirmation of commitments. Globalizing the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggesting accountability panels is indeed a potential way forward but only if a panel can provide recourse. The ALAC concerns about the practical workability of this scenario but is ready to assist.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-ecosystem-2013-10-11-en. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.

5/8/14 The ALAC supports the report from the Panel on Multistakeholder Innovation with some reservations. This panel is a reminder of the need to reach beyond the ‘usual suspects’ with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement. However, we are concerned that some of the suggestions, such as crowdsourcing, for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as alternatives to existing methods of reaching consensus on issues. New techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy processes of collaboration and dialogue. Crowdsourcing for policy input risks breaking the truly bottom-up policy development. We suggest the development and use of tools to assist participation for those whose voice should be heard but do not communicate, or do not communicate easily in the English language. Ultimately, multistakeholder innovation should be targeted at enabling widespread participation at grassroots level as opposed to encouraging counter-arguments at top levels.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/multistakeholder-innovation-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

5/16/14 The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a reminder of the ways ICANN has started to globalize its activities, but real assistance and support for participation in ICANN is a critical element in the globalisation of ICANN and Internet Governance. The issue is additional funding for those unable to self fund real participation in ICANN. There may be other models for funding participation that do not rely on the 'contracted parties' model that can ensure all parties have equal seats at the table.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/public-responsibility-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

3/8/14 RRSAC provides 4 comments regarding the draft proposal.

The ICANN organization understands RRSAC's comments on the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions", and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RRSAC in May 2017.

4/21/14 The ALAC welcomes the announcement recently made by the National Telecommunications and Information Authority (NTIA) to transition over the IANA Functions. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities. The ALAC appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meetings venue. The ALAC suggests that 1) local availability of an open Internet be added to the selection criteria, 2) venues without facilities for the disabled communities shouldn't be considered, and 3) video coverage of meetings venue, camera and camera work (pan and zoom) instead of a stationary Webcam. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This Panel is a reminder of the ways ICANN has started to globalize its activities, but real assistance and support for participation in ICANN is a critical element in the globalisation of ICANN and Internet Governance. The issue is additional funding for those unable to self fund real participation in ICANN. There may be other models for funding participation that do not rely on the 'contracted parties' model that can ensure all parties have equal seats at the table.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/public-responsibility-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

3/8/14 This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/multistakeholder-innovation-2013-10-11-en. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.

3/18/14 The ALAC supports the recommendations of the Meeting Strategy Working Group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase concentrated policy work, engage with local internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa deliverance becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the meetings venue. The ALAC suggests that 1) local availability of an open Internet be added to the selection criteria, 2) venues without facilities for the disabled communities shouldn’t be considered, and 3) video coverage of meetings venue, camera and camera work (pan and zoom) instead of a stationary Webcam. The ALAC welcomes the recommendation not restricting rotation of any meeting to ICANN hub cities.

This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en. On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution approving the new meetings strategy: https://www.icann.org/news/board-meetings/2014-11-17-en.2a. The new meetings strategy was implemented in 2016.

This statement was provided and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en. On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution approving the new meetings strategy: https://www.icann.org/news/board-meetings/2014-11-17-en.2a. The new meetings strategy was implemented in 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS10</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:string-confusions@icann.org">string-confusions@icann.org</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en</a></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This is a response to a Board resolution in which the Bylaws were adopted and does not contain actionable advice: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#R7.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#R7.a</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS11</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:string-confusions@icann.org">string-confusions@icann.org</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en</a></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/zco-framework-principles-2014-02-11-en#On">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/zco-framework-principles-2014-02-11-en#On</a> the NGPC provided a resolution on the expert determinations and proposed review mechanism in October 2014: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-11-en#R7.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-11-en#R7.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS12</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:string-confusions@icann.org">string-confusions@icann.org</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en</a></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This topic was addressed at ICANN 49 in Singapore during the ADAC session. The Contractual Compliance Complaint system does not allow for multiple filings in the same single complaints. However, these types of complaints or issues can be submitted to the <a href="mailto:Compliance@icann.org">Compliance@icann.org</a> email address, which is available for general questions or issues that are not available options on the ICANN website (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints">http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints</a>). ICANN Contractual Compliance staff pulls data across all areas while collaborating with the contracted parties to bring more efficiency to the process and effective resolution. ICANN engages in proactive monitoring of media and industry blogs to identify community concerns that may be ripe for compliance review or audit. For wide-spread problems that affect multiple ccTLDs or multiple problems by a single party, ICANN Contractual Compliance team conducts focused reviews to address the issues that are presented to bring more efficiency to the process and effective resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS14</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.icann.org/commit/2014-02-14-01-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/commit/2014-02-14-01-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This advice is directed towards network operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SA OC65 R-1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC006 R-2 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC006 R-2. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#3).

The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages ICANN to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC007 R-3 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC007 R-3. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#4).

The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages ICANN to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC005 R-0 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC005 R-0. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2).

The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages ICANN to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC004 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC004 R-1. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#1).

The ICANN organization understands that SAC003 R-0 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC003 R-0. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en).

The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages ICANN to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC002 R-2 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC002 R-2. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#0).

The SSAC is proposing a particular behavior in the processing of DNS search lists and encourages ICANN to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.

Phase 2: Advertise Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC001 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC001 R-1. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#000000).
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) should consider the following steps to address search list processing: a. ICANN should consider additional research to understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to such queries. b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with names delegated under the newly delegated top-level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.

The At-Large Advisory Committee considers the submitted "ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan" a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan. The ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated. Nevertheless, as the most important concern today is about the security of the Internet and the trust in the Internet, the ALAC would prefer to include those aspects of trust and security in the paragraph describing the ICANN Vision in this way: "to support a single, open, and globally interoperable Internet with a secure and trusted DNS". The same should be done in all focus areas paragraphs each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. The ALAC recommends that it is necessary to add another bold point to the "Developing a world of public responsibility by bringing together diverse sectors: "Engage and develop the End-Users community globally for full involvement in policy development and decision making processes." The ALAC finds the other elements of the Focus Areas presented and detailed. It appreciates this preliminary work to prepare for a future-oriented and consented 5 years strategic plan and strongly supports that process.

The ALAC has not remitted on the debate of Specification 13, but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point, earlier decisions made were earlier to have no categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic and other similar classes of gTLD.

The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by defining a clear and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must acknowledge the sovereignty and right of self-determination of States to let them choose their region of allocation and request, if they so desire, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geographic regions, we are speaking about areas and the ALAC doesn't believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on other considerations than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity are important but can't impact the geographic regions framework. I we want it to regions plus culture language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years per time to five.

The ALAC adopts the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG, as the Final Report of the DSSA Board. The ALAC considers the submitted "ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan" a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan. The ALAC appreciates this preliminary work to prepare for a future-oriented and consented 5 years strategic plan and strongly supports that process.

The ALAC supports the intent of the proposed bylaw changes to increase the availability of technical advice to the Board as well as the effectiveness of the Technical Liaison Group. It is clear that the current modus operand is not working and that it has not brought any advantage to ICANN in terms of advice. However, the ALAC is concerned that the proposal is the one which the changes are presented is out of line with the original recommendations of the Board technical relationsWG findings. The ALAC understands that the proposal is not to disband the TLD altogether but to remove the TLD from the ICANN Board. We call on the ICANN Board to make sure, in the substitution of the TLD position in the Board, that it be structurally replaced by constant access to the necessary technical competence, not only through a structured, distance consultation. The ALAC considers the actual 4th amendment of the position of a technical liaison to the ICANN Board should not occur until, at least, a mechanism to seek regular advice from the Technical Liaison Group (TLD) be founded. This capability should be a permanent one and, provide for the ability of the technical contingencies to provide advice to the Board on an ongoing basis and not merely when requests are made. The ALAC is concerned that the proposed changes in the bylaws removes the TLD position from the nominating committee. The given the concern, the Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaw changes and provided a resolution adopting the bylaws: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-27-en.pdf.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of increasing name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to such queries. b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with names delegated under new gTLDs and the ICANN staff provided the following report in the new gTLD Program. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en.pdf). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 25 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take up further action once the NCAP's work on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existing TLDs to the root is complete.
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The advice issued by the Standing Panel relates to the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP) and the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Team (PICDRT).

**Process:**

1. The PICDRT process was considered as part of the public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/policy-implementation-2015-03-19-en. The Final Recommendations Report was published on 1 June 2015: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program. Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

2. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-03-05-en. The Board has taken a resolution on ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

**Characteristics:**

- The Public Interest Commitments were considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.c
- The Joint Advisory Panel considered the recommendations provided in the Final Report and provided a resolution: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
- Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
- On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program. Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

**Characteristics:**

- The Public Interest Commitments were considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.c
- Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
- On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

**Characteristics:**

- The Public Interest Commitments were considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.c
- Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
- On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

**Characteristics:**

- The Public Interest Commitments were considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.c
- Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
- On 26 June 2014, the Board has took a resolution on ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 2</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1113-03-02-01</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alege-i.cain.org/consultations/correspondence/correspondence-131103-en.htm">http://www.alege-i.cain.org/consultations/correspondence/correspondence-131103-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Final Draft Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</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>ActionTaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0613-08-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/correspondence-c/03sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/correspondence-c/03sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to revisit the issue of new TLD strings, which are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are virtually certain to create confusion among internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0613-08-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/c/03sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/c/03sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to object the objection decision system with multiple panels that leads to inconsistency and not only review the obvious case of com where conflicting objection decisions have forced such review;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0613-08-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/c/03sep13-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/compere/Correspondence/c/03sep13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to determine a stable way forward which will not create unwanted contentions nor delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure user confusion and implicit loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reconsideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The SSAC aims to delay an acceptable cost for improving accuracy and quality of registration data? Is higher cost an acceptable requirements or expectations of different stakeholders? Is additional registration processing overhead and validation should be answered: What data elements need to be added or validated to comply with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data is 'solution' to 'the WHOIS problem' until the registration data policy has been developed and accepted in the DNS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/group/ssa/docs/ssac-documents/ssac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the EUS state more clearly its positions on specific questions of data availability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In February 2014, the ICANN Board adopted a resolution to clarify the oversight role of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) in the Policy Development Process (PDP) and the related requirements for the ALAC's process. This resolution is intended to ensure that the ALAC's advice is aligned with the goals and objectives of the ICANN community and that the ALAC's advice is based on sound analysis and evaluation. The resolution also provides a framework for assessing and implementing the ALAC's advice in the PDP. The resolution is intended to facilitate a more effective and efficient process for the ALAC to provide advice on PDP-related matters.
<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>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/corresp/2013-09-26-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/corresp/2013-09-26-en.htm</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>When registries calculate variant sets for use in validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the "Name Collisions in the DNS" [PDF, 3.34 MB] study report by Interisle Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN in "New gTLD Collision Risk Management Proposal [PDF, 166 KB]." The ALAC wishes to reiterate its previous Advice to the Board that in pursuing mitigation actions to minimize residual risk, especially for those strings in the "uncalculated risk" category, ICANN must assure that such residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers and individual end-users. In particular, the direct and indirect costs associated with proposed mitigation actions should not have to be borne by registrants, consumers and individual end-users. The ALAC remains concerned that this matter is being dealt with at such a late stage of the New gTLD Process. The ALAC urges the Board to investigate how and why this crucial issue could have been ignored for so long and how similar occurrences may be prevented in the future.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/24/14</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>CANN agrees with this recommendation and the number of strings that may be activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.</td>
<td>CANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.</td>
<td>CANN agrees with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the most considered aspects of the LGR Panel to take into account in each release of the IDN LGR. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Should CANN 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.</td>
<td>CANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/pages/root-zone-lgr-2013-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (13 of 14)
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)
- SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBRIO) providers support variant TLDs, and that petty exists for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should CANN 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.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN should concentrate foremost on the rules for the root zone (versus rules for TLD registry operations).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rules (LGR) calculus.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) considered recommendations by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), public comments, and additional community feedback in its actions regarding Name Collision and Dotless Domains. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution affirming that “dotless domain names” are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en. On 31 July 2014, NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.

The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) considered recommendations by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), public comments, and additional community feedback in its actions regarding Name Collision and Dotless Domains. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution affirming that “dotless domain names” are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en. On 31 July 2014, NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.


Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN Guidelines have been updated to encourage the use of reference LGRs which allow for consistent set of guidelines. These LGRs cover the cost and benefits of resolution data validation and are posted at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/second-level-lgr-2015-06-21-en. The ICANN community considers if some of these guidelines come under their policy remit. The reference second LGRs are posted at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf. The Guidelines are being updated by the ICANN Board. NGPD recently requested deferring their approval by the Board as it considers if some of these guidelines come under their policy remit. The reference second LGRs are posted at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/second-level-lgr-2015-06-23-en. The root zone LGR is posted at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-22-en. IANA also maintains a central repository for LGR tables for all TLDs.

The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period. ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) considered recommendations by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), public comments, and additional community feedback in its actions regarding Name Collision and Dotless Domains. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution affirming that “dotless domain names” are prohibited: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-08-13-en. On 31 July 2014, NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en.
Recommendation 1: Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be required, as well as a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character TLDs in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is a clear evidence that the script is intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Greek/Cyrillic, Greek/Latin, etc.).

In November 2012, the ICANN Board provided a resolution 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#1.a). 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#1.a). Implementation work on WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a. In response to recommendation 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group’s (IRD-WG) final report, a GNSO Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and transcription of contact data, which addresses the submission of internationalized data. Board resolution 2016.03.10.06-7 requests GNSO to review policies implications of IRD Final Report and direct staff to incorporate IRD recommendations into Translation & Localization Policy implementation as consistent with policy (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#1.a).
Committee (SSAC)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

SAC048


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

1/3/12

Recommends (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD system interactivity is currently underway within ICANN and other bodies, ICANN should consider the findings of this report, and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.

Committee (SSAC)

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms: An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System

6/24/11

Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent: Domain Name or Network Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organization from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate connection to the named host, although circumvention techniques may enable connectivity to the intended system anyway (this includes simply accessing the site via IP address rather than via a Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN). A DNS resolver or network operator could also rewrite a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether rewriting a Non-Existing Domain (NODMAY) response or rewriting the DNS response for an existing FQDN, with potentially harmful effects on DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC) supporting name servers and their users. A particularly coarse-grained approach is for an operator to silently discard DNS responses, although this results in non-deterministic behavior and may itself be problematic. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply these principles: 1. The organization imposes a policy on a network and its users over which it exercises administrative control (i.e. it is the administrator of a policy domain). 2. The organization determines that the policy is beneficial to its objectives and/or the interests of its users. 3. The organization implements the policy using a technique that is least disruptive to its network operations and users, unless laws or regulations specify certain techniques. 4. The organization makes a concerted effort to do no harm to networks or users outside its policy domain as a consequence of implementing the policy.

On 3 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of industry service policy and that ICANN adopt the language used by the SSAC: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-11-28-en. Both the new gTLD Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC's terminology: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-11-28-en. Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined in this report) from their DNS domain and/or manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.

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.

Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook

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

6/24/11

The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphan glue is a misnomer in terms for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has prepared a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for the proposed definition). 2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully; and, (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.


Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined in this report) from their DNS domain and/or manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 3: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for the Board. The PDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) is currently considering this topic.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC051


SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure

3/4/11

On 3 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of industry service policy and that ICANN adopt the language used by the SSAC: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-11-28-en. Both the new gTLD Registry Agreement and the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporate the SSAC's terminology: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-11-28-en. Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined in this report) from their DNS domain and/or manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (8 of 8)

3/4/11

Phase 5: Request

The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of recommendations be developed (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-10-28-en). A roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-02-06-en. As of 30 August 2013 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC051


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

1/3/12

Recommends (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD system interactivity is currently underway within ICANN and other bodies, ICANN should consider the findings of this report, and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.

Phase 5: NOTE

The SSAC Board has accepted this advice item on 7 July 2012 with information and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.


Based on the rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2012.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC050


SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)

5/2/11

2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully; and, (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.

SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (6 of 8)

5/2/11

2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully; and, (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.

SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (7 of 8)

5/2/11

2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully; and, (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.

SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (8 of 8)

5/2/11

2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully; and, (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for the Board. The PDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) is currently considering this topic.

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.

Phase 1: Request

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.
SAC046: SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (1 of 7)
3/2/11
1. Finally, to mitigate the actual abuse of orphaned glue, registry operators should take action to remove these records when provided with evidence that the glue is indeed present to abet malicious conduct.

CERN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://www.icann.org/en/applicants/agp/guidebook-approved-09jan14-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement, Section 6.2, which references the SAC’s Advisory directly: “Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records. Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/security/sac046.pdf when provided with evidence that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.” (See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/15mar14-sac046.pdf.)

SAC047: SAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)
4/15/11
The SAC notes that in certain operating circumstances, registry functions, especially critical services such as DNS resolution and DNS security (DNSSEC), may be separable from other functions (registry database maintenance). The SAC asks whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.

The ICANN Board sent the SAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf.) Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (1 of 7)
4/15/11
The SAC recommends that ICANN define a testing process that simulates a full failure 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 (ERERO) to conduct failure testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en. A process for EREOs was implemented into the New gTLD Program and accounted for in DNS Policy (http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm), the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agp/guidebook-approved-09jan14-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this advice item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)
4/15/11
liest, the SAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Explanatory Memorandum: 1) It should be footnoted with references to G-2. 1 It should reference and use defined terms from the Applicant Guidebook rather than crafting its own definitions. 2) It imposes requirements on various parties, but it is unclear if these have the stature of requirements stated in the Applicant Guidebook. Since its function is to be explanatory, the test should truly be explanatory as opposed to normative.

The payment cycle information is reflected by the expiration date of the domain name, which is included as part of the data escrow that the successor registry receives. Each gTLD Registry is required to escrow their zone files in a centrally accessible file, with the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators with respect to root zone scaling.

The ICANN Board sent the SAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information and rationale for the decision to not implement this advice. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf.) Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5)
4/15/11
The SAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about orphan glue records. 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.

SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 5)
4/15/11
The SAC recommends that in a failure event, the successor registry be provided with the current glue records at the time of transition and the billing and payment cycle between the predecessor and successor registry.

SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (4 of 5)
4/15/11
The SAC recommends that in a failure event, the successor registry be provided with the current glue records at the time of transition and the billing and payment cycle between the predecessor and successor registry.

SAC047: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (5 of 5)
4/15/11
The SAC recommends that in a failure event, the successor registry be provided with the current glue records at the time of transition and the billing and payment cycle between the predecessor and successor registry.

SAC048: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)
5/12/11
Recommendation (2): ICANN, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and Verisign should publish statements, or a joint statement, that they are materially prepared for the proposed changes.


Recommendation (3): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including new TLDs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates.


---

**Recommendation (4):** ICANN should assess the threat level and impact (using a threshold of traffic observed at the root) of the current problem of invalid TLD queries at the root level of the Domain Name System.


---