The ALAC believes that the landscape of DNS Abuse continues to evolve and that anti-abuse incentives, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation. Notwithstanding, the ALAC believes that the landscape of DNS Abuse continues to evolve and that anti-abuse incentives, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation.

The ALAC deems the SubPro WG’s approach of Recommendation 9.15 (which is to defer the issue of DNS Abuse mitigation solely to a wider ICANN community effort or “holistic approach”) as foregoing a valuable policy discussion which we hope the ICANN Board will shepherd the community and ICANN Org in addressing.

Our concerns remain over the actions (or lack thereof) by the SubPro WG with respect to CCTRT Recommendations #14, #15, #16 (to do with DNS Security Abuse) and #29, #31 and #32 (to do with the Applicant Support Program), resulting in deficiencies which we hope the ICANN Board will consider addressing.

The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 2018 focused on two things: orientation (goals, objectives) and data, therefore the relevant recommendations represent important inputs.

Any expansion of the new gTLD Program must be beneficial to all stakeholders who benefit from the registry and registration process, as well as the Domain Name System (DNS) as a whole.

In reviewing these publications, the SSAC came to the conclusion that an early warning system for the root zone is currently infeasible, as was also concluded by OCTO-15.

While noting ICANN Board’s action on the CCTRT recommendations through its resolutions of 1 March 2020 and 27 October 2020, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to ensure that all prerequisite and high priority CCTRT recommendations are implemented, as at the latest, prior to the launch of the next round.

The ALAC deems the SubPro WG’s approach of Recommendation 9.15 (which is to defer the issue of DNS Abuse mitigation solely to a wider ICANN community effort or “holistic approach”) as bringing a valuable opportunity to modernize existing contracts with Registries and Registrars in order to contractually compel more immediate, increased efforts to stem ‘abuse’ (as defined by the contracted parties themselves).

The ALAC offers that a new application round represents a carrot and a more immediate avenue to draw contracted parties to negotiate improvements to their own DNS Abuse mitigation efforts; absent this incentive, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation.

Our concerns also remain over the seemingly lack of policy direction in respect of CCTRT Recommendation #12 (to do with user expectation regarding the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name), an omission which we hope the ICANN Board will consider addressing.

The ALAC opines that a new application round represents a carrot and a more immediate avenue to draw contracted parties to negotiate improvements to their own DNS Abuse mitigation efforts; absent this incentive, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation.

The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 2018 focused on two things: orientation (goals, objectives) and data, therefore the relevant recommendations represent important inputs.

Our concerns also remain over the seemingly lack of policy direction in respect of CCTRT Recommendation #12 (to do with user expectation regarding the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name), an omission which we hope the ICANN Board will consider addressing.

The ALAC believes that the landscape of DNS Abuse continues to evolve and that anti-abuse measures must be continuously updated, if not widened, to also recognize and address new forms of harm being perpetrated by bad actors.
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is currently reviewing AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021.

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s continued keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC’s Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program. The ALAC remains convinced that any expansion of the new gTLD market must actively and effectively remove the threshold of foreseeability from action on complaints. The ALAC maintains that a threshold of foreseeability is contrary to the original purpose of the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP), as intended by ICANN, the root zone administrator (RZA) and the root zone delegators.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s recent changes to the NCAP (as the ICANN Board hasn’t yet published the final NCAP report) to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties, and to an expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the IETF Public Safety Working Group (PSWG).

As such, the ALAC recommends that the Board instigate a review of the PICDRP to allow for complaints against any alleged registry violation of a PIC or RVC to be taken up and determined not only where the complainant is able to show evidence of significant harm suffered (as is currently required) but also on the grounds of foreseeable harm to themselves or even a third party.

The ALAC believes that SubPro WG’s A Williams’ Proposal 1: Recommendation 4.1.2 are applied equally to PICs and RVCs, and recommends that the ICANN Board direct ICANN Contractual Compliance to establish guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance on non-compliance of a PIC or an RVC for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or implementation of Registry Agreement Terminations.

ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on publishing more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or non-compliance of a PIC or an RVC.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article I, Section 1.11 reads: “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose rules and restrictions on) services that use the Internet’s unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the scope express of section 1.11.” The parenthesis clearly states that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

We noted the ICANN Board’s expressed concern that ICANN may end up enforcing contract provisions that lie outside its remit. However, the ALAC argues that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside its remit must not replace the exigency for all provisions in contract with ICANN to be enforced and be enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance.

The ALAC remains convinced that any expansion of the new gTLD market must actively and effectively remove the threshold of foreseeability from action on complaints. The ALAC maintains that a threshold of foreseeability is contrary to the original purpose of the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP), as intended by ICANN, the root zone administrator (RZA) and the root zone delegators.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s recent changes to the NCAP (as the ICANN Board hasn’t yet published the final NCAP report) to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties, and to an expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the IETF Public Safety Working Group (PSWG).

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30.
### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Further, we strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCP Studies 2 and 1 (as approved by the ICANN Board) to be implemented prior to the launch of the next round of applications for .new gTLDs, or in the alternative; that delegation of any applicant for strings which poses a risk of name collisions be withheld until the NCP studies are completed and recommendations are addressed in implementation, retroactively for the next round.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-07)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-07)</td>
<td>4/6/21</td>
<td>In the recent absence of consensus policy recommendations by SubPro WG with respect to Closed Generics, the ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted or how to address applications for Closed Generics which variance at public interest.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08A)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08A)</td>
<td>4/3/21</td>
<td>This is to notify the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to be another area for which lack of concrete policy guidance and evaluation metrics. While the SubPro has made some recommendations to improve the ASP, the evident absence of specific goals hinder proper evaluation of program objectives and performance.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-08C)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-08C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We also question the wisdom of allowing any key aspects for development by a Dedicated Implementation Review Team (DIRT) – such as addressing a risk of gaming, assessment of all forms of gaming and penalties to deter the gaming, and development of the Bl Credit for Applicant Support qualifiers – since these would conversely involve questions of policy where the community’s input would prove crucial.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-07)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-07)</td>
<td>4/6/21</td>
<td>From an implementation standpoint, we strongly advocate a dedicated Advisory Board, similarly to secure a larger fund to meaningfully support the ASP in the next round, and secondly, to take a more active coordinating role in the ASP pro-bono assistance mechanism.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09B)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We share the Board’s concern towards an applicant’s ability to “shoe-horn” funds between private auction. This ability for a buyer to apply proceeds from one private auction to fund their other private auctions only really benefits incumbent multi-TLD registry operators or multiple-string applicants, and clearly disadvantages single-string/district applicants. With ongoing and increasing consolidation of the domain name industry, allowing private auctions will likely exacerbate the advantage for merged contracted parties, leading to less competition among registries.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09C)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09C)</td>
<td>4/15/21</td>
<td>Thus, we believe there should be a ban on private auctions. Also, by mandating ICANN only auctions, the proceeds of any such ICANN auctions can at least be directed for uses in pursuit of public interest, such as was determined through the CWSG on Auction Proceeds.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09D)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09D)</td>
<td>4/15/21</td>
<td>We also believe that the use of a bona fide intent affirmation – whether for all applicants or otherwise – where factors for establishing a lack of bona fide intent are too subjective, and without deterrence through penalty, serves little purpose.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09I)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-09I)</td>
<td>4/15/21</td>
<td>After the proposed Convention Resolution Transparency Requirements framework, we do not agree with the proposed provisions on disclosing applicants and ask the Board to ensure all terms of the proposed private resolution be disclosed to ICANN Org (subject to a non-disclosure commitment by ICANN Org where necessary) as data to support and inform future policy work.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-10)</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Closed Generics (R-10)</td>
<td>4/15/21</td>
<td>The ALAC applauds the SubPro WG’s rejection of many of the ALAC suggestions to reform and improve the CPE process, evaluation criteria and procedures, and guidelines in the SubPro Final Report. However, the SubPro WG’s recommendations fall short on 2 counts for which overall on the ICANN Board to reference: a) Implementation Guidance 34.4 fails to address an unreasonable impediment to proving both “awareness and recognition of the community members” for “CPE Criteria 1-A: the absence made only in respect of the “recognition of community members” aspect ignores the collective “and” in Criterion 1-A, such that a worthy community applicant would still forfeit valuable points where “awareness of the community and recognition of the community members” for CPE Criterion 1-A; b) Implementation Guidance 34.12 fails to stipulate that the thresholding and selection of CPE provider(s) by ICANN Org is subject to community input as a pre-emptive measure for selecting the most suitable CPE Provider for subsequent procedures in order to avoid a repeat of the aboveground criticisms resulting from the CPE evaluations for the 2012 round of applications.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 July 2021, the ICANN Board Status Advice Report includes advice items that the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) submitted as of that date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>SAC115: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</td>
<td>3/19/21</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to (1) examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abusive stigmatization; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC115</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>SAC115: SSAC Report on an Interoperable Approach to Addressing Abuse Handling in the DNS</td>
<td>1/19/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to (1) examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abusive stigmatization; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Billing Review Committee (RZBRC)</td>
<td>RZBRC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>RZBRC-003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The ALAC, while on the one hand, funded by ICANN Org to file objections, should have any of its Community Objections, which would be directed through a bottom-up participative process, and dismissed on the grounds of a lack of standing, strike objections.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Billing Review Committee (RZBRC)</td>
<td>RZBRC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>RZBRC-003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>It is inadmissible that the ICANN, while on the one hand, funded by ICANN Org to file objections, should have any of its Community Objections, which would be directed through a bottom-up participative process, and dismissed on the grounds of a lack of standing, strike objections.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Billing Review Committee (RZBRC)</td>
<td>RZBRC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>RZBRC-003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>Inadmissible: A lack of standing, if any of the Community Objections, which would be directed through a bottom-up participative process, and dismissed on the grounds of a lack of standing, strike objections.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Billing Review Committee (RZBRC)</td>
<td>RZBRC-003</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>RZBRC-003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. There is no action for the ICANN board. This understanding we sent to the SSAC on 25 March 2021.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The above table represents a summary of advice items submitted to the ICANN Board. Each item includes a reference to the advice document, the advice provider, and key details such as the advice date and status. The table highlights the progression of advice items through various phases including receipt, review, and acknowledgment. Each phase is associated with specific action(s) taken by ICANN. For a comprehensive understanding, further details and context are provided in the linked advice documents and reports.
The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to recommend the number of gTLDs consistent with ICANN's strategic objectives to "fulfill the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboratively with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base." This review should be considered as input towards updating ICANN's strategic goals in conjunction with the CTT Review Team's recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following areas of study based on prior rounds of the new gTLD program: impacts on root server operations; impacts on SIR issue; impacts on overall DNS operations; analysis of how all metrics for success were met; risk analysis.

The RZERC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to recommend the number of gTLDs consistent with ICANN's strategic objectives to "fulfill the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboratively with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base." This review should be considered as input towards updating ICANN's strategic goals in conjunction with the CTT Review Team's recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following areas of study based on prior rounds of the new gTLD program: impacts on root server operations; impacts on SIR issue; impacts on overall DNS operations; analysis of how all metrics for success were met; risk analysis.

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses to, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CTT Review Team's relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enhanced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board conduct the following RZERC's Final Report (R-3) on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process, 2 subsequent implementations of the approved recommendations developing the policy, and 3) the implementation of the policy.

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data. The ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of recursive TCP traffic? The ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data. The ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data. The ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisory Status**

As of 31 July 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC023</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC023v2</td>
<td>Statement on SSAC's Role in Operations and Implementation</td>
<td>12/20/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. This public comment proceeding asks for feedback on OCTO-016: ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The RSSAC welcomes this public comment proceeding and recognizes ICANN’s operational remit, scope and independence over IAB operations. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root Server System and RSSAC has stated the importance of this feature as one of key values and strength points of the whole system. Keeping that in mind, there are areas in the publication that RSSAC finds refer to a scope larger than just IAB operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC000</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC000v5</td>
<td>Statement on ICANN’s Function in Root Name System</td>
<td>12/20/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Function in the Root Name System. This public comment proceeding is a follow-up to OCTO-015: Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 12 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee">https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee</a> (RPSAC). The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 3.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC054</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC054v2</td>
<td>Statement on ICANN’s Function in Root Name System</td>
<td>09/06/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Function in the Root Name System. This public comment proceeding is a follow-up to OCTO-015: Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 09 June 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 09 June 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee">https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee</a> (RPSAC). The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 3.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC052</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC052v2</td>
<td>Statement on ICANN’s Role in the Root Name System</td>
<td>09/04/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Role in the Root Name System. This public comment proceeding is a follow-up to OCTO-015: Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 04 September 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 04 September 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee">https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee</a> (RPSAC). The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 3.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC051</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC051v2</td>
<td>Statement on ICANN’s Role in the Root Name System</td>
<td>08/26/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Role in the Root Name System. This public comment proceeding is a follow-up to OCTO-015: Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 26 August 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 26 August 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee">https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/operational-procedures-of-the-root-server-system-advisory-committee</a> (RPSAC). The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 3.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC050</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>RSSAC050v2</td>
<td>Statement on ICANN’s Role in Operations and Implementation</td>
<td>08/20/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Role in Operations and Implementation. This public comment proceeding asks for feedback on OCTO-016: ICANN’s Role Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The RSSAC welcomes this public comment proceeding and recognizes ICANN’s operational remit, scope and independence over IAB operations. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root Server System and RSSAC has stated the importance of this feature as one of key values and strength points of the whole system. Keeping that in mind, there are areas in the publication that RSSAC finds refer to a scope larger than just IAB operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC111</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syste">https://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td>SAC111</td>
<td>SAC111: ICANN Comments on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expanded Policy Development Process</td>
<td>05/06/20</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Role in Operations and Implementation. This public comment proceeding asks for feedback on OCTO-016: ICANN’s Role Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The RSSAC welcomes this public comment proceeding and recognizes ICANN’s operational remit, scope and independence over IAB operations. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root Server System and RSSAC has stated the importance of this feature as one of key values and strength points of the whole system. Keeping that in mind, there are areas in the publication that RSSAC finds refer to a scope larger than just IAB operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Isued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SAC109</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/document/14834-sac109-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/document/14834-sac109-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC109: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community</td>
<td>31/07/2021</td>
<td>Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Review that would need amending, and the knowledge that a type of change has been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC026v2</td>
<td>RSSAC048</td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. These functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this Advisory is RSSAC026v2: RSSAC Advisory on Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 04 May 2021. RSSAC026v2 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group as it develops its proposal for root server system governance and root server operator accountability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC109</td>
<td>RSSAC038</td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. These functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this Advisory is RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 04 May 2021. RSSAC038 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group as it develops its proposal for root server system governance and root server operator accountability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC109</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/document/110-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/document/110-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC109: SSAC Comments on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report</td>
<td>2/10/2020</td>
<td>The ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) appreciates the circulation of an early draft of the findings and recommendations from the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team (RT) Draft Report, and we thank the RT for the opportunity to comment on this interim report. In this comment the SSAC presents general comments about the SSR2 review and specific comments on individual recommendations in the report. The SSAC has endeavored to meet the SSR2 timeline, and due to these time constraints this response may not be as comprehensive as the SSAC would have preferred. The SSAC would be happy to discuss these comments with the SSR2 RT at their convenience to explain any items that are unclear and require further elaboration. There are some strongly held mixed opinions within the SSAC on parts of the SSR2 report. Where there is SSAC consensus the document will state a view on behalf of the SSAC. Where there is a diverse set of opinions within the SSAC, the SSAC comment will indicate this. The SSAC would like to acknowledge the significant time and effort devoted by the members of the SSAC Review Team and thank them for their contribution on this important topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SAC109</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/document/14834-sac109-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/document/14834-sac109-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC026v4: RSSAC Advisory on the Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS</td>
<td>3/12/2020</td>
<td>This report analyses the initial effects of these technologies by identifying some groups whose actions around privacy might cause problems with widespread deployment and measurement. This report does not discuss implications occurring now, and raises some longer term challenges for the future. This report frames the issues from the perspectives of interested parties, with the understanding that the issues are nuanced, and that readers coming from different perspectives will have different sensitivities. Readers of this report must bring their own perspectives and likely to view a single issue in two different ways. The intended audience for this report is the ICANN community and the greater Internet community. This includes network operators, DNS software implementers, policy makers, and concerned Internet users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Registry must enshrine in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takedown demands. The Registry for .ORG must enshrine in its bylaws that the principal focus of the domain is nonprofits and that the principal term of service will be described after there is sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the official implementation will be put in place, e.g. an RFP process for a system meeting all the requirements described in RSSAC74 for a demonstration that the initial implementation can meet RSSAC74 requirements (including those enumerated in Recommendation 1) or another approach. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 25 March 2021, the RSSAC considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepted Recommendation 1 to implement a more permanent measurement system after establishing and using the prototype measurement system from Recommendation 1, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to implement such a system.

The RSSAC recommends that the official implementation of the metric system must: a. Meet the minimum requirements described in Section 3 of this report regarding the number, location, connectivity, and other requirements for the vantage points. b. Publish all software related to its operation under an open source license as defined by the Open Source Initiative. c. Make the raw measurement data available to anyone in the internet transparency. A third party should be able to use the raw data to verify the computation of those metrics. d. In its monthly reports, only publish threshold pass or fail indicators for each RSO, not the actual measurements or metrics used to determine the threshold pass or fail values. e. Publish the methods for collecting measurements and aggregating metrics, showing the logical topology of each measurement vantage point. This description should be complete enough for RSOs and DNS researchers to distribute the vantage points by network topology instead of geographic location. While the current ongoing evolution of RSS governance on how they should interpret and act on data from the measurement system, 1. Invests a better long-term plan for the location of the vantage points. Such a plan should distribute the vantage points by network topology instead of geographic location. 2. Whereas the current work is based on a largely empirical model of the RIS, future versions of this document may want to take a more and critical and theoretical modeling approach.

The Registry for .ORG is a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a "Benefit Corporation" (BCorporation). Additionally, the Registry must revolve and maintain B Corporation certification.

The ICANN organization understands this in the SSAC's comment on ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC's recommendation and correspondence through a letter. ICANN acknowledges ICANN: ISSOC/PIR Issue (4-H). This letter has no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the ICAC or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in SSAC718B, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN and the community. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request.
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Advice Item

Rollovers

RSSAC046: RSSAC Statement on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

1/31/20

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.

Advice Document Recommendation

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Decide

ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish a clear definition of “abuse” that is within ICANN’s remit. We assume that any such definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity (as that intersects with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam when it serves as a delivery mechanism for other forms of DNS abuse). ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct org to clarify the “purposes and applications of ” before further work is done to define DNS abuse. We are unsure, however, what ALAC’s reference to “purposes and applications of “ before further work is done to define DNS abuse. We are unsure, however, what ALAC’s reference to “purposes and applications of ” means. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise that once the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit is identified, a determination should be made whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as reference for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Decide

ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN to establish a clear definition of “abuse” that is within ICANN’s remit. We assume that any such definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity (as that intersects with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam when it serves as a delivery mechanism for other forms of DNS abuse). ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct org to clarify the “purposes and applications of “ before further work is done to define DNS abuse. We are unsure, however, what ALAC’s reference to “purposes and applications of “ means. ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise that once the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN’s remit is identified, a determination should be made whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as reference for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Decide

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

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Decide

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 05 February 2020.

Advice Item

security and stability advisory committee (ssac)

SSAC108: SSAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

SSAC108: SSAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

1/29/20

This publication represents the full SSAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The SSAC reviewed the proposal in order to assure itself, and others, that the proposal will not introduce any stability or reliability issues to the root zone, the Root Server System (RSS), or the larger DNS ecosystem. Overall, the SSAC finds no issues with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank IANA for preparing this plan and submitting it for public comment.

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 05 February 2020.

Advice Item

The Registry Agreement must establish a “DNS Abuse Ceiling”. The RA should contain both a reference to an Abuse Statement and a calculation of the maximum number of second level domains engaged in DNS Abuse as material terms. Failure to address DNS Abuse above this ceiling will constitute a breach of the RA and grounds for terminating the RA and for delegation of GNS by ICANN.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC44: RSSAC Statement on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

12/24/19

The RSSAC recognizes the opportunity to comment on subsequent KSK rollovers, and would like to thank IANA for preparing this plan and submitting it for public comment.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.
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Direct ICANN Org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

ICANN.org understands ALAC advice to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable DAAR data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.

Provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out "systems" abuse, not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

ICANN.org understands ALAC advice to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out "systems" abuse, not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability. This is an important step in fulfilling the ICANN Board's request for input on threat mitigation for the Root Server System.

Do not process registrations with "third party" payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

ICANN.org understands ALAC advice to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing payments where the payment is on behalf of an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration.

Adopt an "anti-criminal, anti-abuse" Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

ICANN.org understands ALAC advice to direct ICANN org to adopt an "anti-criminal, anti-abuse" Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement. This is an important step in fulfilling the ICANN Board's request for input on threat mitigation for the Root Server System.

Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language to facilitate ICANN Contractual Compliance to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC advice to implement ALAC's advice. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

ICANN org understands ALAC advice to direct ICANN org to implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language to facilitate ICANN Contractual Compliance to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC advice to implement ALAC's advice. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

ICANN org understands ALAC advice to direct ICANN org to require Contracted Parties to submit a Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) on a quarterly basis to ICANN. ICANN org further understands ALAC advice to direct ICANN org to require Contracted Parties to submit a Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) on a quarterly basis to ICANN. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.
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The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Security and Stability Director (SSAC) submits the following comments in response to the National Institute of Standards (NIST) request for feedback on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms. Our comments concern the role that new cryptographic algorithms would have in the implementation of DNSSEC. In general, implementing quantum-resistant cryptography in DNSSEC should be straightforward. However, an issue that we foresee, given that there are some architectural and limits in the DNS, is that some of the candidate algorithms may not be supportable in the DNS.

The ICANN.org understands that this statement is SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is now in its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be closed.

This understanding was sent to the ICANN on 10 December 2019.

The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its eighth workshop from October 1 to 3, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, four liaisons to the RSSAC, four RSSAC Caucus members, and one ICANN research fellow attended the workshop. The RSSAC workshop also featured remote participation to facilitate broader RSSAC caucus attendance. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.

The ICANN organization understands that this is SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (RSS) and decides to take no action for the ICANN Board.

This understanding was sent to the ICANN on 15 August 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that this is SAC108: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (RSS) and decides to take no action for the ICANN Board.

This understanding was sent to the ICANN on 15 August 2019.
<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>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges</td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that the aim of SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN org understands that SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board. Therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 13 June 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC042</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence</td>
<td>7/22/19</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ICANN60 joint GAC – ALAC Statement on EPDP</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/dis-">https://community.icann.org/dis-</a> <a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a>_ statements/13255</td>
<td>ICANN60 joint GAC – ALAC Statement on EPDP</td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
<td>The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement “Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN”, issued at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and synopses for all relevant issues, processes and activities – something that could be implemented without delay. In the context of the IANA transition process, ICANN was able to offer timely and comprehensive information by breaking down complex issues into understandable components, which allowed interaction within the entire community. The ALAC and the GAC are now asking from ICANN that the same level of effort be made and the same service be provided to the community concerning information on all other relevant issues. The ALAC and the GAC take this opportunity to congratulate the EPDP team and the GNSO Council on the development and approval of the Phase 1 report. The Phase 1 report provides a baseline for ensuring GDPR compliance as it pertains to the processing of Registration Data. The views of the GAC and the ALAC will be presented as part of our ongoing concerns, as articulated in our respective statements to the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board addressed this advice in their Barcelona Scorecard on 27 January 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC104</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process</td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>Follow-up to the Joint Statement From ALAC and GAC</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/di">https://community.icann.org/di</a> <a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a>_ <a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a>_</td>
<td>Follow-up to the joint statement by ALAC and GAC: Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful Participation at ICANN</td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this advice is considered closed due to these two responses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internet of Things (IoT):** The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily lives by seamlessly and autonomously sensing and acting upon our physical environment through billions of interconnected devices. While this makes the IoT vastly different from traditional Internet applications like email and web browsing, we expect that a significant number of IoT deployments will use the DNS to locate remote services that they need, for instance, to enable telemetry data transmission and collection for monitoring and analysis of sensor data. In this report, the SSAC provides a discussion on the interplay between the DNS and the IoT, arguing that the IoT represents both an opportunity and a risk to the DNS. It is an opportunity because the DNS provides functions and data that can help make the IoT more secure, stable, and transparent, which is critical given the IoT’s interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measurement studies suggest that IoT devices may stress the DNS, for instance, because of complex DOS attacks carried out by botnets that grow to hundreds of thousands or in the future millions of infected IoT devices within hours. We also identify and discuss high-level principles for the DNS and IoT industries (e.g., DNS and IoT operators and software developers) to address these opportunities and risks, for instance by making the DNS’s security functions (e.g., response verification and encryption) available on popular IoT operating systems and by developing a shared system that allows different DNS operators to automatically and continually exchange data on IoT Sensor activity. Unlike typical SSAC publications, the aim of this report is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. We therefore provide a tutorial-style discussion that is more forward looking than operational in nature. Our discussion partly falls within ICANN’s and SAC’s remit, but also goes beyond it, for instance, because the challenges we identify will take a wider range of players to address. We explicitly do not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board. | | |
<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>
</table>

The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014-02-07-08.

Phase 4 | Implement
--- | ---
Deferred | Deferred

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states in accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations. This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/epdp-2-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf) between the GNSO Council and the Board, following a motion (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsos/cm%20meetings/Motions%2021-01-25%20January%202021%20passed%20by%20the%20GNSO%20Council%20and%20the%20Board). The topic will be purged and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community to work with gTLD registries and registrars to implement a service-level agreement and registry reporting requirements for RDAP. Per the 26 February 2019 legal notification "Pursuant to Appendix A (Section 1.3) of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf), ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 1 Topics. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment Regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comment/pub-comment-2-policy-res-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the ISOD on 21 March 2021.

Phase 4 | Implement
--- | ---
Deferred | Deferred

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states in accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations. This item remains in Phase 4 | Implement. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics prior to Board consideration, as well as pending Public Comment Regarding Phase 2 Priority 1 Topics. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN.org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf). ICANN.org also notes as the Public Comment Regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comment/pub-comment-2-policy-res-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-01Feb21-en.pdf) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the ISOD on 21 March 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</th>
<th>SAC101v2</th>
<th>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-18)</th>
<th>12/21/18</th>
<th>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN community to align the current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted recommendations 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to work with the community to align the current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements. In accepting advice item 2B, the Board notes that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 2B suggests that the Board direct ICANN to work with the community to clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.” ICANN is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf</a>). Additionally, the Board resolved (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en</a>) to direct ICANN to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021. The ODP for the SSAD was launched on 24 April 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-04-24-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-04-24-en.pdf</a>). Additionally, the Board resolved on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics on 21 June 2021, adopted GNSO Council Recommendations 19-22 and directed ICANN org to develop and execute an implementation plan for the recommendations (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en</a>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</th>
<th>SAC101v2</th>
<th>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)</th>
<th>12/21/18</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item three suggests that the Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of ODPs.” ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf</a>). Additionally, the Board resolved on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics on 21 June 2021, adopted GNSO Council Recommendations 19-22 and directed ICANN org to develop and execute an implementation plan for the recommendations (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en</a>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</th>
<th>SAC101v2</th>
<th>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-4)</th>
<th>12/21/18</th>
<th>The initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item four suggests that the Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of ODPs.” ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/public-comments-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en.pdf</a>). Additionally, the Board resolved on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics on 21 June 2021, adopted GNSO Council Recommendations 19-22 and directed ICANN org to develop and execute an implementation plan for the recommendations (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-06-21-en</a>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)</td>
<td>2/13/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-14)</td>
<td>2/12/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following: (1) 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.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-24)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: A. develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work. In its rationale the Board states: "Advice item seven suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 21 January 2021 and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 21 January 2021 and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration: ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf). ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf).

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states: "Advice item seven suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf). ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf).

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-06-23-en.pdf). In its rationale the Board states: "Advice item seven suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf). ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-031621-en.pdf).
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16 of 54
Recommendation 2: Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document, individually, as part of the proposals given in Section 4 of this document. In particular, RSOs should consider the anonymization specification for IP addresses, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.

The ICANN org understands RSAAC037 Recommendation 2 for each RSO to consider anonymization procedures in RSAAC037 individually. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSAAC on 7 September 2018.

Recommendation 3: Anonymous System MUST 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 this recommendation.

The ICANN org understands RSAAC037 Recommendation 3 for Autonomous System MUST 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. This understanding was confirmed on 17 September 2018.

Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).

The ICANN org understands this recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 July 2018.

Recommendation 5: Autonomous System MUST 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 this recommendation.

The ICANN org understands RSAAC037 Recommendation 5 is not an Autonomous System MUST 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. This understanding was sent to the RSAAC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands this recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 July 2018.

Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to incorporate the following principle into its contracts with gTLD RDDS service providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain technical access mechanism. E. The ICANN Board should arrange updates to the Registrar Accreditation Model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to build on RSSAC032 and the feedback on the draft recommendations from the RSSAC Review Work Party (RWPP) to the independent examiners.

This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. The ICANN Board received comments on the first draft of Version 1 of SAC101 on 12 December 2018. The ICANN Board received these comments and recommended them to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

Recommendation 3: Autonomous System MUST 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 this recommendation.

The ICANN org understands RSAAC037 Recommendation 3 is not an Autonomous System MUST 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. This understanding was sent to the RSAAC on 7 September 2018.

Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).

The ICANN org understands this recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 19 July 2018.

Recommendation 5: Autonomous System MUST 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 this recommendation.

The ICANN org understands RSAAC037 Recommendation 5 is not an Autonomous System MUST 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. This understanding was sent to the RSAAC on 7 September 2018.
**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Advisory Status**
As of 31 July 2021

| 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) | SAC031 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/sac-031-en.pdf | SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R.4 | 6/1/18 | Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to clarify that if a data field is requested to be published, the registry or registrar must publish it in RDDS server output, not just in Web-based output. | Phase 3 | received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC031 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/sac-031-en.pdf | SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R.7 | 6/1/18 | Recommendation 7: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties. | Phase 3 | received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-037-038 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-037-038-en.pdf | RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1 | 6/1/18 | The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. | Phase 1 | evaluate & consider |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-037-038 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-037-038-en.pdf | RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2 | 6/1/18 | The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037 section 5.5.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. | Phase 1 | implement |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-037-038 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-037-038-en.pdf | RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3 | 6/1/18 | The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, sections 5.5.1, 5.5.2 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. | Phase 1 | complete request |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC-015-005-01-00-BN | https://en.zone露天Dropdown.domains/1245 | Release for Registration one .COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: .D.COM | 6/5/18 | Given the lack of stock stability and competition concerns, the ALAC believes the introduction of D.COM represents no downside to end users. The ALAC further suggests that the proceeds of the auction be used to make concrete progress on universal acceptance, one of the primary functions of end users with regards to the introduction of new top level domains. | Phase 1 | no action for the ICANN Board |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-039 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-039-en.pdf | RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement on the Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee | 7/6/18 | The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to publicly comment on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom). The ICANN board understands this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee submitted during the public comment period to the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee. | Phase 1 | complete request |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-034 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-034-en.pdf | RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC, May 2018 Workshop | 7/6/18 | This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model; discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcome from the workshop held in Venice in early May. | Phase 1 | complete request |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-033 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-033-en.pdf | RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root Ops | 7/6/18 | The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC statement regarding Release 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. | Phase 1 | no action for the ICANN Board |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC-035 | https://www.icann.org/en/statements/files/files/rssac-035-en.pdf | RSSAC035: RSSAC Statement on the Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee | 7/6/18 | The ICANN board understands this statement as the final report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee (NomCom). The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC statement regarding Release 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. | Phase 1 | complete request |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC-015-005-01-00-BN | https://en.zone露天Dropdown.domains/1245 | ALAC: Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replacement Strategy | 6/6/18 | The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replacement strategy. At present, the strategy is: The replacement period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (i). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $15 million to total, in line with principle (ii). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $36 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 (US $3m less US $3m and less US $3m above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: (i) Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD program; or (ii) Additional contribution from ICANN Org (iii) Additional contribution from the Auction Proceeds. The ALAC supports this overall strategy but with the following conditions and additions: | Phase 1 | no action for the ICANN Board.
The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure") for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure") for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure") for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure"). This is the ICANN statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN-proposed Interim Model. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment: https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicy/Al- Large+Workspace%3A%2BICANN%2Bfellowship%2Bprogram%2Bcommunity%2Bconsultation. As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/comments/community-gtld-change-procedure-2018-02-14-en). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ioo-recs-2017-11-10-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ICAC statement on Modifications to the ICANN Board Agendas: Towards a Holistic Approach to Agenda Setting. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ICAC statement on Modifications to the ICANN Board Agendas: Towards a Holistic Approach to Agenda Setting. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ICAC statement on Modifications to the ICANN Board Agendas: Towards a Holistic Approach to Agenda Setting. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the Joint Statement on the Draft Decision to Utilize the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ICAC statement on Modifications to the ICANN Board Agendas: Towards a Holistic Approach to Agenda Setting. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the proposed ICANN Operating Plan Update for 2019. This is the ALAC Statement on Draft Decision to Use the .co Generic TLD: Community Consultation. This statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN board understands that SAC039 is a response from the SSAC to the IDN Guidelines Working Group (IDWG) regarding the ICANN’s 27 July 2017 letter that raised a question around "non-authoritative" records constrained to comply with IDNA2008 by the IDN Guidelines. The SSAC concludes that for normal infrastructure records and other records identifying hosts: It should be either: 1) a traditional label, ASCII letters, digits, and the hyphen with the further restrictions that a hyphen cannot appear at the beginning or end of the string or adjacent to another hyphen, or 2) a valid A-label complying with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 (also known as IDNA2008) and their successors, and not in any way dependent on mapping these records should be used without delegated variants, other variations, and, insofar as can be controlled, any infrastructure records that create a re- referral, such as DNAME or DNAME records pointing into or out of the Fully Qualified Domain Name, even if the DNS protocol or other procedures allow those mechanisms.
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**Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**

**RSSAC028: Report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop**

10/24/17

This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides an at-a-glance summary of the outcomes from the fifth RSSAC workshop held hosted by the University of Maryland in early October.

**RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures**

2/26/17

These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document has been updated to reflect any changes to the procedures where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

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

**SSAC098: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2)**

10/4/17

The SSAC sent a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/faltstrom-to-icann-board-20171004-en.pdf) to the ICANN Board on 3 October 2017, regarding the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted advice to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The SSAC has serious concerns that the SSR2 effort may bring a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The SSAC believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. SSAC recommendation: The ICANN Board of Directors and the SSAC community should take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.

**RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers R-4**

8/31/17

**Recommendation 6:** 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 brought 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 hasn’t DO. Research to reduce the response size might consider:

- Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name;
- Revising the consequences of large responses having the TC bit set;
- Backward-compatible protocol enhancements;
- Using DNS to support a priming specific single signature over the entire priming set (SIG, 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 KSK + ZSK scheme;
- Effects of allowing the Additional section in priming responses empty.

**RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers R-5**

8/31/17

The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is to not change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC Caucus Root Server Naming Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider:

- The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable a reader to authenticate resource records within the priming response. The root server addresses should be signed in a way that reduces the potential for operational leakage. For example, the root server IP information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. This can be done using delegation or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root servers’ A/AAAA Records and the root zone should be hosted on the root servers. Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (§5.6), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (§5.4) are both viable options that would result in adding the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.

**RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers R-5**

8/31/17

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

**RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers R-6**

8/31/17

Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impacts of node re-delegation attacks.

**RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers R-5**

8/31/17

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

**Phase 4**

**Implement**

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to that studies on current behavior of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses (queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as DO, are interpreted by root servers and DNS software).

**Phase 4**

**Implement**

ThFrom RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand 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 ICANN Board on 1/17/2018. Upon further review of our original understanding, the org would like to retract it. Because this recommendation is listed as a sub-optimal, the org believes no action is needed for the ICANN Board to take this item should be closed. ICANN understands that the RSSAC would like to conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN org understands there is no action for the ICANN Board.

**Phase 5**

**Close Request**


**Phase 4**

**Implement**

The ICANN org 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 scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN org understands there is no action for the ICANN Board.

**Phase 5**

**Implement**

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 5 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN org understands there is no action for the ICANN Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials/2018-06-23-en#1.g">https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials/2018-06-23-en#1.g</a></td>
<td>SAC097: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers-5</td>
<td>8/3/17</td>
<td>No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>ALAC-017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-017-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/alac-017-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>6/21/17</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of complaints requiring Contractual Compliance follow-up with respect to zone file access. This includes multiple engagements and educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN’s expectations with respect to zone file access.</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>6/21/17</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion. This includes multiple engagements and educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN’s expectations with respect to zone file access.</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 July 2021

---

**Reports, R-3**

Registry Operator Monthly Activity

**SAC097:** SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion. The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of complaints requiring Contractual Compliance follow-up with respect to zone file access. This includes multiple engagements and educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN’s expectations with respect to zone file access. This includes multiple engagements and presentations to the GFO/Registrars Stakeholder Group, the Brand Registry Group, and individual registrars.

---

**ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights**

The ICANN organization understands that the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

---

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

---

**RSSAC028:** Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers-5

As of 31 July 2021
Committee (SSAC)

Security and Stability Advisory

SAC096

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability

SAC095

SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R4

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of the .NET Registry Agreement

SA005

SSAC Advisory on the Use of IDNA In Domain Names R-1

As of 31 July 2021

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item

Advice Document Reference Number

Link to Advice Document

Issue Date

Advice Document Recommendation

Phase I - Implement

SAC096

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf

6/12/17

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

Phase I - Implement

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the public reporting for Web-based WHOIS query statistics (https://www.icann.org/resources-board/material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en-gtld). ICANN staff continues to facilitate the conversation between SSAC and RySG. The SSAC and RySG met to discuss observations of SSAC during ICANN68, where RySG raised concerns. SSAC will work with registrars to ensure the accuracy of the gTLDs. ICANN has created an internal solution for zone file access statistics, which is available through CDS. ICANN.org will continue to support the ICANN registry operators to provide reports with the information provided by CDS. During the September 2020 meeting with ICANN Org, SSAC leadership agreed to work with the TechOps group, which includes registry operators for a solution to have a standardization of the report data about Web-based WHOIS query statistics.

SAC095

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf

6/12/17

This is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability. The ALAC supports the general direction of the recommendations, but does offer the following specific comments. 1. The "best practice", once one by one, each make sense. However, together the ALAC has concern about the impact on groups remembering that these are all volunteers with often relatively minimal staff support. Accountability is important, but a fully accountable group that does nothing other than be accountable has no value within ICANN. 3. The ALAC supported the original position of the SSAC Accountability Working Group to not pursue the accountability by roundtable. That was overturned by the CCWG. As currently proposed there is a high likelihood that it will become a meaningless exercise taking up valuable time at ICANN meetings with little benefit. That notwithstanding, if the decision is made that it should be kept, further thought needs to be given to exactly what it will do and what its aim is. 3. The ALAC does not support the explicit incorporation of ALAC best practices review into the RTT scope. The periodic organizational reviews are a more appropriate opportunity to do such a review. If a future ATRT chooses to do such a review, it is already wholly within its scope and prerogative.

ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of the .NET Registry Agreement

SAC094

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf

6/16/17

The ALAC does not have any comment to make on the changes to the content of the contract overall as we believe that much of it has been predetermined by agreement. However, the increasing cost of .NET domains is a concern as it would make them unaffordable and thus un accessible for low end users, especially for those in already underserved regions. The proposed $10 increase is also out of scope of an ICANN Registry Agreement. A query was raised as to whether or how .NET funds are returned to serve the internet community in line with the redistribution of funds into the community by the Internet Society, to support Internet development.

ALAC Statement on the Proposed Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability

SAC094

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf

6/16/17

This is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 13 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/so-ac-accountability-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability

SAC093

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf

5/30/17

As previously noted, the Nominating Committee (NomCom) raised concerns. ICANN org will work with registries to improve the accuracy of the Zonefile Access metric. The SSAC and RySG met to discuss observations of SSAC during ICANN68, where RySG raised concerns. SSAC will work with registrars to ensure the accuracy of the gTLDs. ICANN has created an internal solution for zone file access statistics, which is available through CDS. ICANN.org will continue to support the ICANN registry operators to provide reports with the information provided by CDS. During the September 2020 meeting with ICANN Org, SSAC leadership agreed to work with the TechOps group, which includes registry operators for a solution to have a standardization of the report data about Web-based WHOIS query statistics.

SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R4

SAC093

0517-07-00-AL-ALAC-ST-EN

m/files/files/sac-093-en.pdf

5/30/17

While the metric described in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to RZ-LGR or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that implements RZ-LGR based on IDNA2008 for validating TLDs. Existing IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDNA2003 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/idnic-resolution-2017-05-10-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDNA2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGRs is also recommended in the recent recommendation for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-10-implementation-2018-07-20-and-adopted-by-the-ICANNBoard-at-CARAS4-for-further-consideration-by-GNSO-and-ccTLDs. Finally, the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/system/files/files-idnic-resolution-2014-12-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 10 June 2018 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccTLDs have considered these items as part of their policy development work. SubPro WG has included RZ-LGR based on IDNA2008 for validating TLDs. Existing IDN gTLDs and ccTLDs are also based on IDNA2008. So this advice is being addressed both currently and in upcoming policies for GNSO and ccTLDs.
### Recommendation 1: ICANN Board Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

**Phase:** Close Request

**Issue:** On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see [https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials-resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials-resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf)). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDNA2008 under the new gTLD program. So registrations for such gTLDs do not permit emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for the following three reasons: and this comment will be included in that consideration ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-2017-11-02-en.html](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-2017-11-02-en.html)). The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see [https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials-resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources-board/materials-resolutions-2017-11-02-en.pdf)). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDNA2008 under the new gTLD program. So registrations for such gTLDs do not permit emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for the following three reasons: and this comment will be included in that consideration ([https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-2017-11-02-en.html](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-2017-11-02-en.html)). The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Public Comment Period:** 22 May 2017 - 19 June 2017

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Chair Statement on the ICANN Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the draft FY18 budget. The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the draft FY18 budget and requested that it be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line. The ALAC Chair also requested that the draft FY18 budget be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line.

The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the draft FY18 budget and requested that it be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line. The ALAC Chair also requested that the draft FY18 budget be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains

"The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Recommendations to the GNSO PDP Manual. Whether this will include a CWG or some other form of group(s) will need to be decided jointly by the ccNSO and the GNSO prior to work proceeding."

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to the GNSO PDP Manual

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Recommendations to the GNSO PDP Manual. Whether this will include a CWG or some other form of group(s) will need to be decided jointly by the ccNSO and the GNSO prior to work proceeding."

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC026: RSSAC Leconin

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's statement on the Recommendations related to the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

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

The ALAC statement on the Proposals for Bylaw Changes to Move the Board's Governance Committee’s Responsibilities to the Reconsideration Process is to be included in this report. It is to be included in the item numbers. The ALAC wishes to make clear that this is a tentative statement and that it is not intended to be inclusive of the entire Board's responsibilities. This statement is not intended to be included in this report.

The ALAC statement on the Proposals for Bylaw Changes to Move the Board's Governance Committee’s Responsibilities to the Reconsideration Process is to be included in this report. It is to be included in the item numbers. The ALAC wishes to make clear that this is a tentative statement and that it is not intended to be inclusive of the entire Board's responsibilities. This statement is not intended to be included in this report.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

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

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Responsibilities to the Reconsideration Process. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 17 May 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments/bgc-ls-bgp-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Responsibilities to the Reconsideration Process. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 17 May 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments/bgc-ls-bgp-17may17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Chair Statement on the ICANN Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the draft FY18 budget and requested that it be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line. The ALAC Chair also requested that the draft FY18 budget be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line.

The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments outside the draft FY18 budget and requested that it be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line. The ALAC Chair also requested that the draft FY18 budget be extended to help improve the ICANN bottom line.

RIPE NCC

RIPE-SO-2015-04-04

The ICANN organization understands this is the RIPE's statement on the Recommendations to the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RIPE's statement on the Recommendations to the ICANN's Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.
**ADVICE ITEM: SSAC091**

The SSAC has reviewed the presentation on Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) and provides this response to the Call for Public Comments on "The description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers." We believe that the diseases proposed are too broad and do not reflect the specific characteristics of the DNS root system. We recommend simplifying and "de-Latinizing" the document. We fully support the basic approach rooted in the ICANN organization's fifth disease of the global DNS and suggest focusing on the DNS root system.

**ADVICE ITEM: SAC091**

The ICANN organization understands SAC091 is the SSAC's comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI). We will consider this advice in our work.

**ARTICLE 12**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1201-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-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.
Advice Item Status

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

RSSAC023

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Action(s) Taken:
The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA) Region View (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-middle-east-and-northern-africa-2018-06-23-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.

SSAC089

Evaluation of SAC084

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materials/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1).

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

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

Phase: Close Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

On 22 March 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedure PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materia...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC025</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/comments/sac-025-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/comments/sac-025-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Overview of RSSAC Workshop (third workshop: 23-27 February 2017)</td>
<td>5/17/16</td>
<td>Draft of recommendation submitted to ICANN Board for their consideration.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC’s response to the PDP Working Group on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address gTLDs. 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/documents/comments/sac-022-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/comments/sac-022-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new gTLD Registration Directory Services 7 Second Outreac</td>
<td>5/16/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC’s response to the PDP Working Group on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address gTLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC084</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/comments/sac-084-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/comments/sac-084-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC084: SSAC Comments on Guidelines for the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process</td>
<td>8/31/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC084 is the SSAC’s response to the PDP Working Group on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address gTLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link to Advice Document


End Users Should Care

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, issues: WHOIS Registration Directory Services - INNA Functions & Stewardship Transition - Contracted Party Agreements - IDNs - New gTLDs - Public Internet - Internet Governance - ICANN Policy Processes - Accountability & Transparency - ICANN Operations/Finances - Reviews at ICANN - Engagement & Outreach.


Action(s) Taken

- SAC084: Final
- SAC087: Final
- SAC085: Final
- SAC082: Final
- SAC081: Final

Advice Item Status ICANN Board Status Advice Report

- SAC084: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9867
- SAC081: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9864
- SAC082: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9866
- SAC085: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9869
- SAC087: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9865
### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<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>ALAC</td>
<td>SAC081</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC081">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC081</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement</td>
<td>SAC081</td>
<td>This is the ALAC's statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group's 3rd PDP Working Group Request for Input on Next Generation gTLD RDS to replace WHOIS FDP. The respective public comment period closed on 26 August 2016 and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 31 July 2016. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
<td>SAC082</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC082">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC082</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Request for Input on Next Generation gTLD RDS to replace WHOIS FDP (Policy Development Process [PDP])</td>
<td>6/25/16</td>
<td>SAC response to the request for input to better inform the policy development process</td>
<td>SAC082</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is SAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input on building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. SAC082 was confirmed this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
<td>SAC083</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC083">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/SAC083</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process</td>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>SSAC response to the working group request for input to better inform the policy development process</td>
<td>SAC083</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is SAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input on building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. SAC083 was confirmed this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's statement on the Final Report. The respective public comment period closed 23 May 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 25 May 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s proposal for Multi-Year F2F meetings. The respective public comment period closed 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the CCWG Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The respective public comment period closed 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-operating-plan-budget-6june16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-operating-plan-budget-6june16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Cross Community Working Groups Operating Plan 2016 and Five-Year Operating Plan. The respective public comment period closed 22 October 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 22 November 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The respective public comment period closed 24 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 May 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geographic-regions-23may16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geographic-regions-23may16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Final Report of the Cross Community Working Groups for the Draft Framework of Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 April 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-framework-crosscommunity-working-groups-20apr16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-framework-crosscommunity-working-groups-20apr16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the GAC Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-1-23feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-1-23feb16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the CCWG Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 3 Recommendations. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s proposal for Multi-Year F2F meetings. The respective public comment period closed 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Cross Community Working Groups Operating Plan 2016 and Five-Year Operating Plan. The respective public comment period closed 22 October 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 22 November 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 18 December 2015 and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the CCWG Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-1-23feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-1-23feb16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the GAC Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 3 Recommendations. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s proposal for Multi-Year F2F meetings. The respective public comment period closed 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Draft Cross Community Working Groups Operating Plan 2016 and Five-Year Operating Plan. The respective public comment period closed 22 October 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 22 November 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 18 December 2015 and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the GAC Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 3 Recommendations. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gac-accountability-supplemental-final-proposal-work-stream-3-23feb16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s proposal for Multi-Year F2F meetings. The respective public comment period closed 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-multiple-year-f2f-budget-6june16-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC’s statement on the Draft Cross Community Working Groups Operating Plan 2016 and Five-Year Operating Plan. The respective public comment period closed 22 October 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 22 November 2015 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-crosscommunity-working-groups-plan-22nov15-en.pdf)) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 18 December 2015 and the item is now closed.
The RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC020 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC020v2 was published on 26 January 2015. It builds on the previous draft, updates a number of minor substantive issues pointed out by reviewers, and adds some text not covered in the previous draft. At this time the RSSAC wishes to address three other issues and again update RSSAC020. It requests Dave Weathers to lead a cross-work group to produce version 3 of RSSAC020.

RSSAC020v3 was published on 27 February 2017. This version includes several updates, including new text on coordination and a new section on the scope of the document. The RSSAC wishes to address one other issue and then update RSSAC020.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item: ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Document Recommendation: The RSSAC organization understands ICANN017 from the RSSAC's scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC020 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

Actors Taken: The RSSAC organization understands ICANN017 from the RSSAC's scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC020 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

#### Advisory Item Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN</td>
<td>Issued 12/21/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The review provides a pragmatic overview of lessons learned from the implementation process which will not only inform the formal Review Team assessment of the implementation process but also provide solutions for creating improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of this process based on staff assessment of this first round of implementation. Of concern to our community was the lifecycle of the application and evaluation process relating to the first batch of applications and that the remaining applications will still not be completed until the end of 2017 which is far beyond originally projected timelines. Among the reasons for the delays include some effectiveness and efficiencies in relation to the time spent on some requirements of the application process that may not have been completely necessary as all applications or as there was no contractual requirement attached. It was noted that some areas of the application process may benefit from further community discussion based on staff lessons learned. We encourage the Review Team to support the recommendations made by staff, and at the same time, give full consideration for more practical support to ensure that the remaining and future batches of applications are expedited as quickly and efficiently as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 3 February 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf</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>AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN</td>
<td>Issued 12/21/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The review provides a pragmatic overview of lessons learned from the implementation process which will not only inform the formal Review Team assessment of the implementation process but also provide solutions for creating improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of this process based on staff assessment of this first round of implementation. Of concern to our community was the lifecycle of the application and evaluation process relating to the first batch of applications and that the remaining applications will still not be completed until the end of 2017 which is far beyond originally projected timelines. Among the reasons for the delays include some effectiveness and efficiencies in relation to the time spent on some requirements of the application process that may not have been completely necessary as all applications or as there was no contractual requirement attached. It was noted that some areas of the application process may benefit from further community discussion based on staff lessons learned. We encourage the Review Team to support the recommendations made by staff, and at the same time, give full consideration for more practical support to ensure that the remaining and future batches of applications are expedited as quickly and efficiently as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-draft-review-29jan16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-draft-review-29jan16-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>AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN</td>
<td>Issued 12/21/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The review provides a pragmatic overview of lessons learned from the implementation process which will not only inform the formal Review Team assessment of the implementation process but also provide solutions for creating improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of this process based on staff assessment of this first round of implementation. Of concern to our community was the lifecycle of the application and evaluation process relating to the first batch of applications and that the remaining applications will still not be completed until the end of 2017 which is far beyond originally projected timelines. Among the reasons for the delays include some effectiveness and efficiencies in relation to the time spent on some requirements of the application process that may not have been completely necessary as all applications or as there was no contractual requirement attached. It was noted that some areas of the application process may benefit from further community discussion based on staff lessons learned. We encourage the Review Team to support the recommendations made by staff, and at the same time, give full consideration for more practical support to ensure that the remaining and future batches of applications are expedited as quickly and efficiently as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 3 February 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisory Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>L267/5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/liaison-statement-l267-05mar15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/liaison-statement-l267-05mar15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Notes on the Need for Establishing New Certification Authorities</td>
<td>21/3/15</td>
<td>The need to evaluate the SSAC's work including engagement and coordination with the DNS, DNSSEC, and DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DNS) program. The SSAC believes that standardization based on DNS is possible in coordination with independent industry-developed solutions such as Certificate Transparency and CRL. Additionally, we encourage interested parties to cooperate closely with the CA/Browser (CAB) Forum and Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).</td>
<td></td>
<td>This advice is not directed at the ICANN Board, but rather the SSAC's response to the 2 November 2015 liaison statement from ITU Study Group 2 Question 2. We note that the SSAC encourages interested parties to cooperate with the CAB Forum and IETF on their work related to DNS-based Authentication of Named Entities (DNSSEC). As such, we do not believe that there are any actionable items for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisory Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-075-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>31/7/19</td>
<td>ALAC-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs. The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 30 November 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 2 December 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rpm-prelim-issue-02dec15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rpm-prelim-issue-02dec15-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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Advisory Item

- **ICANN Board Status Advice Report**: Advisory Item Status
- **Action(s) Taken**: The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 3 February 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC074 | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf | SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Root Zone Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4 | 11/17/15 | Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrants 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 advance training staff in the creation of a curriculum. | Phase 4 | Implement |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC073 | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf | SAC073: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Management Lifecycle - Item 1 | 11/17/15 | Item 1: We recommend that the drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons per registrar and registry 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 advance training staff in the creation of a curriculum. | Phase 4 | Implement |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC073 | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf | SAC073: SSAC Advisory on Root Zone Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 1 | 11/17/15 | Item 1: We recommend that the drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons per registrar and registry 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 advance training staff in the creation of a curriculum. | Phase 4 | Implement |
| Action Advisory Committee (AAAC) | SAC074 | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf | SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Management Lifecycle - Item 2 | 11/17/15 | Item 2: A provision similar to 2013 RAA paragraph 3.20 should be incorporated into all future registry contracts, with similar statistics published. | | |
| Action Advisory Committee (AAAC) | SAC074 | https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_m/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf | SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Management Lifecycle - Item 4 | 11/17/15 | Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrants 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 advance training staff in the creation of a curriculum. | Phase 4 | Implement |
As of 31 July 2021

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Advisor</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>
</table>
ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advisory Status
As of 33 July 2021

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC013: Statement of Scope and Work for “Historical and Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used for Individual Root Servers”
7/20/15
The RSSAC, while to make a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers, the document 2/document the historical value of the names assigned to individual root servers once the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular, whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-DEFN. The Committee recommends approving the re-organization of the root server addresses. 3) Perform a risk analysis; and 4) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root name management partners, and ICANN on which changes should be made, and what those changes should be.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
ALAC073: ALAC Motion to accept the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)
6/5/15
ALAC Motion to accept the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). Approves Final Proposal - PTI Board Members should attempt to address as given by - Success of PTI contingent on adequate funding - Affirms its commitment to continue to support the CWG-Stewardship

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
SSAC070: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal
5/28/15
This is a Comment to the ICANN, the ICANN community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Response to the ICANN Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions. The document will: 1) Document the technical history of the names assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular, whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-DEFN. The Committee recommends approving the re-organization of the root server addresses. 4) Perform a risk analysis; and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root name management partners, and ICANN on which changes should be made, and what those changes should be.

RSSAC013: Resolution (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from ICANN received SSAC’s approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

ALAC074: ALAC Motion to accept the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)
5/28/15
ALAC Motion to accept the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). Approves Final Proposal - PTI Board Members should attempt to address as given by - Success of PTI contingent on adequate funding - Affirms its commitment to continue to support the CWG-Stewardship

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
SSAC071: SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal
5/28/15
SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal
6/5/15
SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal
6/25/15
SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal
7/9/15
Public Comment Statement: In general the ALAC is supportive of the direction being taken by the CWG and will provide guidance on number of issues, some of which the CWG is explicitly seeking, and others where the ALAC believes that reconsideration may be required. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20aug15-en.pdf

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC012: RSSAC Public Comment on IANA Accountability Draft Proposal 2 Draft Report
6/5/15
IANA Accountability Draft Proposal 2

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC011: RSSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)
5/28/15
This is a Comment to the ICANN, the ICANN community, and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) on the Response to the ICANN Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions. The document will: 1) Document the technical history of the names assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular, whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-DEFN. The Committee recommends approving the re-organization of the root server addresses. 4) Perform a risk analysis; and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root name management partners, and ICANN on which changes should be made, and what those changes should be.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 4a: ICANN, as part of its initiatives on universal acceptance, should encourage the software development community (including the open source community) to develop and distribute programming libraries that implement the PSL, with attention towards software developers. As part of this initiative, ICANN should provide funding for this initiative and monitor whether the UASG’s effort is successful. ICANN notes that more specific documentation of this audience (beyond merely including open source) would further the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the promotion effort. On 14 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-matериалы/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 4a is now closed, as the ICANN organization understands that ICANN'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 ICANN Board in May 2017.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSLs. The document will: 1) Document the technical history of the names assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 2) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular, whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-DEFN. The Committee recommends approving the re-organization of the root server addresses. 4) Perform a risk analysis; and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root name management partners, and ICANN on which changes should be made, and what those changes should be.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 1: Recognizing alternatives to the PSL have been discussed (see Appendix A), the SSAC recommends the IETF and the applications community consider them for further specifications and possible standardization through the IETF process.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 2: The IETF should develop a consensus definition of "public suffix" and other associated terminology (e.g. "private suffix").

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 3: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 4: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mosaic PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 4a).

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 5: Application developers should include the root server addresses for TLDs which have not yet been returned to their registries or have unresolved routing to the root zone.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 6: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mosaic PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 4a).

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 7: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 8: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mosaic PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 4a).

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 9: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 10: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mosaic PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 4a).

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 11: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 12: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mosaic PSL and the proposed IANA PSL (Recommendation 4a).

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 13: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 14: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 15: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.

R-2 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists
Recommendation 16: Application developers should use a canonical list format and include validation protocols as specifications to this work.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the UASG to explicitly include the use of a PSL, and act on related to a PSL aspect of their work. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the UASG confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN is ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 03 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 June 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2015/jun/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-0611en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-05-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 01 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 05 June 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2015/jun/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-0605en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-05-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 17 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2</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-015-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_document/AD-11feb15-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_document/AD-11feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC010: RSSAC Statement of Scope for ALAC Statement on the Potential Change Starting Repertoire Version 2</td>
<td>1/30/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit several million users of IDN-based services, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the ISPs are aware and active, others have been less active or inactive. It is important that the IDN program is harmonized in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and engagement with the IAC. The ALAC also recommends that the UAI be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program. MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7, but is limited to the Unicode 6.2 subset. Given that the Unicode 6.0 is scheduled for release in 2015, there may be questions from the community on the stability of the contents of MSR-2, particularly if the Generation Panels are to immediately commence their work based on MSR-2. The ALAC recommends that ICANN clarifies the impact, if any, of changes to the underlying Unicode standard on MSR-2. Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of LGR-1, and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once registered names (or add more PVALID codepoints to the MSR) without causing serious erosion of trust in the Global Internet in general and IDNs in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term ramifications. The ALAC assures its support to the ICANN community in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint action with the At-Large Structures in relevant geographies. Report of Public Comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-015-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 13 March 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 April 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-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>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC011</td>
<td><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></td>
<td>RSSAC011: IAB-Liaison to the RSSAC Procedure-08apr15-en.pdf</td>
<td>2/12/15</td>
<td>History the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has provided a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). With the recent re-establishment of the RSSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC010</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgr-19feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC010: IAB-Liaison to the RSSAC - for &quot;Root Zone TTLs&quot;</td>
<td>2/1/15</td>
<td>This statement refers back to RSSAC010 and requests IAB liaisons to the Root Zone TTLs, with adherence to RSSAC caucus procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of the RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-015-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_document/AD-11feb15-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_document/AD-11feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information POP Initial Report</td>
<td>3/30/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC notes the importance of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit several million users of IDN-based services, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the ISPs are aware and active, others have been less active or inactive. It is important that the IDN program is harmonized in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and engagement with the IAC. The ALAC also recommends that the UAI be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program. MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7, but is limited to the Unicode 6.2 subset. Given that the Unicode 6.0 is scheduled for release in 2015, there may be questions from the community on the stability of the contents of MSR-2, particularly if the Generation Panels are to immediately commence their work based on MSR-2. The ALAC recommends that ICANN clarifies the impact, if any, of changes to the underlying Unicode standard on MSR-2. Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of LGR-1, and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once registered names (or add more PVALID codepoints to the MSR) without causing serious erosion of trust in the Global Internet in general and IDNs in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term ramifications. The ALAC assures its support to the ICANN community in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint action with the At-Large Structures in relevant geographies. Report of Public Comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-015-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 13 March 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 April 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-igprocedure-08apr15-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>Action Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advisory 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>ALAC</td>
<td>SAC069</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition</td>
<td>2/17/14</td>
<td>In its regular meeting on 30 November 2014, the SSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities should ensure that parameters, names, and numbers have been invited to submit proposals that should determine 1) whether to call the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and 2) if so which ones; 3) 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.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 46-ALAC-SAC069-01-01-01 to be an ALAC statement on the SSAC Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). To date, no action has been taken on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
<td>SAC069</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition</td>
<td>2/17/14</td>
<td>In its regular meeting on 30 November 2014, the SSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities should ensure that parameters, names, and numbers have been invited to submit proposals that should determine 1) whether to call the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and 2) if so which ones; 3) 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.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 46-ALAC-SAC069-01-01-01 to be an ALAC statement on the SSAC Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). To date, no action has been taken on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board</td>
<td>SAC009</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition</td>
<td>2/17/14</td>
<td>In its regular meeting on 30 November 2014, the SSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities should ensure that parameters, names, and numbers have been invited to submit proposals that should determine 1) whether to call the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and 2) if so which ones; 3) 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.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 46-ALAC-SAC069-01-01-01 to be an ALAC statement on the SSAC Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). To date, no action has been taken on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board</td>
<td>SAC009</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition</td>
<td>2/17/14</td>
<td>In its regular meeting on 30 November 2014, the SSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone.</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities should ensure that parameters, names, and numbers have been invited to submit proposals that should determine 1) whether to call the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA Functions Contract should be retained, and 2) if so which ones; 3) 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.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 46-ALAC-SAC069-01-01-01 to be an ALAC statement on the SSAC Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). To date, no action has been taken on this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands 46-ALAC-SAC069-01-01-01 to be an ALAC statement on the SSAC Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20). To date, no action has been taken on this issue.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/31/14</td>
<td>RSSAC confirmed that: The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005 provides RSSAC’s statement on the Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul, Turkey in September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</em></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</em></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</em></td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The advice items and recommendations are illustrative and subject to the ICANN Board's decision.*
<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-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-21)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-21. The Board must implement ATLAS II Recommendation 9.3, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation3">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation3</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-22)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-22. The ALAC should work with all MOAs and ASes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation29">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation29</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-23)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-23. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs, and accessible by everyone.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation35">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation35</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-31)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation31">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation31</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Webinars.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation33">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation33</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest. (R-34)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation34">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation34</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D1L-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf">http://files.icann.org/advice/document/20140909-en-atlas-ii-final-declaration-2016-02-24.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-35)</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>R-35. The Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.en</a>. This specific advice item is in the remit of ALAC. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation35">https://community.icann.org/display/42/ATLAS+II+Recommendation35</a>. There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All advice items are in the remit of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/42/At-Large+Advisory+Committee.
**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Advisory Item Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-37)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-37. Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki. Staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership, has already begun to rework the website and wiki to ensure that our &quot;Policy Advisory&quot; pages are concise and understandable. This will continue as the community or 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 (e.g. &quot;Advisory vs Comment&quot;) • The &quot;End user&quot; justification for intervention. Accordingly, staff together with At-Large leadership will categorize the existing documents (as advice, public comment, correspondence, etc.) in a more granular fashion and provide enhanced tools with which to filter search results based on these categories. Furthermore, staff will create a new field in the database for &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 (P-K). • The At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) meets weekly to discuss &quot;end user&quot; justification for intervention (K). With these simple modifications, it should be easier for a Wiki visitor to pursue the work of the At-Large and to quickly understand the rationale for creating individual documents.</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/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-39)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-39. ICANN should encourage open data best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party. The Board has in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see this latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20of%20ICANN%20Large%20II-Declaration">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20of%20ICANN%20Large%20II-Declaration</a> %20Page4.pdf?gnd=nz</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/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-40. ICANN should offer opportunities similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (GDRP), but applicable to short lead-time/budget requests not related to travel. The Board has 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> On an annual basis, the GDRP 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 GDRP Page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609">https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609</a>. See. ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC+Recommendation+40">https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC+Recommendation+40</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. The Board has in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget (<a href="https://forum.icann.org/en/comments-op-budget-fy17-free-year-05-mar16-mgd2013-h-ml.html">https://forum.icann.org/en/comments-op-budget-fy17-free-year-05-mar16-mgd2013-h-ml.html</a>) which was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board finance committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on this topic.</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/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-42. ICANN should encourage annual face-to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events. The Board has in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The 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. The Fellowship 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 GDRP Page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609">https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609</a>. See. ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC+Recommendation+40">https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC+Recommendation+40</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-43. ICANN should encourage RALOs to actively involve their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements. There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC#Recommendation+43">https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC#Recommendation+43</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-3. ICANN should continue support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders. The Board has 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> A Workshop has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN55. The Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alarge/AlargeOutreach+GSR+Workshop">https://community.icann.org/display/alarge/AlargeOutreach+GSR+Workshop</a> <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alarge/Marrakech+AFRALO+NGO+Program">https://community.icann.org/display/alarge/Marrakech+AFRALO+NGO+Program</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-2. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) in programmes having brought valuable members to the community. The Board has in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The 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. The Fellowship 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 GDRP Page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609">https://community.icann.org/pages/vintage-action?query=41900609</a>. See. ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC#Recommendation+40">https://community.icann.org/display/dl/ATLAC#Recommendation+40</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Advice-Report-ALAC-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-6)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-6. ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model reaching not only Board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and production environment. The Board has in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> ICANN leadership has successfully implemented a number of elements covered by work related to CCWG Work Stream 1 and 2. WS proposal has been proposed to the NTIA. WS3 is still in progress. <a href="https://nature.icann.org/proposal/cwg-enhancing-icann-accountability">https://nature.icann.org/proposal/cwg-enhancing-icann-accountability</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf">https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf">https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-17. ICANN needs to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries, and, in conjunction with technical bodies, promote credible alternatives.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf">https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-2. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis, and decisions should be made clear and simple for the public to understand.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf">https://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Final-Declaration-with-appendix-08-26-14.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-3. ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of ATLAS and other Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (AC/SOs) to do away with the “silo” culture.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

- [Discussions about establishing a liaison to the GAC](https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+6)
- [Implementation is underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2-Global-Categories should progress further, the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on ICANN’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/oec-activities-15jan18-en.pdf).
- [There are no actionable items for ICANN.](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e)
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SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks

Feedback, of the Principles and Proposal, Based on Initial Community Committee (RSSAC) Input on "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to "Transition IANA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions""

SAC066: SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Namespace Collisions

SSAC provides 4 comments regarding the draft proposal on mitigating the risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

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

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

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

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.

SSAC Comment Concerning JAS Phase One Report on Mitigating the Risk of DNS Namespace Collisions

The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was rejected and reasoning was explained to SSAC and the public. A Name Collision Management Framework was approved by the NSGC on 30 July 2014: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en. On 30 July 2014, the Board approved the updated compensation recommendations: https://www.icann.org/public/comments/bylaws-amend-compensation-2014-05-02-en.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-4)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN community should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the behavior of search list processing; b. Consideration of implementing additional mechanisms to mitigate search list processing, and continuing to discuss the topic in the ICANN “search list” working group.</td>
<td>SAC005 R-7 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 SAC005 R-7).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN community should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the behavior of search list processing; b. Consideration of implementing additional mechanisms to mitigate search list processing, and continuing to discuss the topic in the ICANN “search list” working group.</td>
<td>SAC005 R-7 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 SAC005 R-7).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC066</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC066: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-2)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN community should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the behavior of search list processing; b. Consideration of implementing additional mechanisms to mitigate search list processing, and continuing to discuss the topic in the ICANN “search list” working group.</td>
<td>SAC005 R-7 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 SAC005 R-7).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC067</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC067: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-1)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN community should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the behavior of search list processing; b. Consideration of implementing additional mechanisms to mitigate search list processing, and continuing to discuss the topic in the ICANN “search list” working group.</td>
<td>SAC005 R-7 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 SAC005 R-7).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 July 2021

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. In SAC064 R-3, ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly delegated top-level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.

**Phase 2** Close Request

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-2 means that the SAC recommends that ICANN organization work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior, beginning with the submission of an Internet-Draft to the IETF and advancing for its standardization within the IETF process. Updates to RFC 7135 and other RFCs related to this topic should be included within the Internet-Draft. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).

**Phase 3** Close Request

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

**Phase 1** Close Request

As of 31 July 2021, the ICANN Board Status Advice Report (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf) further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take up further action once the ICANN.org work on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.

**Action(s) Taken**

Resolved (2021.05.12.08), the Board finds that ICANN org has implemented all of SAC049’s recommendations, and considers SAC062 to be completed.

Resolved (2013.05.16.06), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2015.05.16.15), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

**All of SAC049’s recommendations have been implemented.**

Resolved (2013.05.16.06), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2015.05.16.15), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2013.05.16.06), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2013.05.16.06), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2015.05.16.15), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2013.05.16.06), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all of Recommendations from SAC064, SAC073, and SAC101, as evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC101 to be completed.

Resolved (2011.11.21.20), the recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

Resolved (2014.02.05.07), the ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf.
The SSAC advises the Board to determine a viable way forward which will not create unwarranted contention or delegate multiple TLDs destined to ensure user confusion and implicit loss of faith in the DNS.

In February 2018, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing name collisions. Initial reports on new gTLDs' Domain Name Collision Resolution Guidelines are available on the NGPC webpage: https://www.icann.org/en/news/2018/02/14/initial-report-on-ndcrgs-ngpc. ICANN responded to the NGPC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of new gTLDs are ongoing. TMCH, related to matching must be made clear. 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. Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found below: IDN Implementation Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-implementation-guidelines-2012-02-25-en?kw=IDN. This statement was considered as a part of the public comment period on the initial report: https://www.icann.org/en/news/2014/06/05/initial-report-on-ndcrgs-gwen-en. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf. The SSAC suggests that the EWG address this recommendation from SAC058: "SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation: As the ICANN community discusses validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered: What data elements need to be added or validated to comply with requirements or expectations of different stakeholders? Is additional registration processing overhead and delay an acceptable cost for improving accuracy and quality of registration data? Is higher cost an acceptable outcome for improving accuracy and quality? Would accuracy improve the registration process were to provide natural persons with privacy protection upon completion of multi-factored validation?"

The SSAC recommends that the EWG state more clearly its positions on specific questions of data availability and use. 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. The SSAC agreed with this recommendation. The implicit assumption of the current LGR works is that the root uses one and only one set of Label Generation Rules (LGR). ICANN agrees with this recommendation. The implicit assumption of the current LGR works is that the root uses one and only one set of Label Generation Rules (LGR).
<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>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)</td>
<td>7/22/13</td>
<td>The matching algorithm for TNCX must be improved.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is waiting a response before taking further action. If we focus on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs, there is ongoing. TNCX Resources include general information on TNCX: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project</a>. If we focus on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs, there is ongoing. TNCX Resources include general information on TNCX: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/22/14</td>
<td>The TNCX must add support for test variants. Particularly during the N Dalles service, a name registered under a TLD that has allocated variant TLDs should trigger trademark holder notifications for the registration of the name in all of all of its allocated variant TLDs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is waiting a response before taking further action. If we focus on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs, there is ongoing. TNCX Resources include general information on TNCX: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project</a>. If we focus on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs, there is ongoing. TNCX Resources include general information on TNCX: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project">https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root+Zone+LGR+Project</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/22/13</td>
<td>ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the number of strings that may become activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the 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/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (3 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/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 the 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) active nodes.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the main considerations the Integration Panel has to take into account in each release of the IDN LGR. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4/18/13
growth should be examined.
- Conducting specific
components.
- Updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines; - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of
ICANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting
program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on
public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry
the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies'
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC055: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>1/28/13</td>
<td>The SSAC believes the view of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding the unsolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC058</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC058: R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant - Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>2/7/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC054: R-1 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant - Block via the Domain Name System</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>The ICANN community should discuss validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC058</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC058: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>7/27/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incentivize the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC056</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/056-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/056-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC056: Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System</td>
<td>10/9/13</td>
<td>SAC 056 concludes that: Governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>1-R WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>12/1/13</td>
<td>The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2-R WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>12/14/13</td>
<td>The Board should direct the GNSO to create a registration data policy committee that includes the highest levels of executive engagement to develop a registration data policy which defines the purpose of domain name registration data, as described elsewhere in this document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC056</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/056-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/draft-docs/056-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>3-R WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>The Board should explicitly define any other activity (within ICANN's remit) directed at finding a solution to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy identified in [1] and [2] has been developed and accepted by the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SSAC believes the view of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding the unsolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.

The SSAC provides a recommendation for adopting the terminology outlined in SAC055 in documents and discussions.

The ICANN community should discuss validating contact information. The SSAC recommends the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered.

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incentivize the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.

SAC 056 concludes that: Governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content.

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.

The Board should direct the GNSO to create a registration data policy committee that includes the highest levels of executive engagement to develop a registration data policy which defines the purpose of domain name registration data, as described elsewhere in this document.

The Board should explicitly define any other activity (within ICANN's remit) directed at finding a solution to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy identified in [1] and [2] has been developed and accepted by the community.

Internationalised Domain Names: Internationalisation MOID be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the IRD-WS final report.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>5/14/12</td>
<td>An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicate for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data.</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/applicants-agb-guidebook-full-04jun12-enpdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/applicants-agb-guidebook-full-04jun12-enpdf</a>. The Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-21-en#I">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-21-en#I</a>. An implementation work on WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here: [<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/whoiswhoare">https://www.icann.org/en/whoiswhoare</a>]. The expert working group is evaluating accuracy policy and a policy development process (PDP) on registration data policy by the GNSO will follow the EWG’s work. The policy recommendations arising from the GNSO’s work will then be sent to the Board for consideration.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (1 of 2)</td>
<td>2/23/12</td>
<td>The SSAC notes that all ICANN Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees, and in particular Registry and Registrar Stakeholder groups to (a) consider this data model and comment on its completeness, and (b) comment on the utility of the model in furthering the definition of a directory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SAC033 and SAC031.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)</td>
<td>6/11/12</td>
<td>The SSAC encourages the community to adapt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Report on the Domain-Level TLD Delegation Policy Recommendation</td>
<td>2/23/12</td>
<td>This recommendation: “single character domains that cannot be clearly distinguished and its SSAC recommends strongly against use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use of DNS resource records such as A, AAAA, and MX in the apex of a Top-Level Domain (TLD) be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases.”</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the ICANN: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains</td>
<td>2/23/12</td>
<td>Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfettered work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character IDN TLD top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on user confusion/string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends 1. Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be disallowed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of potential confusability by both within and across scripts. Such consideration should involve comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN’s advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts. A. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of single-character TLDs, and how such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be released if appropriate. B. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a concise specification of the TLD label syntax is currently underway within ICANN, the IETF, and other bodies, ICANN should review the Findings of Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD label blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of any other letter (Lx) as defined by the Unicode Standard. 12 c) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of code points that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Greek/Cyrillic, Lao/Thai, etc.). e) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script should be disallowed. C) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Lx-class code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. d) The code point is from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard. 12 i) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Lx-class code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. d) The code point is from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard. 12</td>
<td>The SSAC Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs: <a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf</a>.</td>
<td>The SSAC Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs: <a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-052-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains</td>
<td>2/23/12</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD label blocking of the script is currently underway within ICANN, the IETF, and other bodies, ICANN should review the Findings of this report, and any policies it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, less than one year after the three work items mentioned above have been completed.</td>
<td>Considerable work has been performed or is ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en</a>. A String Similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules Project (5), but this project was deprioritized based on public comments, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken.</td>
<td>Considerable work has been performed or is ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en</a>. A String Similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules Project (5), but this project was deprioritized based on public comments, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms (Handling the Duplication from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System).</td>
<td>6/14/11</td>
<td>Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain names account for nearly 50% of traffic on the Internet. Thus, the security and stability of the Internet is held hostage to the dub that controls DNS-based attacks. The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure</td>
<td>6/14/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your WHOIS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing WHOIS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC051: SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure [F-1]</td>
<td>6/14/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your WHOIS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing WHOIS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on DNS-data Risk Assessment and Management (3 of 3)</td>
<td>5/28/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC049: SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the DNS Registry Root Zone</td>
<td>6/12/11</td>
<td>1. Orphan glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue is supported by the current and operation of the DNS. Thus, it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed. The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the DNS Registry Root Zone</td>
<td>6/12/11</td>
<td>1. Orphan glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue is supported by the current and operation of the DNS. Thus, it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed. The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the DNS Registry Root Zone</td>
<td>6/12/11</td>
<td>The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphaned glue as an ambiguous term for which no definitive definition exists. The SSAC has proposed a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the RFC applications: 1. 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 by enforcing a technique that at least disrupts to 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. The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing safeguards and proactive measures to manage the risk associated with loss, disruption, or inconsistent availability of name service (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; (3) Establish incident response plans; and (4) Educate your users. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

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

16/11/11
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.


Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)

15/11/11
The SSAC notes that in certain operating circumstances, registry functions, especially critical services such as DNS resolution and DNS security (DNSSEC), may be separable from other functions (registry database maintenance). The SSAC also whether in such circumstances critical functions can be transitioned separately.

The ICANN Board sent the SSAC notice regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)

15/11/11
The SSAC recommends that ICANN define an existing process that embodies a full takeover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria.

SSAC047 was considered by ICANN and relevant recommendations were implemented into the Registry Transition process, including the requirement for an emergency back-end registry operator (BBERO) to conduct takeover testing periodically. The Registry Transition process is available here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en. A process for EBEROs was implemented into the New gTLD Program and is documented in the New gTLD Policy (http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm), the Applicant Guidebook (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf).

Advice Document Recommendation Phases Action(s) Taken

- Request
- Close
- Issue

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)

15/11/11
The SSAC recommends that ICANN define an existing process that embodies a full takeover scenario and that successor and emergency registry operators demonstrate their ability to satisfy the testing criteria.


Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)

15/11/11
The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of a domain name during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain names during a transition.


Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)

15/11/11
With respect to registration fees, the SSAC also notes that certain registrant information is not associated with the payment cycle information. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the billing and payment cycle to the successor registry along with each registrant registration information. 2) The registrar has payment information. In this case, the current registry operator must provide the billing and payment cycle to the successor registry.

The payment cycle information is reflected in the registration data of the domain name, which is included as part of the data escrow that the successor registry receives. Each gTLD Registry is required to escrow their registration data with an ICANN-approved data escrow agent on a daily basis. The data is monitored by ICANN through regular checks. Additionally in the event of a transition the DNS Zone files continue to be escrowed daily. Registry Data Escrow requirements are noted here: Applicant Guidebook, Attachement to Module 2: Evaluation Questions and Criteria (http://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.pdf).

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (5 of 7)

15/11/11
Lastly, the SSAC makes the following recommendations regarding the construction of the Explanatory Memorandum: 1) It should be fleshed out with references to the AG. 2) It should reference and use defined items from the Applicant Guidebook rather than crafting its own definitions. 3) It imposes requirements on various parties, but it is unclear if those have the stature of requirements stated in the Applicant Guidebook. Since its function is to be explanatory, the text should truly be explanatory as opposed to normative.

ICANN adopted these recommendations and clarified in the Registry Transition process that the Explanatory Memorandum is part of the Applicant Guidebook. See: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-processes-2013-04-22-en.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 7)

15/11/11
The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about gTLDs. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition processes can be studied and improved.

See https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf for the rationale for the decision to not implement this advice. The ICANN Board sent the SSAC notice regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on the rationale for the decision to not implement this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)


Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)

15/10/10
The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about gTLDs. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition processes can be studied and improved.

The Board recommended the ICANN to direct staff to work with ICANN and root servers to explore publication of one or more statements regarding preservation for the proposed changes. See: https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf for the rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 5)

15/10/10
Recommendation (2) ICANN, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and VeriSign should publish statements, or a joint statement, that they are materially prepared for the proposed changes.

The ICANN Board recommended the ICANN to direct staff to work with NTIA and Verisign to explore publication of one or more statements regarding preservation for the proposed changes. See: https://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf for the rationale for the decision to not implement this advice.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (9 of 11) | 12/8/10 | Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including IDNs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (9 of 11) | 12/8/10 | Recommendation (5): ICANN should convene and recertify interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities who may implement strong assumptions about the number of TLDs or as local TLDs that may conflict with future allocations. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 11/15/10 | ICANN should educate users so that, eventually, private networks and rhizomatic nodes do not attempt to resolve local names with the root system of the public DNS. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 11/15/10 | The SAC recommends that ICANN promote a greater awareness of the potential problems that may occur when a query for a TLD string that has historically resulted in a negative response begins to resolve to a new TLD. Specifically, ICANN should: (1) Study invalid TLD query dataset at the root level of the DNS and contact hardware and software vendors to try programming errors that might have resulted in those invalid TLD queries. The SAC is currently exploring one such problem as a case study, and the vendor is reviewing its software. Future efforts to contact hardware and software vendors, however, are outside SAC's remit. ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 11/15/10 | ICANN should contact organizations that are associated with strings that are frequently queried at the root to warn organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, so they may eliminate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than MX/DNS traffic from root servers. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 12/1/10 | Recommendation (2): The SAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new gTLD program—Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. If ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 12/1/10 | Recommendation (2): The SAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new gTLD program—Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. If ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC046 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 12/1/10 | The SAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the presence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic observed at the root as the basis for such notification. | Phase 4 | Deferred |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC045 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf | ICANN: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (3 of 6) | 12/1/10 | The SAC recommends that ICANN define a circumstance where a previously delegated string be re-used, or prohibit the practice. | Phase 4 | Deferred |