On 24 January 2020, the second security, stability, and resiliency (SSR2) Review Team published a public comment proceeding on its draft report. This statement represents the RSSAC’s full input to that public comment proceeding. The RSSAC welcomed this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team draft report, and would like to thank SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC’s comment on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

On 20 March 2020, the second security, stability, and resiliency (SSR2) Review Team published a public comment proceeding on its draft report. This statement represents the SSAC’s full input to that public comment proceeding. The SSAC welcomed this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team draft report, and would like to thank SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC’s comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC’s comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rr2-ntm-draft-report-2020-03-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.
## Advice Item: ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-7)

**Description:**
- The Registry Agreement must enshrine PIR prohibited practices such as bulk sales to commercial registrars.
- The Registry must provide 6 months prior written notice to its registrants of any increase in wholesale price on its wholesale pricing model.
- The Registry must enshrine in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takedown demands, and not implement different levels of service for different classes of registrants.
- A corporate Board should have the explicit mandate to focus on the overall public interest and specifically the interests of individual and not commercial interests.

**ICANN Board Action:**
- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC’s recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

## Phase: 1 - Understand Request

**ALAC’s Reply:**
- The ALAC acknowledges the ICANN Board’s understanding of this recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

---

## Advice Item: ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-5)

**Description:**
- Individuals and not commercial interests.

**ICANN Board Action:**
- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC’s recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

## Phase: 1 - Understand Request

**ALAC’s Reply:**
- The ALAC acknowledges the ICANN Board’s understanding of this recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

---

## Advice Item: ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-4)

**Description:**
- The Registry must receive and maintain B Corporation certification.

**ICANN Board Action:**
- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC’s recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

## Phase: 1 - Understand Request

**ALAC’s Reply:**
- The ALAC acknowledges the ICANN Board’s understanding of this recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

---

## Advice Item: ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-2)

**Description:**
- The Registry must receive and maintain B Corporation certification.

**ICANN Board Action:**
- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC’s recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

## Phase: 1 - Understand Request

**ALAC’s Reply:**
- The ALAC acknowledges the ICANN Board’s understanding of this recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

---

## Advice Item: ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-1)

**Description:**
- The Registry must receive and maintain B Corporation certification.

**ICANN Board Action:**
- The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s comment on ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue. The ICANN Board acknowledges ALAC’s recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

## Phase: 1 - Understand Request

**ALAC’s Reply:**
- The ALAC acknowledges the ICANN Board’s understanding of this recommendation and has correspondence directly through a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

---

## Action(s) Taken

**Understand Request**

- ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-7)
- ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-5)
- ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-4)
- ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-2)
- ALAC: ISSOC/PIR Issue (R-1)
Al-LAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The GDPR has already produced a concise definition of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain name" that are more specific. According to that definition, "abuse" is an action that: 1) causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm; and 2) is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intentions and design of a stated legitimate purpose. If such a purpose is disclosed. The GDPR also recognizes that "malicious use of domain names" include, but are not limited to: i) spam, ii) malware distribution, iii) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, iv) phishing, v) botnet command and control. ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of "abuse" before further work is done to define DNS Abuse. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN should determine whether those definitions used by outside sources can serve as references for the ICANN community, or whether abuse, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

Rollovers

Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

RSSAC046: RSSAC Statement on IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-root-zone-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.

Action Taken: Understand Request.

Domain and Security Advisory Committee (GAC)


GAC108: GAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

2/25/20

This publication represents the GAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers ICANN Public Comment Proceeding. The GAC 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 GAC finds no issue with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank the IANA for developing a strong proposal. The ICANN does find some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This comment also includes future considerations that IANA should take into account for subsequent rollovers.

Action Taken: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ICANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN to require Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data. ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse 30 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN understands ALAC to advise the Board to 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 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

12/24/19

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 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

12/24/19

Determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as references for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)

12/24/19

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)

12/24/19

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

12/24/19

Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-root-zone-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.

Action Taken: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

12/24/19

Domain and Security Advisory Committee (GAC)


GAC108: GAC Comments on the IANA Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

2/25/20

This publication represents the GAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers ICANN Public Comment Proceeding. The GAC 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 GAC finds no issue with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank the IANA for developing a strong proposal. The ICANN does find some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This comment also includes future considerations that IANA should take into account for subsequent rollovers.

Action Taken: Understand Request.

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

12/24/19

Cease rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)

12/24/19

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

12/24/19

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

12/24/19

Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-root-zone-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.

Action Taken: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

12/24/19

Phase 2: Understand Request.

Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN https://atlarge.icann.org/statement-13747

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)

12/24/19

Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers

The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 21 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposal-future-root-zone-ksk-rollovers-2019-11-01-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 05 February 2020.

Action Taken: Understand Request.
Committee (RSSAC)
Root Server System Advisory Committee (SSAC)
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

- RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop
- RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System

References:
- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1219-03-00-ALAC-ALAC-ST-EN-1219-03-00-ALAC-ALAC-ST-EN
- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747
- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747
- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747

- ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to compel Contracted Parties to adhere to industry-wide good behavior, for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrants that continually demonstrate high abuse rates. When it comes to implementation of this recommendation, ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of Contracted Parties to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties regarding pricing and industry best practices. We interpret "abuse" in this context to refer to the time being, to harmful activity as it intersects with the DNS and is intended to be malicious in nature. ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board on the scope and characteristics of abuse that is performed within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

- RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop
- RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System

- ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties on the scope and characteristics of "abuse" within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

- RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop
- RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System

- ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties on the scope and characteristics of "abuse" within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.

- RSSAC044: Report from the RSSAC October 2019 Workshop
- RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System

- ICANN received ALAC: DNS Abuse on 10 January 2020 and is currently reviewing. ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties on the scope and characteristics of "abuse" within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020.
<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>SAC106</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (RSS) Metrics Work Party. The RSSAC also discussed several matters related to its proposed governance model for the RSS from RSSAC037. This document contains a high-level summary of these activities.</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SAC108</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000v4-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000v4-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC108: The ICANN organization understands SAC108 Recommendation 2 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC108 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC108 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC109</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-109-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-109-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC109: ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019. The ICANN organization understands SAC109 Recommendations 1 through 3 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). The ICANN organization understands SAC109 Recommendation 1 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC109 Recommendations 4 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC110</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-110-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-110-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC110: ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019. The ICANN organization understands SAC110 Recommendations 1 through 3 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). The ICANN organization understands SAC110 Recommendation 1 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC110 Recommendations 4 to mean that the RSSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. The RSSAC’s responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article XII, Section 2.c. These Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 11 Aug 2019. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 Aug 2019. SAC109 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.
The ICANN Board receives SAC104v2 in its entirety, and finds that SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process discussed in the SAC104v2 has two main items: "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. " and "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." The ICANN Board notes that these are similar recommendations, and that the ICANN Board is not in a position to make a decision on these items. The ICANN Board refers to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 report. The ICANN Board also notes that these recommendations are similar to recommendations made in other reports, and that the ICANN Board has already made similar recommendations in other reports. The ICANN Board is not in a position to make a decision on these items and refers to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 report.

The ICANN Board notes the recommendations made in SAC104v2, and finds that these recommendations are similar to recommendations made in other reports. The ICANN Board is not in a position to make a decision on these items and refers to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 report. The ICANN Board also notes that these recommendations are similar to recommendations made in other reports, and that the ICANN Board has already made similar recommendations in other reports. The ICANN Board is not in a position to make a decision on these items and refers to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 report.
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Number

en.pdf

Link to Advice Document


Organizational Reviews (R-3)

10/5/18

Recommendation

The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-derided problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SAC101v2 recommends that the ICANN Board create a timeline for the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in automation registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RPAS protocol. C. The remaining tlds gTLD registries should be required to move to thicker status, per the Think WHOIS Consensus Board Resolution 2014-02-07-08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism.

Phase 4

Implement

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to create a timeline for 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.

1. Organizational Reviews (R-3)
   a. Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy. 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated into FPD plans at the GNDQ.'

2. Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)
   a. When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that the organizational review is meeting contractual obligations. Depending on the outcome of each checkpoint, the ICANN organization should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.

   b. The ICANN Board should request that the ICANN organization develop clear and tight definitions of the purposes and criteria for rate limiting policy. In its rationale the Board states 'Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that the ICANN Board should ensure that the registration data policy is published with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.'

   c. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c), in its rationale the Board states 'Advice item three suggests that the Board direct EPDP to work with the ICANN community to develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements. As policy is developed by the community and this topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of FPDs. In taking this action, the Board also notes that in the Areas to the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, the Board asked that the topic of rate limit be discussed and resolved by the community as quickly as possible.'

3. Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)
   a. 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. The EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c) in its rationale notes 'The 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.'

4. Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)
   a. 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.

5. Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)
   a. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c), in its rationale the Board notes '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 FPDs.'
As of 31 March 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</th>
<th>10/5/18</th>
<th>Committee Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC037</td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Review (R1)</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>Committee Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Final Report &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN org understands that the SSAC had not identified any reason within the SSAC’s scope why the October 2018 root zone KSK rollover should not have proceeded as it was planned. The ICANN org also understands that the SSAC would like the ICANN org to establish a framework for scheduling further rollouts of the root KSK based on analysis of the outcomes of this initial roll out. This is an updated understanding of SAC102 based on feedback provided by the SAC on 17 June 2018. ICANN sent this updated understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2018. At the ICANN 66 meeting in August 2018, there was published a framework requested in the SSAC initial report, ICANN 66 and on the customary DNS-Org related mailing lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Final Report on the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC</th>
<th>8/7/18</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Round Process (SRP) Final Report</td>
<td>8/10/18</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Round Process (SRP) Final Report. As of 07 November 2019, a proposed framework requested in the SAC103 initial report, ICANN 66 and on the customary DNS-Org related mailing lists.

|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------|

The ICANN org understands that this is a draft proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands that the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org understands that this is a draft proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root Server System. The ICANN org understands that the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendation items for the ICANN Board.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf | ICANN Board Status Advice Report | 2/14/18 | Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization 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. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf | ICANN Board Status Advice Report | 2/14/18 | Recommendation 5: The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy. These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNOO. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC101 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf | ICANN Board Status Advice Report | 2/14/18 | Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to attend registry and registrar contracts to clarify that if a data field is required to be published, the registry or registrar must publish it in RDDS server output, not just in Web-based output. |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC037-018 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rss-037-018.pdf | RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R.3 | 2/14/18 | The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC038-018 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rss-038-018.pdf | RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R.2 | 2/14/18 | The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. |
The ICANN Board understands TSSAC038: Recommendation 1 is for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on TSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 17 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed TSSAC037 Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-11-07-en#1). The RSSAC directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to publish the final charter, operating procedures, and work plan for the GOV, and to convene the GOV. RSSAC037: the Concept Paper, and the GOV charter, operating procedures, and work plan provide a starting point for discussions in the ICANN community about existing GOV processes. By convening the GOV, the RSSAC completes its consideration of recommendation one from TSSAC038. Furthermore, the RSSAC continues its evaluation and consideration of recommendations two and three from TSSAC038.

The ICANN Board understands TSSAC037 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board to request the ICANN staff to produce the draft final Model for implementation based on TSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 17 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed TSSAC037 Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-11-07-en#1). The RSSAC directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to publish the final charter, operating procedures, and work plan for the GOV, and to convene the GOV. RSSAC037: the Concept Paper, and the GOV charter, operating procedures, and work plan provide a starting point for discussions in the ICANN community about existing GOV processes. By convening the GOV, the RSSAC completes its consideration of recommendation one from TSSAC038. Furthermore, the RSSAC continues its evaluation and consideration of recommendations two and three from TSSAC038.

The ICANN Board understands TSSAC037 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board to request the ICANN staff to produce the draft final Model for implementation based on TSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 17 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed TSSAC037 Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-11-07-en#1). The RSSAC directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to publish the final charter, operating procedures, and work plan for the GOV, and to convene the GOV. RSSAC037: the Concept Paper, and the GOV charter, operating procedures, and work plan provide a starting point for discussions in the ICANN community about existing GOV processes. By convening the GOV, the RSSAC completes its consideration of recommendation one from TSSAC038. Furthermore, the RSSAC continues its evaluation and consideration of recommendations two and three from TSSAC038.
<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 Recommendations</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-008-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update</td>
<td>1/15/18</td>
<td>This is the ALAC's statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC's statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-008-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>2/8/18</td>
<td>This is the ICANN org's response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Policy Development Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the ICANN org's response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Policy Development Process. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC031</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC031: Response to the IDN Guidelines Working Group regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter on the use of hyphens in IDN domain names</td>
<td>1/21/18</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC's response to the IDN Guidelines Working Group regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter on the use of hyphens in IDN domain names.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC's response to the IDN Guidelines Working Group regarding the WG's 27 Jul 2017 letter on the use of hyphens in IDN domain names. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-008-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/11239</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>2/8/18</td>
<td>This is the ALAC's statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC's statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC100</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-100-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-100-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC100: Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling</td>
<td>12/2/17</td>
<td>This is the SAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the SAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC099</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-099-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC099: Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling</td>
<td>12/2/17</td>
<td>This is the SAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is the SAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advice 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>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC030</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC098: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td>11/4/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC statement on entries in DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC030v3</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/sac-098-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC030v3: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td>11/4/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC statement on entries in DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC030v4</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/sac-098-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC030v4: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td>11/4/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC statement on entries in DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC030v3</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC030v3: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td>11/4/17</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC statement on entries in DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server system in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organisation responsible for the operation of the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 1 - Implement**

**Phase 4 - Implement**

**Phase 5 - Close Request**

Closeds
Recommendation 6: Study reducing the priming response size when considering the priming response under DNSSEC. The thought expressed in Section 6.5 generated the small size(256), 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 to the root server community would vary depending on the implementation. The ICANN organization notes that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. This statement will be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 3: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response under DNSSEC, the thought expressed in Section 6.5 generated the small size(256), 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 to the root server community would vary depending on the implementation. The ICANN organization notes that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. This statement will be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 5: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 6: Study reducing the priming response size when considering the priming response under DNSSEC. The thought expressed in Section 6.5 generated the small size(256), 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 to the root server community would vary depending on the implementation. The ICANN organization notes that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. This statement will be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 7: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 8: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 9: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.

Recommendation 10: Study which of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability. RSSAC made significant progress in addressing questions on this topic. In particular, this workshop was DNS root service accountability and next steps. The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to respond to the public consultation. Although At-Large members participated in the WHOIS-IAG during 2016, we do not believe that the interpretation and future implementation of the Human Rights' Core Value that is now part of ICANN’s DNS root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18.
### Advice Provider (ALAC)


### Advice Item

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

6/12/17

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1. Phase 4 | Implement

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

6/12/17

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion. Phase 4 | Implement

### Action(s) Taken

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the public reporting for Webbased WHOIS query statistics (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org continues to facilitate the conversation between SSAC and R&TG. The SSAC and R&TG met to discuss observations of SSAC during 2017 to address members raised concerns.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

| Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC097 | SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1 |
| Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC097 | SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-2 |
| Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC097 | SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3 |

### Action(s) Taken

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 subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate the implementation of Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org continues to work with the Policy team to inform the community to have the recommendation to be considered for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

---

### Advice Item

**SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1**

6/12/17

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1. Phase 4 | Implement

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

6/12/17

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 26 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 July 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?en#1.g). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

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

6/12/17

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 14 July 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments?en#1.g). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC096 | SAC096: SSAC Comment on the CWG- Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights |

### Action(s) Taken

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-review feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zonefiles. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in Q2FY20.

---

### Advice Item

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

5/20/17

This is a SAC's comment on the CWG- Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SAC wishes to thank the Human Rights Sub-Group for its enormous effort over a significant period of time and for this excellent report. The SAC provided previous input to the Human Rights Sub-Group in SAC029, input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights and thanks the CWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are no associated security and stability aspects, the SAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SAC notes that, as a Chartering Organization of the CWG- Accountability, formal SAC approval of the final version of the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.

---

### Action(s) Taken

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-review feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zonefiles. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in Q2FY20.

---

### Advice Item

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

5/20/17

This is a SAC's comment on the CWG- Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SAC wishes to thank the Human Rights Sub-Group for its enormous effort over a significant period of time and for this excellent report. The SAC provided previous input to the Human Rights Sub-Group in SAC029, input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights and thanks the CWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are no associated security and stability aspects, the SAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SAC notes that, as a Chartering Organization of the CWG- Accountability, formal SAC approval of the final version of the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

As of 31 March 2020

1. Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Advisory Item: SAC095

Title: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2018 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN67 for further consideration by the ccNSO and GNSO). Finally the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 20 June 2019 pending external activity.

2. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2018 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN67 for further consideration by the ccNSO and GNSO). Finally the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en.pdf. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 20 June 2019 pending external activity.

3. Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Advisory Item: SAC095

Title: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

4. Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

Advisory Item: SAC095

Title: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

5. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

6. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

7. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

8. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

9. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

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

10. Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advisory Item: ALAC-01-01-05-01-DN

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

Issued Date: 25/3/2017

Phase: Deferred

Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrars of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment | 5/17/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Chair’s 28 April 2017 | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment | 5/17/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommodation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommodation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AT-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommodation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommodation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

**Reference Number** | **Link to Advice Document** | **Advice Item** | **Issued Date** | **Advice Document Recommendation** | **Phase** | **Action(s) Taken**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
SA0593 | https://www.icann.org/en/technical-body/status/ssa/ssa-comment-093-en.pdf | ALAC Statement on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Committee’s Recommodation Process Responsibilities to Another Board Committee | 4/28/17 | The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Recommendations to Improve Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. | |
1. The ALAC recognizes the continued effort to maintain an up-to-date set of rules and procedures applicable to the ICANN’s day-to-day operations in a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-driven process. 2. The ALAC appreciates that details have been carefully addressed to avoid any conflicting situations between the ICANN’s procedures being updated and those proposed as new IRP Supplementary Procedures. 3. The ALAC specifically recognizes the effort put in drafting an updated set of IRP Supplementary Procedures that address the delicate balance between this process and expedited resolution times that will help provide, both, certainty and celerity to applicants in IRP processes. 4. The ALAC recommends that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvements.

2. The ALAC is concerned that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvements.

3. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 3/22/17. The item is now closed.

1. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC’s documentation of the terms commonly used in discussions concerning the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org received confirmation of this understanding on 3/22/17.

2. The ICANN Organization understands that ALAC049 is included as a recommendation for discussion by the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

3. The ICANN organization understands ALAC049 is included as a recommendation for discussion by the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

1. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 3/22/17. The item is now closed.

2. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 3/22/17. The item is now closed.

3. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 3/22/17. The item is now closed.

1. The ICANN organization understands SAC077 is the SSAC’s comment on the 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.’

2. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.

3. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.

4. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.

5. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.

6. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.

7. The ICANN organization understands this understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 5 May 2017.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

31 March 2020
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Advice Item

Reference Number

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item Document Recommendation

Phase

Action(s) Taken

4-At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-LAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9909

ALAC Statement on the Draft PTF17 Operating Plan and Budget

12/22/16

Phase 1

Issue

Public Comment Statement: The overall budget estimate is reasonable increment figures of the PTF17 budget, and there is no major change in the budget when compared to the PTF16 budget. Although overall the travel and meetings budget line items have increased by 42.1% from $0.4 million to $0.6 million, we think that the items for community engagement which is proposed as $0.1 million could be increased to ensure PTF17 engagement with its customers and non-customers stakeholders communities. Some examples of such engagement community could be the participation in major Internet and ICT regional forums and the publication of PTF materials in multiple languages (e.g., in language). It would be useful in the future to provide a detailed breakdown of the ICANN’s support functions provided to the PT. For example, it will be useful to know the figures allocated for PT’s Communications activities which are conducted by ICANN support functions. The total proposed figure for ICANN provided professional services to be $0.3 million.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft PTF17 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 10 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/file/report-comments-draft-pty-16-08-plan-budget-23jan17-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.

5-Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC090


SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Name System, R-1

12/22/16

Phase 1

Issue

Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain label would be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.

The ICANN organization understands SAC090 is the second SSAC advisory on the Stability of the Domain Name System, R-3. This recommendation was included in the SSAC’s second comment on the R-3 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 23 January 2017. SSAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

5-Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC089


SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Name System, R-2

12/22/16

Phase 1

Issue

The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: (1) the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications (2) ICANN’s criteria and/or list of strings that could be applied for as new gTLD names, such as the “reserved names” listed in Section 2.2.1.2 (3) the “trademark strings” listed in Section 2.2.1.3, the two character ISO 3166 codes prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.2 Part III, and the geographic names prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special Use Domain Name Registry. As described in RFC 7012, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined “special” way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize the status of the names on these lists? If so (how should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN’s direct influence)? How should ICANN respond to a change in the names listed that occurs during run of new gTLD applications? Is the IETF an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of “special use” names? What should ICANN’s response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? Some names that are not on any formal list are generically presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called “private use” names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are hierarchically located by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of “private use” names? If so (how should ICANN deal with private use names such as corp., home, and mail) that are already known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? (how should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? 676122, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined “special” way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize the status of the names on these lists? If so (how should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN’s direct influence)? How should ICANN respond to a change in the names listed that occurs during run of new gTLD applications? Is the IETF an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of “special use” names? What should ICANN’s response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? Some names that are not on any formal list are generically presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called “private use” names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are hierarchically located by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of “private use” names? If so (how should ICANN deal with private use names such as corp., home, and mail) that are already known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? (how should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?)
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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>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-022-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-022-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures - Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>A report to the Internet community from the RSSAC. The RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is the RSSAC’s response to the GNSO on its evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSSAC023</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>History of the Root Server System</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>A report to the Internet community from the RSSAC. The RSSAC gives an overview of the organizational history of the root server system.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023 in RSSAC’s report to the community on the organization history of the root server system and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSSAC024</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>A advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. RSAC024 and RFC 7720 are considered as starting points; alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethos, etc.) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not addressed herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC’s input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSSAC025</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Workshop Report</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>Overview of RSSAC’s third workshop (October 11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the mind map constructed during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC’s report on its third workshop in which it discusses accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system; and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC085</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-085-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-085-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms for input and invites the WG to review SAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAC086</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-086-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-086-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures - Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures - Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures for input and invites the WG to review SAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAC087</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-087-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/sac-087-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services 7 Second Outrach</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services 7 Second Outrach</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services request for input and invites the WG to review SAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-022-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/sys/index/files/rssac-022-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Subsequent Procedure</td>
<td>10/9/16</td>
<td>Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the New Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Subsequent Procedure</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC’s input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-en/pdf/9857">Public Comment Statement</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-en/pdf/9829">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-en/pdf/9815">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-en/pdf/9815">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSSAC</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC021</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-expected-standards-revisions-11jul16-en.pdf">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>8/6/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC021</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-expected-standards-revisions-11jul16-en.pdf">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>8/24/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fellowship Development Program (FDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship Development Program</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Development Program</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large+At-Large+Community+Policy+Issues+-Why+End+Users+Should+Care+Workspace">Issue Report</a></td>
<td>7/29/16</td>
<td>There is no further action required of the Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advice Item Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-en/pdf/9857">Public Comment Statement</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-01-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 29 August 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-08sep16-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>
The ICANN organization understands SAC039 is SAC's report on the second workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and operational and organizational evolution, and that there were actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-02-00-EN's Statement on the Request for Input - Next-Generation RDS to replace WHOS PDP. The input was provided to the GNSO on 10 June 2016 for consideration (https://community.icann.org/display/PDP/Request+for+Input+to+Next-Generation+RDS+to+replace+WHOS+PDP). 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 SAC082 is SSAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures requested input from the Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituencies seeking assistance in building a model of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.

The ICANN organization understands SAC080 is SSAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group focus on more critical documents, including: - the latest WHOS Policy Review Team Final Report 2012 - SAC Reports 041, 051 and 053 - 2013 RAA and 2014 New gTLD Registry Agreement Relevant IRCs - the latest decisions from the EU on data protection, particularly the latest Directive/Regulation. The EWG Final Report, together with additional statements by GNSO members The GNSO must, at a minimum by Fall Commanus, address the following question: - Should the domain name ecosystem capture, collect and curate personal data elements for a valid domain name registration transaction? - Should ICANN capture the capture, collection and the curation of certain specific personal data elements of the domain name registration transaction? Specifically, the Working Group should identify all data that ICANN requires to be collected. This data, together with other data, can potentially lead to concern to individual users. With the increasing use of data analytics, a great deal of information about people can be gained by analyzing data from a variety of sources in combination with other data.

The ICANN organization understands SAC081 is SSAC's response to the Request for Input on Next-Generation gTLD RDS to replace WHOS PDP. The input was provided to the GNSO on 10 June 2016 for consideration (https://community.icann.org/display/PDP/Request+for+Input+to+Next-Generation+RDS+to+replace+WHOS+PDP). 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 SAC081 is SSAC's response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.

Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0616-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Request for Input - Next-Generation RDS to replace WHOS PDP. The input was provided to the GNSO on 10 June 2016 for consideration (https://community.icann.org/display/GNSO/Request+for+Input+to+Next-Generation+RDS+to+replace+WHOS+PDP). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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ALAC believed that the Board has all of the requisite authority to call on the community to establish the said Review Committee based upon the fact that this is a specific ICANN implementation that was called for by the GAC in their ICANN 46 Beijing Communiqué, as well as in every related Communiqué since.

The ALAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4) addresses caused by increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPv4 addresses.

The ICANN Board considered this advice at ICANN55, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (ECCRT) and the DNS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group (DNP-PWG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2012 application round of the new gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked ECCRT to improve its processes to determine if the number of gTLDs is a concern the ALAC in the course of their work (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-zuck-30mar16-en.pdf).

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0216-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Deployment of EKMS Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow-up Updates. The SSAC considers the changing role of Internet Protocol Version 4 (IPv4) addresses caused by increasing scarcity, and subsequent exhaustion, of IPv4 addresses.

SSAC has formed a work party to investigate the implications of this work as it pertains to the security and stability of DNS. This work party will study the security and stability issues associated with multiple uses of the domain name space.

SSAC comments on the CWG-A Proposals on Work Stream 3 Recommendations in the Public Comment Forum that opened on 30 November 2015 and is scheduled to close on 23 December 2015 specifically on those aspects that are related either to security and stability or to the manner in which such functions are performed for those aspects related to security and stability and/or to the manner in which such functions are performed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Incorporation of the CCWG Accountability Proposals into the Proposed Revised SSAC Chart. The ALAC believes that the Board has all of the requisite authority to call on the community to establish the said Review Committee based upon the fact that this is a specific ICANN implementation that was called for by the GAC in their ICANN 46 Beijing Communiqué, as well as in every related Communiqué since.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-078-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the CCWG Accountability Proposals. The ALAC believes that the Board has all of the requisite authority to call on the community to establish the said Review Committee based upon the fact that this is a specific ICANN implementation that was called for by the GAC in their ICANN 46 Beijing Communiqué, as well as in every related Communiqué since.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC018 is RSSAC’s statement congratulating the NASA stewardship transition coordination group and the CCWG on the transmission of the IC and CCWG accountability proposals to the IIA and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC17 is RSSAC’s scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-057-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-framework-principle-draft-05may16-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 AL-ALAC-ST-0116-02-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-076-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-078-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-002-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-028-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-023-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-057-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-framework-principle-draft-05may16-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 AL-ALAC-ST-028-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-057-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed and Planning for Cross Community Working Groups (Interagency) re the SSAC Comment on gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdds-output-25apr16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 May 2017.
This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum), which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines.

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

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC015 is RSSAC's comment detailing that the RSSAC has no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC015 is RSSAC's comment detailing that the RSSAC has no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0116-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Profile for gTLD Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rdap-profile-25apr16-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 AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG- Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 25 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-profile-25apr16-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 AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-profile-08jan16-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 AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-profile-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC074</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preventing Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 1</td>
<td>9/19/15</td>
<td>Item 1: The ICANN Compliance department should publish data about the security breaches that registrars have reported in accordance with the 2013 RAA.</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/9700">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/9700</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td>10/16/15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0915-00-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/9711">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/9711</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td>10/16/15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The respective public comment period closed on 08 Nov 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Initial Report on 
Proceeds Discussion Paper. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Nov 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Initial Report on 
Proceeds Discussion Paper. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Nov 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-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 respective public comment period closed on 27 July 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 Aug 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proxy-services-02aug15-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 respective public comment period closed on 27 July 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 Aug 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proxy-services-02aug15-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.

ALSAC014: Comment to "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..."

The ICANN organization understands ALSAC014 is ALSAC’s comment detailing support for the “Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...” and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

ALSAC020: RSSAC Report on Root Zone TLS

To address the DNSSEC problems identified in Section 5.4, the RSSAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners to increase the signature periods for signatures generated by both the ESK and the ZSK. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days. ZSK signature validity should be increased to at least 21 days.

The ICANN organization understands ALSAC020 is RSSAC’s report detailing the “Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...” and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
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Advice Document Recommendation

Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and standardization through the IETF process recommends the IETF and the applications community consider them for further specifications and possible

Recommendation 4b: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication terminology (e.g., “private suffix”).

Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to “advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet’s naming and address allocation systems”. SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties. This statement was considered apart from a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 15 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/en/0613-16-draft-rfc.c.

SSAC Comments on the Accountability Draft Proposal
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Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to “advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet’s naming and address allocation systems”. SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties. This statement was considered apart from a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 15 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/en/0613-16-draft-rfc.c.
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Recommendation 4b: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication terminology (e.g., “private suffix”).

Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to “advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet’s naming and address allocation systems”. SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties. This statement was considered apart from a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 15 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/en/0613-16-draft-rfc.c.

Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and standardization through the IETF process recommends the IETF and the applications community consider them for further specifications and possible

Recommendation 4b: Application developers should use a canonical file format and modern authentication terminology (e.g., “private suffix”).

Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to “advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet’s naming and address allocation systems”. SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties. This statement was considered apart from a public comment period: see https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 15 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/en/0613-16-draft-rfc.c.
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<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>To close the knowledge gap between registrars and popular PSL maintainers, ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation should collaborate to create informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-3)</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ima should host a PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. Such a PSL should not include all TLDs in the IANA root zone.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/5491">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/5491</a></td>
<td>ALAC-Statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - As noted within the General Comments: The ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft Proposal. That being said, the ALAC does have a number of concerns that will need to be addressed to allow us to fully support the final CWG proposal. As detailed under the comment on section II.A.1, the ALAC would prefer an IANA wholly integrated into ICANN, but is willing to accept a compromise of a separate legal entity if the details of its organization and governance are satisfactory. One major concern that we believe must be addressed is that any multi-stakeholder oversight and support mechanisms must address a number of other concerns. This list should at least include a TLD in the root zone and a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 November 2019, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). On 11 December 2019, ICANN staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone.</td>
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<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/5491">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/5491</a></td>
<td>ALAC-Statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
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### Advice 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><strong>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</strong></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement</td>
<td>3/23/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) - The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: Registrant and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNS penetration; education at all levels is key to increasing local and supply; requirements placed on registrants should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints; the insurance required for registrants is a real concern for underdeveloped regions. The second round of the new GDD program should give preference, if not exclusivity, to applicants from underdeveloped regions, with adequate outreach efforts. In response to the five questions posed in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrant rights must be secured through the CGL insurance or any other mechanism(s), 2) the ALAC notes that the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit millions of end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the IDs are wasted and active, others have been less active or inactivate, it is important that the IDN program is harmonized (in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, support by building and outcomes) with the IA. The ALAC recommends that the ICANN clarify the likely impact, if any, if changes to the underlying Unicode standard in MSR-2. Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of IDN, and once IDN start getting registered, it would not be necessary to change the once-registered names or add new Pseudo codepoints to the IDN system causing serious erosion of trust in the global Internet in general and IDN in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term implications. The ALAC assumes its support to the ICN team in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint activities that involve All Large Structures in relevant geographic. Report of Public Comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf</a>.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 17 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICAN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review in 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</strong></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement</td>
<td>3/23/15</td>
<td>(Public Comment Statement) - The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes ICANs scope for developing a recommendation on &quot;Root Zone TTLs&quot; (RSSAC010) and there are no actionable items for the ICAN Board. ICANs understanding of this request was reviewed and later confirmed by the ICAN in May 2017.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the GNOS Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prg-15apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prg-15apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICAN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review in 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advice Item: "Root Zone TTLs" (RSSAC003)

This statement refers back to RSSAC010 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone TTL work party to liaise.

Historically, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has provided a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) in the DNI. Registrant rights must be secured by another mechanism.

Report of Public Comments:

The elimination of the CGL requirement could be the best way to support underserved regions to participate applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrant and user rights. - lowered to an amount that the registrar can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) If the CGL requirement is maintained, the $500,000 limit should be covering any harm caused to registrants is a "best practice," registrants using registrars that do not follow the permanent fund reserved by ICANN and provided by the registrars based on their transaction volumes for through the CGL insurance or any other mechanism(s); 2) No opinion; 3) If ICANN determines that a - The ALAC notes the inclusion of six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit millions of end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the IDs are wasted and active, others have been less active or inactivate, it is important that the IDN program is harmonized (in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, support by building and outcomes) with the IA. The ALAC recommends that the ICANN clarify the likely impact, if any, if changes to the underlying Unicode standard in MSR-2. Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of IDN, and once IDN start getting registered, it would not be necessary to change the once-registered names or add new Pseudo codepoints to the IDN system causing serious erosion of trust in the global Internet in general and IDN in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-user and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as these have long-term implications. The ICANN assumes its support to the ICN team in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint activities that involve All Large Structures in relevant geographic. Report of Public Comment: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-lgprocedure-03apr15-en.pdf).
<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-0115-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6581">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6581</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone</td>
<td>12/10/14</td>
<td>Recommend 1: Maintaining the security and stability of the IANA functions through the Stewardship Transition</td>
<td>In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <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>). The respective public comment period closed on 04 Jan 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Feb 2015 (<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>) 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 then it is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC001</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC001: SSAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone</td>
<td>12/10/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <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>). The respective public comment period closed on 04 Jan 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Feb 2015 (<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>) 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 then it is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: RSSAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone</td>
<td>12/10/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The operational communities (protocol parameters, names, and numbers) that have regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role associated with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <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>). The respective public comment period closed on 04 Jan 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Feb 2015 (<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>) 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 then it is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action(s) Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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><a href="https://www.icann.org/news/09-12-en">Regions (3 of 6)</a></td>
<td>7/31/14</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) education at all levels is key; 2) the processes to become a registrar should be revised in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies; 3) the evolution of DNI programs should adhere to the following principles: 2) education at all levels is key; 3) the processes to become a registrar should be revised in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/news/09-12-en">Regions (3 of 6)</a></td>
<td>8/15/14</td>
<td>The ALAC is concerned that the proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The proposed Bylaws changes regarding consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI tends to push towards giving increased power to governments. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/news/09-12-en">Regions (3 of 6)</a></td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this document. Measurements outlined in this document should be revisited in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/news/09-12-en">Regions (3 of 6)</a></td>
<td>12/10/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports maintaining the security and stability of the IANA functions and recommends the ICANN organization undertake to implement the RZM process that involves more than one root zone management partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/news/09-12-en">Regions (3 of 6)</a></td>
<td>12/10/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC's “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum” in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 September 2014, and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. The ICANN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions, but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: 6) technical and legal supports should be provided to new gTLD applicants in underserved regions.

The ALAC statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the final ATLAS II declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e. This is part of the Global Stakeholder Engagement team’s ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) statement on the report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comment/rbs-undsub-2014-05-24-en. The ICANN Board published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions in September 2014: https://community.icann.org/display/prjct/Board+Project+Roadmap+3.1%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider (ALAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>At-LAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">At-LAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-29)</td>
<td>6/24/14</td>
<td>R-29. The ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <img src="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e" alt="Link" /> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <img src="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TRT.pdf?api=v2" alt="Link" />.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <img src="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e" alt="Link" /> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <img src="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TRT.pdf?api=v2" alt="Link" />.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <img src="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e" alt="Link" /> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <img src="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TRT.pdf?api=v2" alt="Link" />.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <img src="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e" alt="Link" /> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <img src="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TRT.pdf?api=v2" alt="Link" />.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-RC9.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <img src="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e" alt="Link" /> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <img src="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20TRT.pdf?api=v2" alt="Link" />.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**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>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-18. Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-18)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-19. ICANN needs to consider 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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-21. Implement the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-22. Membership of the public should be able to participate in ICANN in an issue-by-issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</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>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-23. The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-24. The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-5)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-25. The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-6)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-26. The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-7)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-27. The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALAC**

**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>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-28. 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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-29. 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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-30. 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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</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>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DC</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>R-31. 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>6. ICANN's MSM should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants (individuals or parties) to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest, each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board is it's September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat...ntia-on-10-March-2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CWG Accountability wiki: https://community.icann.org/display/WG/A6+-+Enhance+inc+CCWG-Accountablility+Home.

The ALAC wishes to go on record as strongly supporting the comment submitted by Alan Greenberg - [http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-bylaws-amend-compensation-02may14/msg00003.html]. 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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.

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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.
<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>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Public Responsibility Framework</td>
<td>4/21/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the report from the Panel on Public Responsibility Framework. This panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the &quot;usual suspects&quot; with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement.</td>
<td>This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/public-responsibility-framework-2013-10-11-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/public-responsibility-framework-2013-10-11-en</a>. There is no actionable item for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Root Server System Advisory</td>
<td>5/16/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the report from the Panel on Root Server System Advisory on Multistakeholder Innovation. This panel is a useful reminder of the need to reach beyond the &quot;usual suspects&quot; with suggestions on how new techniques and technologies can be used to support global engagement.</td>
<td>This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-server-system-advisory-2013-10-11-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-server-system-advisory-2013-10-11-en</a>. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Strategy Panels: Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>5/16/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the report from the Panel on Meetings Strategy working group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase concentrated policy work, engage with local Internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa delivery becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the hosting cities.</td>
<td>This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution about the recommendations of the ICANN meeting strategy working group, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/advice-statements/6891">https://www.icann.org/advice-statements/6891</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Future Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the recommendations of the Meetings Strategy Working Group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase concentrated policy work, engage with local Internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa delivery becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the hosting cities.</td>
<td>This statement was provided and considered as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution about the recommendations of the ICANN meeting strategy working group, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-05-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Future Meetings Strategy</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the recommendations of the Meetings Strategy Working Group report. The differentiation of the 3 annual meetings would improve the geographic rotation, minimize the number of conflicting sessions, facilitate cross community interactions, increase concentrated policy work, engage with local Internet communities, and increase thematic, regional or language-based interactions. The ALAC also appreciates very much that visa delivery becomes one of the main criteria for the selection of the hosting cities.</td>
<td>This is a statement on a final report, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. On 17 Nov 2014, the ICANN Board took a resolution about the recommendations of the ICANN meeting strategy working group, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/meetings-strategy-2014-02-25-en</a>. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ST-0514-06-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/co-responsibility/correspondence-6891-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Announcement Regarding the Transition of the Stewardship of the IANA Functions</td>
<td>7/17/14</td>
<td>The ALAC welcomes the announcement recently made by the National Telecommunications and Information Authority (NTIA) and celebrates the designation of ICANN as the organisation in charge of convening the global stakeholders to develop a proposal to transition the stewardship over the IANA functions by designing a multistakeholder mechanism. We expect that the design process will be open and inclusive allowing the various communities, within and outside of ICANN, to be properly considered and taken into account by adequately incorporating and addressing their concerns and thoughts in the final outcome of this collaborative effort. The ALAC believes that the end user community has a vital role in the Internet governance ecosystem and must be a part of any process going forward. We call on ICANN leadership to ensure that any mechanism that replaces the stewardship over the IANA functions is based on enhancing the multistakeholder model, maintaining the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet’s DNS, and several other principles and requirements. We commit to contributing to the process so that any outcome is a result of bottom-up, consensus-driven and multistakeholder effort in which the interests of all the end users are properly taken into account.</td>
<td>This is a statement on the announcement by the NTIA of ending its contract with ICANN. Considerable work has been completed on the transition, which can be tracked here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-ntia-2014-11-17-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/transition-ntia-2014-11-17-en</a>. The new meetings strategy was implemented in 2016.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/sc/technical/cr/2013-09-02-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/sc/technical/cr/2013-09-02-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Inconsistent Expert Determinations on String Confusion Objections</td>
<td>3/7/14</td>
<td>The ALAC supports the details of the process described, but recommends that it be included in cases such as the various top-level objections where the objections are not identical, but the results were just as inconsistent. Moreover, the ALAC notes that it has previously made statements to this effect, and that the ALAC will continue to support efforts that result in more efficient, consistent and fair processes for the resolution of disputes. The ALAC supports the ALAC's statement that the latest round of expert determinations should be reviewed and updated to address any inconsistencies or ambiguities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/sc/technical/cr/2014-03-28-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/sc/technical/cr/2014-03-28-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Related Issue Compliance Submission Process</td>
<td>3/28/14</td>
<td>CANN Contractual Compliance (CC) receives complaints either on a case-by-case basis or in bulk submissions. The ALAC understands that regardless of the submission vehicle, each complaint is reviewed on its merits and processed individually. However, this methodology is not suitable when the subject of a complaint is not an individual occurrence, but a widespread spread of incidents. This lack of coordination between the CANN and the NGPC has resulted in a significant number of cases being referred to the NGPC. The ALAC recommends a review of the NGPC's processes to ensure that the NGPC is better coordinated and more efficient. The ALAC also recommends that the NGPC provide regular updates on the status of these cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/tech/ra/files/sac-005-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/tech/ra/files/sac-005-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on ICANN RACs' Leveling DNS Infrastructure - R2</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: All types of network operators should take immediate steps to prevent network address spoofing. This involves, a) implement network ingress filtering, as described in RFC 1388 and 3704, to restrict packet level forgeries to the greatest extent possible. b) Disclose the extent of their implementation of network ingress filtering to the Internet community as a means of encouraging broader and more effective use of ingress filtering.</td>
</tr>
<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-2</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-2 means that ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 5</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-1</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The ICANN organization understands that SAC066 R-1 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 5</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 DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The ICANN organization understands that SAC067 R-5 means that ICANN should help to facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

As of 31 March 2020

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Provider: EN

Reference Number: 0114-02-00-

Issue Date: 31 March 2020

Advisory: ALAC Statement on the Proposed Bylaws

ALAC Statement on the Proposal for a "List" Processing (R-3)

Issued Date: 31 March 2020

Reference: 16dec13-en.htm

Link to Advice Document: https://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jan14-en.htm

Phase 4 | Deferred

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of forging new constituencies, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior:

1. ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the context of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with new TLDs from the 2012 application round for the new gTLD Program. On 24 June 2013, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per their ICANN organization's recommendation.

This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/strategy-2013-10-29-en. On 16 October 2014, the Board took a resolution adopting the Strategic Plan: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.c

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Technical Liaison Group (TLG)

The ALAC is concerned that the proposed changes in the bylaws removes the TLG from appointing a delegate to serve on the Nominating Committee.

The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by defining other and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must actively engage the Sovereign entities and rights of self determination of states to let them choose their region of allocation and request. If they may be, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geography, we are speaking about regions, and the ALAC doesn’t believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on another consideration than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity are important but cannot impact the geographic regions framework. We have it to be regions or cultural plus language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years period to five.

This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment on Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations. The WG provided a Final Report in October 2015: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/geog-regions-2015-10-26-en.pdf This report was placed for public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geog-regions-2015-12-23-en. The ALAC also provided comments as part of this public comment period: https://forum.icann.org/tc/drafts/geog-regions-2015-12-23-en.html ICANN staff produced a summary report of all the community comments submitted in the proceeding regarding the WG recommendations: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-region-gos-15may16-en.pdf

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Statement on the Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan

The ALAC adopts the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG, as the final Report of the DSSA WG in accordance with section 2.4 of its charter; The Chair of the ALAC is requested to inform the ccNSO, GNSO, NRO and SSAC of the DSSA WG’s adoption of the Report by the ALAC; The Chair of the ALAC is also requested to inform the chair of the other participating SO’s and AC’s (GNSO, ccNSO, NRO and SSAC); The ALAC agrees with but notes with significant regret the recommendations to not proceed with phase 2 as noted in the co-chair’s letter; and The ALAC thanks and congratulates all, and in particular the co-chairs of the WG, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond (ALAC), Joerg Schweiger (.DE, ccNSO), Mikey O’Connor (GNSO), James Galvin (SSAC) and Mark Kosters (NRO) and all volunteers and staff who helped with this effort.

This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/bylaws-amend-tlg-2013-10-30-en. On 7 February 2014, the Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaws and provided a resolution adopting the Bylaws: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#1.e

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC in Support of the ALAC Statement on the Draft Vision, Mission and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan

The ALAC supports the intent of the proposed bylaw changes to increase the availability of technical advice to the Board and the effectiveness of the Technical Liaison Group. It is clear that the current model is not working and that it has not brought any benefit to ICANN in terms of advice. However, the ALAC is concerned that changes in which the changes are presented is out of line with the original recommendations of the Board technical relations WG Findings. The ALAC understands that the proposal is not to disband the TLG altogether but to remove the TLG position from the ICANN Board. We call on the recommendations from this report.

This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment period: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en.html. On 7 February 2014, the Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaws and provided a resolution adopting the Bylaws: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#1.e
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
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ALAC recommends that ICANN be better prepared organizationally to support future reviews and that the ATRT2 be provided with a full year (12 months) for its review work, even if review commencement is delayed.

ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

The ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This ALAC statement is a part of the public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has provided a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This ALAC statement is a part of the public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d

Implementation work on ATRT2 is underway and general information about the implementation efforts can be found here:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://community.icann.org/public-comments/2014-01-09-on

The Board has taken a resolution on the ATRT2 recommendations, directing the President and CEO to proceed with implementation:

https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/ATRT2+Implementation+Program.

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

https://www.icann.org/public-comments/thick-whois-recommendations-2013-11-06-en

The Board considered the recommendations provided in the final report and provided a resolution:

https://w...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>SAC063 staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of clear and objective metrics for acceptable level of “breakage” resulting from a key rollover.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This part of the overall ICANN Rollover Project. See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>SAC062 staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the development of rollback procedures to be executed when a rollover has affected operational stability beyond a reasonable boundary.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This part of the overall ICANN Rollover Project. See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>SAC062 staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative methodology for the purpose of analyzing various viable rollover implementation, their variants, and their network environments (e.g., middleboxes) that may affect or be affected by a key rollover, such that potential problem areas can be identified, catalogued, and addressed.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 24 June 2013, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement the advice. See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf">www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>SAC061 staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of as much valuable information as possible about the impact of a key rollover to provide input for planning for future rollovers.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 15 October 2013 ICANN Board determined that the first-ever changing of the cryptographic keys that help protect the DNS has been completed with minimal disruption of the global internet. See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/news/announcement-2013-10-15-en">https://www.icann.org/en/news/announcement-2013-10-15-en</a>. The communication plan is part of the overall ICANN Rollover Project. See <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/rfc-rollover-2014-07-30-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1113-01-02-RES</td>
<td><a href="http://www.al-ac.org/st-1113-01-02-res.pdf">www.al-ac.org/st-1113-01-02-res.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Draft Final Report on Protection of ISO and NGO Identifiers at IN (GTD)</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>The ALAC is particularly concerned that granting blocking out their protection may prohibit other reasonable uses of the same strings and the ALAC is not satisfied that the methodology outlined in the report would be effective in this case, it may be important to consider the principles that guided the ALAC in its participation in the activities that led to this report, and that the ALAC believes should guide ICANN in considering a resolution on the issue. The ALAC recommends that the Board consider the following:</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of public comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of ISO and NGO Identifiers at IN (GTD). See <a href="https://www.al-ac.org/st-1113-01-02-res.pdf">https://www.al-ac.org/st-1113-01-02-res.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 3:** ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances delegation of TLDs is appropriate taking into account the status and position of the TLD domain, the security and stability of the TLD, and the risk of a collision on the TLD. In the case where TLDs have an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zones is greater than the risk and harm of removing a visible and useful namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid reversal of the delegation of TLDs.

**ICANN Board:** The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 Nov 2013 that “directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated.” See https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-materait/resolutions-2013-11-21-en#2.c. 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/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#2.c. |
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Advice Provider: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
Advice Item: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)
Issue Date: 9/9/13
Advice Document Recommendation: SAC101v2, the ICANN org has returned SAC061 to Phase 2 | Understand. SAC061 Recommendation 2 will change SAC061 Recommendation 2’s status from ‘Closed’ to ‘Open.” Upon review of SAC061 and August 2018 the SSAC contacted the ICANN org to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN org change SAC061 Recommendation 2’s status from “Closed” to “Open.” Upon review of SAC061 and SAC061v2, the ICANN org has returned SAC061 to Phase 2 | Understand. SAC061 Recommendation 2 will be considered in conjunction with SAC101v2. On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 1A and through amendment in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPoD Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-25-en#). In its notation the Board states “Advisory Committee Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that the ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the ICANN Board’s recommendations for multi-factored validation.”

Advice Provider: At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
Advice Item: At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
Issue Date: 9/16/13
Action(s) Taken: In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf). In February 2014, the NGPC directed ICANN to publish for public comment the proposed review mechanism for addressing perceived inconsistent Expert Determinations from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#b. The Board has also identified this topic as one that may be appropriate for the GNSO’s discussion of evaluation in the 2012 application round and adjustments for future application rounds (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/at-large/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/at-large/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Regarding ICANN's recommendation on the impact of community applications in string contention and provide preferential treatment to applications that meet the characteristics of community applications.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/at-large/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/at-large/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The current rights protection regime associated with the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMDH) process is susceptible to homographic attacks. The roles of the involved parties, specifically registrars, registrants, and TMDH, related to matching must be made clear.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<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>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>When registrar calculates variant TLDs for validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<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>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The matching algorithm for TMDH must be improved.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<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>Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the "Name Collisions in the DNS" [PDF; 3.34 MB] study report by Interot Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN to the ICANN-105 Collision Risk Management Proposal [PDF; 164 KB]. The ALAC wishes to reiterate its previous Advice to the Board that, in pursuing mitigation actions to minimize residual risk, especially for those strings in the "uncalculated risk" category, ICANN must assure that such residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers, and individual end users. In particular, the direct and indirect costs associated with proposed mitigation actions should not have to be borne by registrants, consumers and individual end users. The ALAC remains concerned that this matter is being dealt at such a late stage of the New gTLD Process. The ALAC urges the Board to investigate how and why this crucial issue could have been ignored for so long and how similar occurrences may be presented in the future.

As of 31 March 2020

### SAC060

**Advice Item**: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item Status**: ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advice Provider**: At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Reference Number**: SAC060


**Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)**: The matching algorithm for TMDH must be improved.

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

**Advice Document Recommendation Phase**: -

**Action(s) Taken**: On 30 July 2014, the NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2014-07-30-en. Implementation and general information about the Name Collision efforts can be found at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-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>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (5 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, where possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Should ICANN decide to implement safeguards, it should distinguish two types of failure modes when a user expects a variant to work, but it is not implemented: denial of service versus misconnection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rule (LGR) calculations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>The process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/docs/sac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) providers support variant TLDs, and that party exists for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advising on the development of recommendations for the Root Zone (RZ) Label Generation Rules (LGR) procedure, which is aimed at a conservative and minimalist approach to ensure the security and stability of the root zone. The RZ-label procedure is designed to follow a recommendation from the ICANN Board at ICANN64, where the Board asked the GNSO and ccNSO to consider the following items as part of their policy development work:

- The Label Generation Rules (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the RZ-LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The RZ-LGR procedure, including guidelines, has been put in place at Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program, and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the RZ-LGR procedure can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-2015-06-21-en.

Specifically, the RZ-LGR procedure is aimed to minimize non-local impact, new rules added to a LGR must, where possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations. General information on the root zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-2015-06-21-en.

ICANN is responsible for the security and stability of the root zone and the activities of this committee. The SSAC is an independent, self-regulating committee that provides advice to ICANN on SSR. The SSAC operates under the ICANN bylaws and policies. The SSAC provides advice on SSR and the SSAC’s process is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The RZ-LGR procedure, including guidelines, has been put in place at Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program, and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the RZ-LGR procedure can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-2015-06-21-en.

ICANN is responsible for the security and stability of the root zone and the activities of this committee. The SSAC is an independent, self-regulating committee that provides advice to ICANN on SSR. The SSAC operates under the ICANN bylaws and policies. The SSAC provides advice on SSR and the SSAC’s process is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The RZ-LGR procedure, including guidelines, has been put in place at Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program, and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the RZ-LGR procedure can be found here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-2015-06-21-en.
The ICANN Board Status Advice Report is a document that provides advice on various topics related to the operation and governance of the Internet's domain name system. The report includes recommendations from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), and other relevant committees. The report is structured in a tabular format, listing the advice items, references, and action taken. The report covers a range of topics, including WHOIS policy, root zone scaling, and new generic top-level domain (gTLD) operations. The recommendations are based on extensive analysis and input from the ICANN community, experts, and other stakeholders. The report is an important resource for the ICANN Board and the community in making decisions and implementing strategies to ensure the stability and security of the Internet.
<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/docs/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicated for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en</a> In November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/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 adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.</td>
<td>Phase</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 SSAC: <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>SAC053</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-053-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-053-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model (2 of 2)</td>
<td>6/11/12</td>
<td>Recommendation: Entities domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use of DNS resource records such as 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>Phase</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 SSAC: <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>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-052-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/docs/documents/sac-052-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2)</td>
<td>12/31/12</td>
<td>Recommendation: To ensure the potential for user confusion and the currently unfulfilled work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes its work on user confusion/striking similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be allowed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of possible confusability both within and across scripts. Such consideration should include comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN/SSAC advisory committees. 3. Single character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Such applied for single character TLD label must be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts. 4. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of character TLDs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be released if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a concise specification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs. 12. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding its consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be PVALID according to IDN-GOD. b) The code point is from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard 12.2. Some single character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include not-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. c) The restriction in which an exception is made and a single character IDN TLD is allowed should not have characteristics that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Greek/ Cyrillic, and Thai, etc.). The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Finally, a single character TLD application does not imply blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook to allow for the delegation of single character IDN TLDs: <a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/ngd/guides/guidebook-full-final-en-02-2012-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/ngd/guides/guidebook-full-final-en-02-2012-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-052-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-052-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single Character Internationalized Domain Name Top Level Domains (1 of 2)</td>
<td>1/31/12</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): Because important relevant work on string similarity, IDN variant issues, and TLD interconnection is currently underway within ICANN's architecture advisory committees, ICANN should review the Findings of this report, and any policies that it adopts in response to Recommendation 1, no later than one year after the three works 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 in the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en</a>). Based on this extensive work, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>DNS Blocking: Benefits Versus Harms</td>
<td>6/24/11</td>
<td>Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain name or Internet Protocol (IP) space protection (or otherwise preventing access to web content) as a matter of security policy may be favored by some organizations as a natural extension of telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organization from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate connection to the named host, although circumvention techniques may enable connectivity to the intended system anyway (this includes simply accessing the site via IP address rather than via Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN)). A DNS resolver on network operator could also return a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether resolving a Non-DNS (NQDNS) DNS or resolving with existing DNS infrastructure. Although DNS blocking can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphan glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS system. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphan glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure</td>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>6.1 The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in discussions and documents. In particular, Domain Name Registration Data (DNRD). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars or registrants collect. - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNRD-AP). The components of a standard communications exchange and responses - that specify the access to DNRRD - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNRD-DS). The service offered by domain name registrants and registrars to implement the DNRRD-AP and to provide access to DNRRD-DS. Additional terminology includes: TLDWHOIS, WHOIS policy, DNRRD-DS Policy, DNRRD-AP Protocol, Internationalized Domain Name (IDN), and TLDWHOIS. The term ‘WHOIS’ should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 3912.</td>
<td>On 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work began related to the development of a new WHOIS service policy and that is incorporated into the language used by the SSAC. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en</a>). This specific advice item contains no action for the Board. The FDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDSD) is currently considering this topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC053</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-053-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-053-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure</td>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>6.3. The ICANN community should develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing DNRRD that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of verification methods, credential services, and access control capabilities.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for the ICANN Board. The FDP on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDSD) is currently considering this topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure</td>
<td>2/24/11</td>
<td>6.2. The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of internationalized DNS data as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC 003, SAC 027 and SAC 033.</td>
<td>The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC055 be developed (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en</a>). A roadmap to implementing SAC055 was published for public comment in February 2012 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/announcement-6-2012-02-06-en">https://www.icann.org/en/announcement-6-2012-02-06-en</a>). On 26 August 2016 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.</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/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on DNS Zone Risk Assessment and Management (1 of 3)</td>
<td>6/24/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that registrants consider implementing [URL] 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) Actively manage DNS information; (4) Protect domain registration and hosting accounts against unauthorized access or misuse; (5) Monitor the health and well being of your name service; (6) Track operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS loss; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully, and (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC048: SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)</td>
<td>5/22/11</td>
<td>1. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue under the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed.</td>
<td>The SSAC voted to close this advice item on 7 July 2017. This advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-046-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/documents/sac-046-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC046: SAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)</td>
<td>5/22/11</td>
<td>The SSAC offers the following comments for consideration on the removal of orphan glue records: 1. Orphaned glue is a significant issue which will require a definitive definition. The SSAC has prepared a definition that we recommend be included for reference in the Applicant Guidebook (see below for proposed definition).</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, those already identified in RFC 2606.

Recommendation (2): The SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new servers.

Forewarn organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, so they may mitigate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NXDOMAIN responses from root servers. ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity.

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

The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addressed the issues related to invalid top-level domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en#1. As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. It should be noted however that invalid TLD query data has not yet been studied and such a study would be required for future "subsequent procedures" for new gTLDs. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf.

The NGPC resolutions on name collision were also published as part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution: http://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06.en Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf.

The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance. In cooperation with RISAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.

The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance. In cooperation with RISAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 31 December 2010 pending external activity. ICANN will take up further action once the implementation of RISAC037-038 and the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group is complete.

ICANN commissioned Interisle to study the namespace issue raised in SAC059 and further to JAS to provide a report on mitigating namespace collisions.

The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance. In cooperation with RISAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 31 December 2010 pending external activity. ICANN will take up further action once the implementation of RISAC037-038 and the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group is complete.

The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance. In cooperation with RISAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 31 December 2010 pending external activity. ICANN will take up further action once the implementation of RISAC037-038 and the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group is complete.