

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-03feb22-en.pdf	RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System (R-2)	2/3/22	The RSSAC recommends that the official implementation of the metric system must: a. Meet the minimum requirements specified in Section 3 of this report regarding the number, location, connectivity, and other requirements for the vantage points. b. Publish all software related to its operation under an open source license as defined by the Open Source Initiative. c. Make the raw measurement data available to anyone in the interest of transparency. A third party should be able to use the raw data to verify the computation of these metrics. d. In its monthly reports, only publish threshold pass or fail indicators for each RSI, not the actual measurements or metrics used to determine the threshold pass or fail values. e. Publicly describe its methods for collecting measurements and aggregating metrics, including the topological location of each measurement vantage point. This description should be complete enough for RSOs and DNS researchers to create their own measurement collection systems similar to those used by the official implementation. f. Share with an RSO the underlying measurements and metrics that resulted in failure any time an RSI fails to pass a threshold test. The shared measurements and metrics must include all measurements from around the time of failure and must include all measured values for all transports and address types.	-	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is instead describing a later long-term service that might be implemented. The operational details of the long-term service will be described after there is sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the official implementation will be put in place, e.g. an RFP process for a system meeting all the requirements described in RSSAC047 or a determination that the interim implementation can meet RSSAC047 requirements (including those enumerated in Recommendation 2) or another approach. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-03feb22-en.pdf	RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System (R-3)	2/3/22	The RSSAC, in collaboration with ICANN and the Internet community, should consider the following additional work: ● For a holistic view of RSS performance, it may be desirable or necessary to include measurements for all instances of each RSI. The only reasonable way to provide for such a view would be through self-reporting. In the future, it should be considered to have each RSO perform self-reporting of the defined metrics to eliminate uncertainty of components not under the RSO's control, and it should probably be tied to an SLA including compensation for the RSO to implement. ● Create a reference data set. ● Explore the financial aspects of increased accountability and how it might relate to these metrics. ● Keeping with the provisions of RSSAC037 and RSSAC038 publish a document that advises any bodies created as part of the ongoing evolution of RSS governance on how they should interpret and act on data from the measurement systems. ● Investigate a better long-term plan for the location of the vantage points. Such a plan would distribute the vantage points by network topology instead of geographic location. ● Whereas the current work is based on a largely empirical model of the RSS, future versions of this document may want to take a more analytical and theoretical modeling approach.	-	ICANN org understands this to be a request for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-03feb22-en.pdf	RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System (R-4)	2/3/22	The RSSAC should review the measurements, metrics, and thresholds listed in this document every two to three years, and determine if updates are needed.	-	ICANN org understands this to be a request for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-03feb22-en.pdf	RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System (R-1)	2/3/22	The RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation should be designed such that it can transform into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands this to be a request to create an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The "initial implementation" is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that a long-term service would have. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 18 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-058-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC058: Success Criteria for the RSS Governance Structure	11/17/21	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted various statements concerning the future of Root Server System (RSS) governance with the hope that it will lead to a new RSS Governance Structure (RSS GS). These include: ● RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System (12 June 2018); ● RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence (13 May 2019); ● RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community (14 April 2020); and ● RSSAC055: Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System (7 July 2021) This document provides additional details that build upon these and other statements by RSSAC and constitutes a more definite statement of RSSAC advice.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC058 is the Success Criteria for the RSS Governance Structure. The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted various statements concerning the future of Root Server System (RSS) governance with the hope that it will lead to a new RSS Governance Structure (RSS GS). These include: ● RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System (12 June 2018); ● RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence (13 May 2019); ● RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community (14 April 2020); and ● RSSAC055: Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System (7 July 2021) This document provides additional details that build upon these and other statements by RSSAC and constitutes a more definite statement of RSSAC advice. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC058 on 3 December 2021.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-058-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC058: Success Criteria for the RSS Governance Structure	11/17/21	The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted various statements concerning the future of Root Server System (RSS) governance with the hope that it will lead to a new RSS Governance Structure (RSS GS). These include: ● RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System (12 June 2018); ● RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence (13 May 2019); ● RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community (14 April 2020); and ● RSSAC055: Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System (7 July 2021) This document provides additional details that build upon these and other statements by RSSAC and constitutes a more definite statement of RSSAC advice.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC058 is the Success Criteria for the RSS Governance Structure. The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) has adopted various statements concerning the future of Root Server System (RSS) governance with the hope that it will lead to a new RSS Governance Structure (RSS GS). These include: ● RSSAC037: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System (12 June 2018); ● RSSAC042: RSSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence (13 May 2019); ● RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community (14 April 2020); and ● RSSAC055: Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System (7 July 2021) This document provides additional details that build upon these and other statements by RSSAC and constitutes a more definite statement of RSSAC advice. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC058 on 3 December 2021.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC059	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-059-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC059: Success Criteria for the Root Server System Governance Structure R-1	11/17/21	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board accepts the advice presented in RSSAC058 and communicates its expectation that RSSAC058 shall be incorporated into all ongoing and future work involved in designing, evaluating, agreeing, implementing, and enforcing RSS governance.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received RSSAC059 on 24Nov21 and is currently reviewing.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC059	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-059-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC059: Success Criteria for the Root Server System Governance Structure R-2	11/17/21	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board review its response to RSSAC038 Recommendation 1 and take such further action as necessary to take account of the content of RSSAC058.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received RSSAC059 on 24Nov21 and is currently reviewing.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC059	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-059-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC059: Success Criteria for the Root Server System Governance Structure R-3	11/17/21	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board take account of the content of RSSAC058 in its response to RSSAC038 Recommendation 2.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received RSSAC059 on 24Nov21 and is currently reviewing.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC059	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-059-17nov21-en.pdf	RSSAC059: Success Criteria for the Root Server System Governance Structure R-4	11/17/21	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board take account of the content of RSSAC058 in its response to RSSAC038 Recommendation 3.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received RSSAC059 on 24Nov21 and is currently reviewing.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC057	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf	RSSAC057: Requirements for Measurements of the Local Perspective on the Root Server System (R-1)	9/9/21	The RSSAC recommends that a tool, or set of tools, be built based on the requirements articulated in Section 3 of this document. The tools described in Section 4 of this document could be used as building blocks. The tools should be made available for the Internet community.	-	ICANN understands that the perf_root tool described in Section 4 is already a complete implementation of the requirements in Section 3. Thus, ICANN understands that this requirement is already met. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 14 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC057	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf	RSSAC057: Requirements for Measurements of the Local Perspective on the Root Server System R-2	9/9/21	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board identify a person or group to collaborate with the RSSAC Caucus on further development of a data repository as described in Section 5 of this document. The purpose of such collaboration is to make specific proposals for a data repository, including: A. Implementation of the data publication mechanism B. Whether or not access to measurement results should be public or limited due to privacy concerns C. How to ensure data quality and prevent abuse D. A proposed database schema and model E. A proposed data exchange format (e.g., JSON) F. Cost estimates for the initial development and ongoing operation G. Identification of groups or parties that could operate the data repository	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN understands that this requirement is for ICANN org, or some other party designated by the Board, to have collaborative discussions with the RSSAC Caucus about developing a data repository as described in Section 5. ICANN understands that the expected outcome of these discussions is a proposal to create a data repository that matches the requirements. ICANN believes that this recommendation is feasible. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 14 March 2022. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 March 2022.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13833	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN: Advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 (SSAD) (R-1)	8/12/21	Either reject the SSAD recommendations and/or request that the GNSO Council reconsider the issue, perhaps with a suitable delay to fully understand the potential changes to the GDPR-related regulations in Europe.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN on 12 August 2021 and is currently reviewing.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13833	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN: Advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 (SSAD) (R-2)	8/12/21	Immediately have ICANN Org design and begin implementation of a no-charge ticketing/tracking system to track requests for disclosure of non-public gTLD registration information. Such a system has no need for accreditation, thus simplifying the implementation. This can likely be built upon existing components already in use within ICANN, or commercial solutions readily available. If a PDP is required to require that all contracted parties use it, such a targeted GNSO PDP should be initiated by the Board. Consideration should be given to having the ticketing/tracking system also apply to Privacy/Proxy providers.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN on 12 August 2021 and is currently reviewing.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13833	AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN: Advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 (SSAD) (R-3)	8/12/21	Should regulations comparable to those related to domain name registration data in the NIS2 proposal be adopted by the European Union Council and Parliament, the ICANN Board should immediately consider initiating a targeted GNSO PDP to ensure that all ICANN registrars are subject to comparable rules. This will provide fairness within the registrar community and ensure that we do not end up with registrars outside of the EU being able to provide higher levels of anonymity to those registering domains in support of DNS abuse and other fraudulent or illegal activities. This last advice is not directly related to the SSAD, but the lack of an SSAD (or equivalent) implies that we need to maximize the amount of information legally published in the non-redacted RDDS. This is in line with ICANN's original intent of "maintaining the existing WHOIS system to the greatest extent possible".	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN on 12 August 2021 and is currently reviewing.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC119	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-119-en.pdf	SAC119 Feedback to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP WG	8/5/21	The SSAC appreciates the opportunity to provide early input into the GNSO Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG). The SSAC believes that it is important for registrants to experience a secure, stable, and smooth transition when transferring registrations between registrars. There are two specific security risks the SSAC would like to highlight. ● A registrant's domain name is at risk of experiencing a discontinuity of DNS resolution, and when DNSSEC is in use, a discontinuity of validation, during a registration transfer if the transfer of DNS services is not considered during the process. ● A registrant's domain name is at increased risk of being hijacked if the authInfo code is not managed according to best practice security principles.	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC119 is the SSAC's Feedback to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP WG and that the SSAC believes that it is important for registrants to experience a secure, stable, and smooth transition when transferring registrations between registrars. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 19 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2A)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: A. A data element should be defined that denotes the legal status of the registrant. Initially we propose three admissible values: Natural, Legal, and Unspecified. "Unspecified" would be the default value until the registrant identifies themselves as a natural or legal person. This field should be able to support status values depending upon future policy decisions.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2B)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: B. This data element should be displayed as part of the publicly available data.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2C)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: C. Registrants should be classified as either natural or legal persons. This should be required at the time of registration, for all new domain registrations. For existing registrations, the value can remain "Unspecified" until it is filled at a later time. Registrars should be required to ask at relevant times, such as upon domain renewal and/or the annual accuracy inquiry, whether the registrant is natural or legal, with the goal of eventually obtaining that data for all registrants, and reducing "Unspecified" to the lowest practical level.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2D)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding legal versus natural persons: D. Registrants currently are able to and should continue to have the option of making their contact data publicly available. Legal person registrants should also have the ability to protect their data via privacy and proxy services.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3A)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding the feasibility of pseudonymous email contact: A. The two policy objectives—namely (1) the ability to quickly and effectively contact the registrant without disclosing personal data, and (2) A common identifier that helps investigators to correlate registrations with common contacts should be considered separately.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-3B)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding the feasibility of pseudonymous email contact: B. To achieve policy objective (A1), registrars should deploy (or continue to deploy) methods to support registrant-based email contact (See section 2.1.2 discussion of the two methods). The SSAC further recommends uniform requirements for safeguards be developed for the registrant-based email contact. The requirements should include maintaining the privacy of the registrant as appropriate and service level commitments to set expectations for the use of the service. These safeguards are independent of the method chosen (e.g., unique email addresses or web-based forms).	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R3-C)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the following regarding the feasibility of pseudonymous email contact: C. To achieve policy objective (A2), additional research is needed on the methods, their efficacy, and their tradeoffs. We recommend the EPDP Phase 2A not specify a method for correlating registrations with a common contact at this time.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-1)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO) and ICANN org focus their attention on building and operating an effective differentiated access system. A differentiated access system with the following properties is needed: Timely - It must come into operation soon. Reliable - It must operate in a predictable and consistent fashion, both in the operation of the system and the decision-making by the participants of the system. Useful - It must provide results that are of benefit to the requesters. Efficient - It must provide responses to legitimate data requests quickly, and at a cost to all the parties that are acceptable for the purpose. Easily Accessed - Gaining and maintaining credentials has to work well enough to facilitate—rather than impede—use. This document uses the term “effective” to refer to a differentiated access system fulfilling all the above requirements, and, of course including the functionality required to manage distinct requests and responses to various combinations of requesters and purposes as noted in Section 2.2.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC118 on 13 August 2021 and is currently reviewing.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC118	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf	SAC118: SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-1)	7/15/21	The SSAC recommends the Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO) and ICANN org focus their attention on building and operating an effective differentiated access system. A differentiated access system with the following properties is needed: Timely - It must come into operation soon. Reliable - It must operate in a predictable and consistent fashion, both in the operation of the system and the decision-making by the participants of the system. Useful - It must provide results that are of benefit to the requesters. Efficient - It must provide responses to legitimate data requests quickly, and at a cost to all the parties that are acceptable for the purpose. Easily Accessed - Gaining and maintaining credentials has to work well enough to facilitate—rather than impede—use. This document uses the term “effective” to refer to a differentiated access system fulfilling all the above requirements, and, of course including the functionality required to manage distinct requests and responses to various combinations of requesters and purposes as noted in Section 2.2.	Phase 2 Understand Request	With respect to the SSAD recommendations, the Board understands that the SSAC is recommending that the ICANN Board, Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO) and ICANN org should take into account the SSAC's previous advice and minority opinion on the SSAD recommendations and collectively rethink and refocus their attention on how to achieve a complete system that is usable, effective, reliable, accessible, and timely. As SSAC is aware, the Board has received additional information from ICANN org's recently completed ODP assessment of the recommendations. We are also looking forward to hearing from the GNSO Small Team (that SSAC is participating in) that has been recently formed to look at the ODP work. We welcome continued dialogue with the SSAC and the entire ICANN community with regards to the next steps as the Board considers the SSAD recommendations. ICANN sent the above Understanding to the SSAC on 08 April 2022.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC117	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-117-en.pdf	SAC117: Report on Root Service Early Warning Systems	7/13/21	The SSAC reviewed many relevant publications on the topic of a root zone early warning system and provides a short summary of each in this report. The concept of an early warning system for the root zone comes originally from the Root Scaling Study Team and TNO Reports, both published in 2009. Since then the concept has evolved away from an original intention of modelling the potential impact on the operation of the root service with the addition of internationalized domain names (IDNs), IPv6, and new gTLDs to the root zone into a concept that is intended to provide feedback about the operational stability of the root service as more gTLDs are added to the root zone. In reviewing these publications, the SSAC came to the conclusion that an early warning system for the root zone is currently infeasible, as was also concluded by OCTO-15.	-	The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the Report on Root Service Early Warning Systems of the SAC. The SSAC reviewed many relevant publications on the topic of a root zone early warning system and provides a short summary of each in this report. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 18 August 2021.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC055	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-055-07jul21-en.pdf	RSSAC055: Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System	7/7/21	During the writing of RSSAC037, the RSSAC identified the key factors for the success of the DNS in general, and the RSS in particular. Eleven guiding principles emerged from the discussions and are listed in RSSAC037. The principles have been referred to in different contexts often enough that the RSSAC has decided to publish them separately here, with additional explanatory text. Some items in the list of guiding principles apply to the RSS as a whole, while others apply to the individual RSOs that make up the RSS. A primary goal for the RSS is to support the entire Internet community by serving a single consistent root zone. To support that goal for the RSS, each RSO is committed to being neutral, impartial, and focused on the provisioning and maintenance of the RSS technical infrastructure. Thus, the principles listed for the RSS and the RSOs are interrelated.	-	17Aug21: The ICANN organization understands RSSAC055 are the Principles Guiding the Operation of the Public Root Server System of the RSSAC. During the writing of RSSAC037, the RSSAC identified the key factors for the success of the DNS in general, and the RSS in particular. Eleven guiding principles emerged from the discussions and are listed in RSSAC037. The principles have been referred to in different contexts often enough that the RSSAC has decided to publish them separately here, with additional explanatory text. Some items in the list of guiding principles apply to the RSS as a whole, while others apply to the individual RSOs that make up the RSS. A primary goal for the RSS is to support the entire Internet community by serving a single consistent root zone. To support that goal for the RSS, each RSO is committed to being neutral, impartial, and focused on the provisioning and maintenance of the RSS technical infrastructure. Thus, the principles listed for the RSS and the RSOs are interrelated. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 13 August 2021.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC056	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-056-07jul21-en.pdf	RSSAC056: RSSAC Advisory on Rogue DNS Root Server Operators	7/7/21	In this report, the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) examines both measurable and subjective activities of a root server operator (RSO) that could be considered rogue to inform future Root Server System (RSS) governance bodies. Future RSS governance bodies may use this document to develop a more complete definition of rogue RSO actions and will ultimately be the authority in determining subjective factors such as intent, when judging the actions of a RSO. The audience of this report is the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), future root server system governance bodies, and, more broadly, the Internet community.	-	The ICANN organization understands RSSAC056 is the RSSAC's Advisory on Rogue DNS Root Server Operators. In this report, the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) examines both measurable and subjective activities of a root server operator (RSO) that could be considered rogue to inform future Root Server System (RSS) governance bodies. Future RSS governance bodies may use this document to develop a more complete definition of rogue RSO actions and will ultimately be the authority in determining subjective factors such as intent, when judging the actions of a RSO. The audience of this report is the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), future root server system governance bodies, and, more broadly, the Internet community. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 13 August 2021.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01A)	4/16/21	Any expansion of the New gTLD Program must be beneficial to all stakeholders	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01B)	4/16/21	Program Objectives must be sufficiently reviewed and particularized to enable formulation of suitable metrics for effective evaluation beyond just general consumer choice, and Domain Name System (DNS) marketplace competition aspects.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01C)	4/16/21	Any expansion of the domain namespace must not compromise the stability, security and resiliency of the DNS.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-02A)	4/16/21	The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 20182 focused on two things: intention (goals, objectives) and data, therefore the relevant recommendations represent important inputs.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-02B)	4/16/21	Our concerns remain over the actions (or lack thereof) by the SubPro WG with respect to CCTRT Recommendations #14, #15, #16 (to do with DNS Security Abuse) and #29, #31 and #32 (to do with the Applicant Support Program), resulting in deficiencies which we hope the ICANN Board will shepherd the community and ICANN Org in addressing.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-02C)	4/16/21	Our concerns also remain over the seemingly lack of policy direction in respect of CCTRT Recommendation #12(1) (to do with user expectation regarding the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name), an omission which we hope the ICANN Board will consider addressing.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-02D)	4/16/21	While noting ICANN Board's action on the CCTRT recommendations through its resolutions of 1 March 20203 and 22 October 20204, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to ensure that all prerequisite and high priority CCTRT recommendations are implemented, at the latest, prior to the launch of the next round.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-03A)	4/16/21	The ALAC deems the SubPro WG's approach of Recommendation 9.15 (which is to defer the issue of DNS Abuse mitigation solely to a wider ICANN community effort or "holistic approach") as foregoing a valuable opportunity to modernize existing contracts with Registries and Registrars in order to contractually compel more immediate, increased efforts to stem 'abuse' (as defined by the contracted parties themselves).	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-03B)	4/16/21	The ALAC opines that a new application round represents a carrot and a more immediate avenue to draw contracted parties to negotiate improvements to their own DNS Abuse mitigation efforts; absent this incentive, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-03C)	4/16/21	Notwithstanding, the ALAC believes that the landscape of DNS Abuse continues to evolve and that anti-abuse measures must be continuously updated, if not widened, to also recognize and address new forms of harm being perpetrated by bad actors.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-03D)	4/16/21	Therefore, if the ICANN Board sought to agree with the suggested "holistic approach", then the ALAC strongly urges the Board to also ensure that not only must those community discussions take place promptly, but that they be completed with outcomes put in place prior to the launch of the next round of applications for New gTLDs. To this end, we believe it is imperative for the ICANN Board consider the following inputs: o Prior ALAC Advice on DNS Abuse; o The SSR2 Final Report recommendations touching on contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS Abuse; o The SSAC's proposition in SAC114 Recommendation 3 regarding best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse; o The SSAC's proposal in SAC115 for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to streamline abuse reporting and minimizing of abuse victimization, as well as the call to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties; and o An expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG).	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04A)	4/16/21	We noted the ICANN Board's expressed concern that ICANN may end up enforcing contract provisions that lie outside its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside its remit must not displace the exigency for all provisions in contract with ICANN to be enforceable and to be enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04B)	4/16/21	Any provision that ICANN does not intend to enforce should not appear in contracts with Registries and/or Registrars.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04C)	4/16/21	Should a jurisdictionally competent dispute resolution procedure determination or ruling of unenforceability (on whatever grounds) be served on ICANN, the ICANN Board must take action to remedy such unenforceability, by preserving, where feasible, the original intention of the affected PIC or RVC through negotiation with all impacted contracted parties or other actions. Such actions could, if necessary, include Bylaw amendments.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04D)	4/16/21	The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads "ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose rules and restrictions on) services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 1.1(a)". The parenthetical expression clearly says that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04E)	4/16/21	The ALAC believes that SubPro WG's Affirmation 4.1.1 and Recommendation 4.1.2 are to apply equally to PICs and RVCs; and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that ICANN Contractual Compliance's role in publishing more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or an RVC for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering/effecting Registry Agreement termination.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04F)	4/16/21	At the time that PICs were first introduced, the ALAC was assured that they would be enforceable by Contractual Compliance and not solely through PIC Dispute Resolution Procedures (PICDRPs). PICDRPs require that the entity initiating the dispute must show measurable harm. It should not be necessary to show harm to have contracts enforced and the Board must ensure that the original commitment is honored.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04G)	4/16/21	As such, the ALAC recommends that the Board instigate a review of the PICDRP to allow for complaints against any alleged registry violation of a PIC or RVC to be taken up and determined not only where the complainant is able to show evidence of significant harm suffered (as is currently required) but also on the grounds of foreseeable harm to themselves or even a third party.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-05A)	4/16/21	The ALAC remains convinced that any expansion of the new gTLD market must actively and effectively facilitate the inclusion of the next billion Internet end-users, i.e. those who depend on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and IDN-emails and that Universal Acceptance (UA) is key in ensuring this outcome.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-05B)	4/16/21	Therefore, while the ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board lead the pursuit of greater action towards UA-adoption through specific measures such as, including a metric on UA adoption by third parties as a measure of success for the New gTLD Program, and encouraging increased promotion for UA-readiness by contracted parties and with new applicants.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06A)	4/16/21	The ALAC supports the ICANN Board's continued keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC's Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06B)	4/16/21	We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.30.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-06C)	4/16/21	Further, we strongly advocate for the recommendations of SSAC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 (as approved by the ICANN Board) to be implemented prior to the launch of the next round of applications for New gTLDs; or in the alternative, that delegation of any applied-for strings which pose a risk of name collisions be withheld until the NCAP studies are completed and recommendations are addressed in implementation, retrospectively for the next round.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-07)	4/16/21	In the present absence of consensus policy recommendations by SubPro WG with respect to Closed Generics, the ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted on how to address applications for Closed Generics which serve a global public interest.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08A)	4/16/21	The ALAC finds the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to be another area for which a lack of concrete policy guidance and evaluation metrics. While the SubPro has made some recommendations to improve the ASP, the evident absence of specific goals hinders proper evaluation of program objectives and performance.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08B)	4/16/21	We also question the wisdom of leaving many key aspects for development by a Dedicated Implementation Review Team (IRT) – such as addressing a risk of gaming, assessment of willful gaming and penalties to deter the gaming, and development of the Bid Credit for Applicant Support qualifiers – since these would conceivably involve questions of policy where the community’s input would prove crucial. Faced with this situation, we call for priority for ALAC membership in the Dedicated IRT.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-08C)	4/16/21	From an implementation standpoint, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org, firstly, to secure a larger fund to meaningfully support the ASP in the next round, and secondly, to take a more active coordinating role in the ASP pro-bono assistance mechanism.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09A)	4/16/21	The ALAC continues to strongly oppose not only allowing private actions in subsequent procedures but also the use of a second-price, sealed bid auction instead of the Vickrey auction solution as the mechanism to resolve contention sets.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09B)	4/16/21	We share the Board’s concerns towards an applicant’s ability to ‘shuffle funds between private auctions’. This ability for a loser to apply proceeds from one private auction to fund their other private auctions only really benefits incumbent multi-TLD registry operators or multiple-string applicants, and clearly disadvantages single-TLD/niche applicants. With ongoing and increasing consolidation of the domain name industry, allowing private auctions will likely exacerbate the advantage for merged contracted parties, leading to less competition among registries.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09C)	4/16/21	Thus, we believe there should be a ban on private auctions. Also, by mandating ICANN only auctions, the proceeds of any such ICANN auctions can at least be directed for uses in pursuit of public interest, such as was determined through the CCWG on Auction Proceeds.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09D)	4/16/21	We also believe that the use of a bona fide intent affirmation – whether for all applicants or otherwise – where factors for establishing a lack of bona fide intent are too subjective, and without deterrence through penalty, serves little purpose.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09E)	4/16/21	As for the proposed Contention Resolution Transparency Requirements framework, we do not agree with the protections for disclosing applicants and advise the Board to ensure that all terms of every concluded private resolution be disclosed to ICANN Org (subject to a nondisclosure commitment by ICANN Org where necessary) as data to support and inform future policy work.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-10)	4/16/21	The ALAC applauds the SubPro WG’s inclusion of many of the At-Large suggestions to reform and improve the CPE process, evaluation criteria procedures and guidelines in the SubPro Final Report. However, the SubPro WG recommendations fell short on 2 counts for which we call on the ICANN Board to redress: o Implementation Guidance 34.4 fails to address an unreasonable impediment to proving both “awareness and recognition of the community members” for CPE Criterion 1-A; the allowance made only in respect of the “recognition of community members” aspect ignores the conjunctive “and” in Criterion 1-A, such that a worthy community applicant would still forfeit valuable points where “awareness of the community members” is also not measurable. o Implementation Guidance 34.12 fails to stipulate that the shortlisting and selection of CPE provider(s) by ICANN Org be subject to community input as a proactive measure for selecting the most suitable CPE Provider for subsequent procedures in order to avoid a repeat of the widespread criticisms resulting from the CPE evaluations for the 2012 round of applications.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11A)	4/16/21	Despite the welcomed retention of much of the 2012 AGB implementation relating to Geographic Name at the Top Level (and their adoption as new consensus policy in place of the much less favourable ones in the GNSO 2007 Consensus Policy), the ALAC remains concerned over the insufficient support within the community for the need to respect and take into consideration the voice of stakeholders to future applications for strings matching many names with geographical meaning.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11B)	4/16/21	We ask the ICANN Board to consider the public interest ramifications and serious potential consequences in allowing applications for Non-Capital City Name strings which do not clearly allude to and/or commit applicants to whether the TLD will be used primarily for purposes associated with that city name. We opine that stronger preventive protection for such strings is merited to prevent unintended consequences. Therefore, we reiterate our call for applications for strings which match the names of non-capital cities meeting specified criteria to be accompanied by letters of support/non-objection from relevant local governmental/public authorities irrespective of the applicant's declared use of the TLD.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11C)	4/16/21	The ALAC also asks that the ICANN Board consider directing ICANN Org to provide a Notification Tool exclusively to GAC Members who wish to be informed of any applications for strings matching any names with geographical meaning as submitted by participating GAC Members under any established conditions or criteria.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11D)	4/16/21	Lastly, we are disappointed at the lack of community-wide support for an ICANN Org-provided opt-in update system for interested parties to automatically keep them informed on application(s) for specified string(s), a tool we see simply as a logical extension of SubPro WG's Implementation Guidance 20.5.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12A)	4/16/21	The 2012 AGB Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.2.4 appear to suggest that the ALAC is required to prove 2 elements to qualify for standing for a community objection.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12B)	4/16/21	It is incomprehensible that the ALAC, while on the one hand, funded by ICANN Org to file objections, should have any of its Community Objections, which would be derived through a bottom-up participative process, be dismissed on the ground of a 'lack of standing' to file such objections.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the advice and next steps.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823	ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12C)	4/16/21	Therefore, the ALAC strongly recommends that it be granted, under no uncertain terms, automatic standing to file Community Objections in Subsequent Procedures and in future rounds of the New gTLD Program.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN Board and Org are currently reviewing this Advice. In October 2021, a small group of ICANN Board members met with a small group of ALAC members to discuss the Advice and next steps.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC116	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-116-en.pdf	SAC116: SSAC Comments on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report	3/22/21	SSAC Comments on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Final Report. The respective public comment period closes on 8 April 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 22 April 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ssr2-final-report-2021-01-28-en . There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC for review on 25 March 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC115	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-115-en.pdf	SAC115: SSAC Report on an Interoperable Approach to Addressing Abuse Handling in the DNS	3/19/21	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to (1) examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse victimization; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.	-	ICANN org understands this to be a request directed at the ICANN community recommending that they work towards forming a new body. That body being a neutral facilitator on matters related to "Abuse", titled as a "Common Abuse Response Facilitator The proposed Facilitator is suggested to be a new "entity should ideally be a wholly independent non-governmental, not-for-profit organization" As this recommendation is directed to the community and does not solicit any actions from the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. ICANN Org sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 March 2021. This item is considered complete as of the SSAC's confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC003	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-003-en.pdf	RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3	2/12/21	Developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default when the software is configured to locally serve root zone data.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN org understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC003	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-003-en.pdf	RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-1	2/12/21	The root zone maintainer and root server operators should verify and confirm that the addition of a ZONEMD resource record will in no way negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RSS.	Phase 4 Implement	ICANN org understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with the Root Zone Maintainer and the Root Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the Root Server. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021. On 24 February 2022 the ICANN Board considered RZERC003 and Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone. This item is now in Phase 4 Implement.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC003	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-003-en.pdf	RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2	2/12/21	The DNS and Internet community should be made aware of plans to use ZONEMD in the root zone, and be given an opportunity to offer feedback. This may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the DNS Operations Analysis and Research Center (DNS-OARC), the North American Network Operators' Group (NANOG), the Réseaux IP Européens (RIPE), etc.	Phase 4 Implement	ICANN org understands this recommendation to have ICANN org develop a plan for the deployment of ZONEMD in the root zone and make relevant technical bodies aware of that plan by making presentations in appropriate forums. ICANN org further understands opportunity for feedback from the community resulting from those presentations should be offered and any input provided should be included as appropriate in the final ZONEMD deployment plan. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021. On 24 February 2022 the ICANN Board considered RZERC003 and Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone. This item is now in Phase 4 Implement.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC003	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-003-en.pdf	RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-4	2/12/21	Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) and the RZM should jointly develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in the root zone, and make this plan available for review by RZERC.	Phase 4 Implement	ICANN org understands this recommendation to have ICANN org to develop a plan with its contractors and make the plan available to RZERC for review. ICANN org further understands input from RZERC should be incorporated into the final plan as appropriate. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021. On 24 February 2022 the ICANN Board considered RZERC003 and Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone. This item is now in Phase 4 Implement.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-1)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to increase the number of gTLDs is consistent with ICANN's strategic objective to "evolve the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base." This review should be considered an input towards updating ICANN's strategic goals in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team's recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following areas of study based on prior rounds of the New gTLD program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on root server operations • Impacts on SSR issues • Impacts on overall DNS operations • Analysis of how all metrics for success were met • Risk analysis 	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends that, as part of the process for creating new gTLDs, ICANN develop and adopt a protocol for measuring progress against stated goals of the program and thresholds, which if crossed, may require mitigation actions. Such measurements and actions should consider the entirety of the DNS ecosystem.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses to, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that proliferates in the new gTLDs from the 2012 round. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CCT Review Team's relevant recommendations. The best practices should be incorporated into enforced requirements, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-4)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends the ICANN Board take the comments in SAC114, Sections 3.1-3.3 into consideration in the Board's deliberations on the following items: 1) accepting the recommendations of the Final Report on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process; 2) subsequent implementations of the approved recommendations developing the policy; and 3) the implementation of the policy	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-5)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends that ICANN org develop reference materials or a set of tutorials to teach the basics of registry service provision as a prerequisite for new registry service providers. The purpose of the reference materials is to educate potential registry service providers on the requirements and testing thresholds for pre-delegation testing.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC114	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-114-en.pdf	SAC114: SSAC Comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-6)	2/11/21	The SSAC recommends that the words "intended use" be removed as a defining characteristic to determine for whether applications should be placed in the same contention set or not.	Phase 2 Understand Request	ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.	SSAC has asked ICANN Board/Org to hold work on SAC114 until further notice from the SSAC
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC002	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-002-en.pdf	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1A)	2/4/21	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Revisit the options and consequences of having signed root zone name server data.	-	ICANN org understands this recommendation to be a request from RZERC for the org to complete the work specified in RSSAC028, and that RZERC is not requesting any additional work beyond that specified in RSSAC028. As this item contains no new action for the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. The RZERC can monitor progress of RSSAC028 by accessing the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Advice Status page (https://features.icann.org/board-advice/rssac). ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 29 June 2021. This item is considered complete as of the RZERC's confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC002	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-002-en.pdf	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1B)	2/4/21	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response. Would this result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?	-	ICANN org understands this recommendation to be a request from RZERC for the org to complete the work specified in RSSAC028, and that RZERC is not requesting any additional work beyond that specified in RSSAC028. As this item contains no new action for the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. The RZERC can monitor progress of RSSAC028 by accessing the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Advice Status page (https://features.icann.org/board-advice/rssac). ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 29 June 2021. This item is considered complete as of the RZERC's confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC002	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-002-en.pdf	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-1C)	2/4/21	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data? What fraction of priming queries today have the DO bit set?	-	ICANN org understands this recommendation to be a request from RZERC for the org to complete the work specified in RSSAC028, and that RZERC is not requesting any additional work beyond that specified in RSSAC028. As this item contains no new action for the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. The RZERC can monitor progress of RSSAC028 by accessing the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Advice Status page (https://features.icann.org/board-advice/rssac). ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 29 June 2021. This item is considered complete as of the RZERC's confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC002	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-002-en.pdf	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-2A)	2/4/21	The RZERC recommends that ICANN org further explore the cost / benefit tradeoffs and risks of signed root zone name server data.	Phase 3 Deferred	ICANN org understands this to be a request to explore the cost / benefit tradeoffs and risks of signed root zone name server data, looking at each of the proposed signing mechanisms in RSSAC028. ICANN org understands that this is a request to begin with the analysis in Section 6 of RSSAC028, and extend that analysis with any new information gained from additional research and other differences seen in the RSS since the time that RSSAC028 was published. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 17 March 2021 and received confirmation of understanding on 14 June 2021.	
Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)	RZERC002	https://www.icann.org/uploads/ckeditor/rzerc-002-en.pdf	RZERC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-2B)	2/4/21	Do the risks of redirected query traffic outweigh the risks of increased operational complexity?	Phase 3 Deferred	ICANN org understands that RZERC is directing the org to determine its own criteria for evaluating the risks of redirected query traffic and increased operational complexity. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 29 June 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC054	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-054-16dec20-en.pdf	RSSAC054: Statement on ICANN's Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation	12/16/20	On October 27, 2020, the ICANN Organization published a public comment proceeding on Recommendations for ICANN's Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. This public comment proceeding asks for feedback on OCTO-016: ICANN's Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The RSSAC welcomes this public comment proceeding and recognises ICANN's operational remit, scope and independence over IMRS operation. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root Server System and RSSAC has stated the importance of this feature as one of key values and strength points of the whole system. Keeping that in mind, there are areas in the publication that RSSAC finds refer to a scope larger than just IMRS operations.	-	The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on ICANN's Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The respective public comment period closed on 8 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due on 5 January 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/root-name-service-implementation-2020-10-27-en . There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 January 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC113	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-113-en.pdf	SAC113 SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs	9/18/20	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 4.1 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands SAC113 to mean SSAC is requesting the Board to choose a TLD as described in Section 4.1 of the document, and to reserve that TLD in the DNS root for private use, and to be sure that that TLD is never delegated in the DNS root. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 01 October 2020. ICANN Received confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC049	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-049-14apr20-en.pdf	RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community	4/14/20	Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN Bylaws that would need amending, and the knowledge that this type of change has not been attempted since the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board's implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC038.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands Recommendation 1 to mean that the RSSAC believes that the best way for the RSO community to join the Empowered Community is through the implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC038. Also, the RSS GWG should note the expectations and needs of the RSO community. There is no immediate action for the ICANN Board. For the purposes of the ARR, this item will remain in Phase 3 until the RSS GWG delivers its proposed final governance model for the RSS to the ICANN Board for consideration. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 04 May 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 May 2020.	RSSAC049 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group as it develops its proposal for root server system governance and root server operator accountability.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-1	3/12/20	The RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation should be designed such that it can transform into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary.	Phase 4 Implement	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is asking for an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The "initial implementation" is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that a long-term service would have. This recommendation is to the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.04 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, which calls for implementing a prototype measurement system for RSOs, and thanks ICANN org for already developing such a system to assist with defining the metrics outlined in RSSAC047.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-2	3/12/20	The RSSAC recommends that the official implementation of the metric system must: a. Meet the minimum requirements specified in Section 3 of this report regarding the number, location, connectivity, and other requirements for the vantage points. b. Publish all software related to its operation under an open source license as defined by the Open Source Initiative. c. Make the raw measurement data available to anyone in the interest of transparency. A third party should be able to use the raw data to verify the computation of these metrics. d. In its monthly reports, only publish threshold pass or fail indicators for each RSI, not the actual measurements or metrics used to determine the threshold pass or fail values. e. Publicly describe its methods for collecting measurements and aggregating metrics, including the topological location of each measurement vantage point. This description should be complete enough for RSOs and DNS researchers to create their own measurement collection systems similar to those used by the official implementation. f. Share with an RSO the underlying measurements and metrics that resulted in failure any time an RSI fails to pass a threshold test. The shared measurements and metrics must include all measurements from around the time of failure and must include all measured values for all transports and address types.	Phase 4 Implement	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is not asking for anything at the present time, but is instead describing a later long-term service that might be implemented. The operational details of the long-term service will be described after there is sufficient experience with the initial implementation described in Recommendation 1. After initial implementation, the ICANN Board would determine how and when the official implementation will be put in place, e.g. an RFP process for a system meeting all the requirements described in RSSAC047 or a determination that the interim implementation can meet RSSAC047 requirements (including those enumerated in Recommendation 2) or another approach. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 21 April 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 23 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.05 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2 to implement a more permanent measurement system after establishing and using the prototype measurement system from Recommendation 1, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to implement such a system.	Recommendation 2 will implement a more permanent measurement system after establishing and using the prototype measurement system from Recommendation 1

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC047	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-047-12mar20-en.pdf	RSSAC047: RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for the DNS Root Servers and the Root Server System R-3	3/12/20	The RSSAC, in collaboration with ICANN and the Internet community, should consider the following additional work: ● For a holistic view of RSS performance, it may be desirable or necessary to include measurements for all instances of each RSI. The only reasonable way to provide for such a view would be through self-reporting. In the future, it should be considered to have each RSO perform self-reporting of the defined metrics to eliminate uncertainty of components not under the RSO's control, and it should probably be tied to an SLA including compensation for the RSO to implement. ● Create a reference data set. ● Explore the financial aspects of increased accountability and how it might relate to these metrics. ● Keeping with the provisions of RSSAC037 and RSSAC038 publish a document that advises any bodies created as part of the ongoing evolution of RSS governance on how they should interpret and act on data from the measurement systems. ● Investigate a better long-term plan for the location of the vantage points. Such a plan would distribute the vantage points by network topology instead of geographic location. ● Whereas the current work is based on a largely empirical model of the RSS, future versions of this document may want to take a more analytical and theoretical modeling approach.	Phase 5 Close Request	ICANN org understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by RSSAC, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This recommendation is to RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 02 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.06: RSSAC047's Recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5 Close Request as of 25 March 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SSAC2020-06	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac2020-06-14feb20-en.pdf	SSAC2020-06: SSAC Public Comment on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group	2/14/20	The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG's report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track-record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG recommendations.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN org understands the SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG's report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track-record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its finding and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of a grant making process for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. The ICANN org also understands that the SSAC recommends that this step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG recommendations. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 16 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 22 July 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)	12/24/19	Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The GNSO has already produced consensus definitions of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain names" that are more expansive. According to that definition, "abuse" is an action that: 1) Causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm; and 2) Is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose, if such a purpose is disclosed. The GNSO also recognized that "malicious use of domain names" include, but are not limited to: 1) spam, 2) malware distribution, 3) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, 4) phishing, 5) botnet command-and-control. ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of "abuse" before further work is done to define DNS abuse. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN should determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as references for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish a clear definition of "abuse" that is within ICANN's remit. We assume that any such definition would, without limitation, include harmful activity insofar as they intersects with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse). ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct org to clarify the "purposes and applications of ""abuse"" before further work is done to define DNS abuse." We are unsure, however, what ALAC's reference to "purposes and applications" of abuse is intended to mean and request clarification on this point. Is ALAC's advice to identify the characteristics of abuse (e.g., behavior that affects the DNS in specified ways) that would be within ICANN's remit? If so, ICANN org also understands ALAC to advise that once the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN's remit is identified, a determination should be made whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as references for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-2)	12/24/19	Cease rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) or simplify the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAP) requests or to require Contracted Parties to simplify the process of whitelisting. ICANN understands that ALAC believes that these changes would facilitate improved reporting on the rate of abuse in the registration ecosystem that falls within ICANN's remit. ICANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN to require Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC's expectations in this regard. Does the ALAC recommendation refer to something beyond universal adoption of RDAP and implementation of policies developed by the EPDP? With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (i) initiate a PDP process by calling for an Issues Report or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to prohibit rate limiting or simplify the white-listing process and to adopt a uniform and timely framework for access to publicly available registrant data. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)	12/24/19	Direct ICANN Org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) data: identifying the operators with high concentrations of abuse against whom onward action ought to be contemplated.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to establish low thresholds for identifying bad actors. We interpret this to mean that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to use DAAR to identify operators with high concentrations of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and other abusive behaviors within ICANN's remit once, with respect to the latter, agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN's remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties). ICANN also understands that ALAC advises the Board to direct ICANN org to identify and acquire data needed to publish more actionable DAAR data and to identify registrars that sponsor or registries containing high concentrations of domain registrations engaged in such behaviors. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4)	12/24/19	Provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out "systemic" abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out "systemic" abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability. We interpret this to mean that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to do so now with respect to malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse) and, once agreement is reached on the scope and characteristics of abuse within ICANN's remit (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties), other such behaviors. We understand that the ALAC is advising the Board to direct ICANN org to undertake regular audits of compliance with resulting obligations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)	12/24/19	Do not process registrations with "third party" payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to prohibit Contracted Parties from processing registrations where the payor is or the method of payment belongs to an individual or entity other than the registrant, unless such payment methods have been approved in advance of registration. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN Org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (1) initiate a PDP by calling for an Issue Report on this topic or (ii) cause ICANN Org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC's advice. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-6)	12/24/19	Adopt an "anti-crime, anti-abuse" Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	With respect to implementation of this recommendation, and taking into account that ALAC is empowered to initiate discussions leading to the creation of a PDP, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board either to (1) initiate a PDP by calling for an Issue Report on this topic (ii) or cause ICANN org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement ALAC's advice. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)	12/24/19	Compel industry-wide good behavior: for ex. by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct ICANN org to compel Contracted Parties to adhere to industry-wide good behavior, for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates. With respect to implementation of this recommendation, ICANN org understands that ALAC advises the Board to cause ICANN org to enter into voluntary negotiations with Contracted Parties regarding (i) pricing and (ii) industry best practices. We interpret "abuse" in this context to refer, for the time being, to harmful activity insofar as it intersects with the DNS and involves the use of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam (when it serves as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse). We understand that the scope of this could expand once agreement has been reached (either through Consensus Policy development or through voluntary contract negotiations between ICANN and Contracted Parties) on the scope and characteristics of "abuse" within ICANN's remit. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13747	ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-8)	12/24/19	Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN Contractual Compliance to adopt.5 Convene a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finally resolve what additional tools might be needed by Compliance.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	ICANN org understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN org to enter into voluntary contract negotiations with Contracted Parties to implement the above advice, and to include clear enforcement language to facilitates ICANN Contractual Compliance to enforce. ICANN org further understands ALAC to advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN org to ensure that ICANN Contractual Compliance has the tools it will need to enforce the output of any relevant Consensus Policy and/or voluntary contract negotiations. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC045	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-045-03dec19-en.pdf	RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System	12/3/19	At ICANN61 the ICANN Board and the RSSAC engaged in a discussion about threats to the Root Server System (RSS) and how the ICANN Board could respond if threats to the RSS materialized. The RSSAC took this input back to the Root Server Operators (RSOs) for feedback. Since that time, the RSOs have published a document that outlines security risks and mitigations to the RSS and general methods used for mitigation. The RSSAC would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Furthermore, the RSSAC regards the ICANN Board's request for input fulfilled.	-	ICANN understands that this is the Root Server System Advisory Committee's (RSSAC) Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System.2 Furthermore, the RSSAC regards the ICANN Board's request for input fulfilled. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 16 Dec 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-2)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that the SSAC not be given any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG, but is open to invitations to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities.	Phase 4 Implement	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 2 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC not be given any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG. The ICANN org also understands the SSAC is open to invitations from the bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC's charter, experience and capabilities. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and is incorporating it into its proposal. The Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSS GWG) is aware of this SSAC statement. The emerging proposal from the RSS GWG includes a community performing the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF).	SAC106 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group as it develops its proposal for root server system governance and root server operator accountability.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that bodies involved in the ongoing oversight of the RSS be reviewed regularly to ensure that the RSS is both meeting its commitments and that it remains responsive to evolutionary needs and changing environmental factors as appropriate.	Phase 4 Implement	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 4 to mean that the SSAC recommends the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that bodies involved in the ongoing oversight of the Root Server System (RSS) be reviewed regularly to ensure that the RSS is both meeting its commitments and that it remains responsive to evolutionary needs and changing environmental factors as appropriate. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 have been received by the Root Server System Governance Working Group and is incorporating it into its proposal.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC106	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf	SAC106: SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System (R-3)	8/8/19	The SSAC recommends that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC106 Recommendation 3 to mean that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that decisions of the GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 was provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) and is operating on the basis of consensus. The Root Server System Governance Working Group operates transparently and makes decision by consensus. This item is in Phase 5 Close Request as of 07 April 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1C)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. C. The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08.	Phase 4 Deferred	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations." This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/fouquart-to-botterman-29jan21-en.pdf) between the GNSO Council and the Board, following a motion (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+21+January+2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 Deferred.	Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2B)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: B) clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to work with the community to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board state "Advice item 2B suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to 'clarify current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.' In accepting advice item 2B, the Board notes that the community should be involved in the discussion to clarify existing contractual obligations relating to rate limits." ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021. The ODP for the SSAD was launched on 29 April 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/icann-organization-launches-operational-design-phase-for-system-for-standardized-accessdisclosure-29-4-2021-en). Additionally, the Board resolved on the EPDP Phase 2 Priority 2 topics on 21 June 2021, adopted GNSO Council Recommendations 19-22 and directed ICANN org to develop and execute an implementation plan for the recommendations	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item three suggests that the 'Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.' As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs."	As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-4)	12/11/18	The initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item four suggests that 'initiation of charges for RDS access, or any significant future changes in fees for RDDS access, must include a formal assessment of user impacts and the security and stability impacts, and be conducted as part of a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).' As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." ICANN org is currently reviewing this advice to determine how it should be implemented. Once ICANN org has determined a path forward for implementation, further updates will be provided to the SSAC. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item six suggests that the 'ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.' As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item seven suggests that the 'ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.' As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#2.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 25 March 2021.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1A)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDDS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations." The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. The EPDP Phase 2 Report contains recommendations regarding: Accreditation of SSAD requestors, Required criteria and content of SSAD requests, Response requirements, Required Service Level Agreements (SLAs), Automation of SSAD processing, Terms and conditions of SSAD, Logging, auditing, and reporting requirements, Implementation of a GNSO Standing Committee. ICANN org notes the SSAC confirmation that item "a" is considered complete. This item will be parsed and placed in Phase 5.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1B)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require contracted parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RDAP protocol.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a plan that reports on ICANN org's and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an "accredited RDAS access program," is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations." ICANN notes that the SSAC has stated this item is complete pending implementation work. ICANN continues to work with gTLD registries and registrars to implement a service-level agreement and registry reporting requirements for RDAP. Per the 26 February 2019 legal notification "Pursuant to Appendix A (Section 1.1) of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/gtldregistration-data-specs-en [icann.org]] and other contractual provisions relating to Registration Data Directory Services, all gTLD registries and registrars are required to implement RDAP no later than 26 August 2019." Accordingly, this item will also be parsed and placed in Phase 5.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2A)	12/11/18	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: A) develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDAS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item 2A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to 'develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDAS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.' As policy is developed by the community and this topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs. In taking this action, the Board also notes that in the Annex to the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, the Board asked that the topic of rate limit be discussed and resolved by the community as quickly as possible."	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC101v2	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf	SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-5)	12/11/18	The SSAC reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061: "The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council."	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should, with sufficient detail, define an ICANN organizational review. This definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be crisp and tight in order to ensure complete clarity of scope.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 1 to mean that the ICANN org should define the ICANN organizational review. The definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be straightforward and unambiguous in order to ensure complete clarity of scope. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should document the intent of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 2 to mean that the ICANN org should document the intent of each organizational review, what information ICANN org hopes to obtain, and how the information from the review will be used. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)	10/5/18	The ICANN organization should continue to use its RFP process to select the IE. The process should be modified to ensure that the IE are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN org should continue to use its Request for Proposal process to select the Independent Examiner for reviews. The process should be modified to ensure that the Independent Examiners are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)	10/5/18	When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that the organizational review is meeting contractual obligations. Depending on the outcome of each checkpoint, the ICANN organization should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 4 to mean that the ICANN org should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure that an organizational review is meeting its contractual obligations throughout the review process. The ICANN org should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance at each checkpoint. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC041	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-041-05oct18-en.pdf	RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)	10/5/18	At the conclusion of any organizational review, the ICANN organization should report on how the process transpired. If there are any lessons learned from the organizational review, the ICANN organization should demonstrate how the process will be modified.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC041 Recommendation 5 to mean that at the conclusion of every organizational review, the ICANN org should report on how the process transpired. The ICANN org should demonstrate how the process will be modified if there are any lessons learned from the organizational review. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 13 June 2019.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC102	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-102-en.pdf	SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover	8/20/18	On 13 May 2018, the ICANN Board requested the SSAC to provide advice to the Board on the "Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover." This comment represents the SSAC's response to that request.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as is evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102 to be completed.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity.	Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.	RSSAC038 Recommendation 3 will move forward pending the completion of RSSAC037 Recommendation 2
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.5.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.	Phase 4 Implement	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board to estimate costs of the Root Server System and for developing the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. The ICANN Board should refer to RSSAC037 section 5.5.3 in estimating these costs. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.	As the GWG begins its work to develop a final governance model for the Root Server System, ICANN org is working on a methodology for estimating the costs of the RSS. ICANN org will also work proactively with the GWG to estimate the costs of the final governance model.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC037-038	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-en.pdf	RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1	6/14/18	The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 1 is for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 07 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed RSSAC037 Recommendation 1 https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-11-07-en#2.d . The ICANN Board directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to publish the final charter, operating procedures, and work plan for the GWG and to convene the GWG. RSSAC037; the Concept Paper; and the GWG charter, operating procedures, and work plan provide a starting point for discussions in the ICANN community about evolving RSS governance. By convening the GWG, the ICANN Board completes its consideration of recommendation one from RSSAC038. Furthermore, the ICANN Board continues its evaluation and consideration of recommendations two and three from RSSAC038.	
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R1)	11/2/17	I. Develop a simple and efficient document management system that allows non-experts to easily and quickly access and identify documents, starting with defining minimal requirements that ensure that every document has a title and a date or reference number, identifies the author and indicates intended recipients, makes reference to the process it belongs to and explains the acronyms used in the document; and	Phase 4 Implement	The Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team previewed new Announcements and Blog pages on feedback.icann.org in October 2018. Work on the authoring and content model in the document management system has begun and several content types have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project. On 30 October 2019, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new search experience for Board Meeting content for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improved searchability, which is core to ITI, includes: filters to narrow search by document type (Resolutions, Minutes, Agenda), Board Committees (current and former), and Board Meeting type; a date range filter; an expandable and collapsible table structure, jump-to links for upcoming Board Meetings, Year, and Month/Year; and keyword(s) search within Board Meeting content with results available by relevance (number of instances of the keyword(s)) or newest (search results ordered by publish date). Also, the ITI team is developing an improved Public Comment feature based on invaluable input from members of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. This new feature will be available for testing in late January 2020. ITI is aiming for an April 2020 soft launch of the new site. In September 2019 and October 2019, blogs were published to https://icann.org , which provided the community with an update on the project's status. On 7 February 2020, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new Public Comment feature for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improvements include: Closed Proceedings will be searchable via filters (category and date) or keyword, Submissions will be included in search results, the most recent published Submissions and Reports will be more easily accessible, a count of the number of Public Comment Submissions will be displayed, the Submission process will include a guided form to help with the efficiency of the submission process. Alternative processes like bypassing the form and uploading a Submission as a document or emailing Submissions to the org will also be available. During the development phase of this feature, the ITI convened a	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC	https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statements/10443	Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R2)	11/2/17	II. Produce easily understandable executive summaries, key points and synopses (using e.g. infographs, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information) for all relevant issues, processes and activities, so that also non-expert stakeholders will be able to (a) quickly determine if a particular issue is of concern to them and (b) if yes, to participate in the policy process easily and effectively, on equal footing with other stakeholders. This should be done at least, but not only, before putting issues up for public comment. Attention should be paid to using plain English (and if possible translations into other languages) in order to allow non-English native speakers to understand the issues;	Phase 4 Implement	On 9 February 2018, the ICANN Board sent a letter to Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC, regarding this joint ALAC-GAC advice. Please see the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-greenberg-09feb18-en.pdf . In August 2019, ICANN Org shared an update that a meeting will be facilitated at ICANN66 with the ALAC, GAC, and NCSG to discuss the needs of all groups regarding simple language documentation and capacity building activities. Additionally, the co-chairs of the At-Large Consolidated Policy WG will prepare podcasts for each public comment which ALAC has agreed to prepare a statement. During ICANN66, representatives of the ALAC and NPOC, with input from GAC support staff, held an informative session on current communication procedures and tools within their respective groups. They received useful comments from Sally Costerton and Sally Newell-Cohen. Next steps will include the ALAC reaching out to the GAC and NPOC leadership on organizing an inter-session call early in 2020 to discuss follow up from their successful session. The ALAC will propose a joint f2f session during ICANN67 in Cancun.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC098	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf	SAC098: The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2)	10/4/17	The SSAC sent a letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/faltstrom-to-icann-board-03oct17-en.pdf) to the ICANN Board on 3 October 2017, regarding the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted advice to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The SSAC has serious concerns that the SSR2 effort may fail bringing a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The SSAC believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. SSAC recommendation: The ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community should take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSR2 Review Team instructing the team to pause all work related to the review, excepting only planned engagement meetings at ICANN 60 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-ssr2-28oct17-en.pdf). On 7 June 2018 ICANN Org announced the formal restart of the SSR2 Review with four additional Review Team members (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2018-06-07-en).	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-2	8/3/17	Conduct studies to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviours.	Phase 4 Implement	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as the DO bit are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 17 January 2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.02 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-3	8/3/17	Conduct a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks.	Phase 4 Implement	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that proof-of-concept code for testing these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 23 September 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 3, relating to conducting a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.	
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)	RSSAC028	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-028-03aug17-en.pdf	RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers R-1	8/3/17	No changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 17 January 2018. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.01 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, calling for the current naming scheme used in the root server system to remain unchanged until more studies have been conducted.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-1	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to consider revising the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default, for example by allowing subscriptions to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber's access at any time.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zone files. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product road map for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in 2QFY20. Despite not implementing new features to CZDS, ICANN org did work to expand the utility of CZDS by adding the five largest legacy gTLDs, .biz, .com, .info, .net, and .org and most others to the platform as their contracts were being renewed or revised. New functionality for automated renewal of access by default was proposed and discussed with CZDS users, the RySG and SSAC to incorporate their feedback. The development of the functional changes is pending prioritization and incorporation to ICANN's frozen development pipeline. The CZDS 3.0 project has started recently, which among other things will address the SAC097 recommendations related to CZDS including support for zone file access extension prior to their expiration date, automatic renewal of access as the default system behavior, and automatic compliance escalation of unattended access requests in pending status. ICANN org plans to release this new functionality to CZDS in phases during the following months, and is available to provide a briefing to SSAC on the CZDS 3.0 project if it is of interest.	New functionality for automated renewal of access by default was proposed and discussed with CZDS users, the RySG and SSAC to incorporate their feedback. The development of the functional changes is pending prioritization and incorporation to ICANN's frozen development pipeline.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-2	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that in subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to adjust the zone file access subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate the implementation of Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN 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. Once the described functional updates that resulted from Recommendation 1 are applied to the CZDS system, any TLDs added to the CZDS system in the future would be able to offer the same approval policies to end-users. Once the CZDS 3.0 project is completed, the CZDS system will support the same functionality and zone file access approval policies for any TLD added in the future.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-3	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to seek ways to reduce the number of zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN's expectations with respect to zone file access (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). The number of complaints requiring Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption rate of the new auto-approve feature increased to 45% from 40% in June 2019. The number of TLDs that approve requests for a period longer than 2 years is increasing. SAC097 was prepared in the first half of 2017. Since then ICANN org has worked with registry operators to decrease the number of zone file related complaints by creating awareness about zone files access. This includes multiple engagements and presentations to the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group, the Brand Registry Group, and individual registries. ICANN Contractual Compliance is currently training additional staff members to assist in processing complaints related to zone file access requests. ICANN Contractual Compliance continues to address the contractual scope of denials and revocation of access to zone files with registry operators that appear to misunderstand the boundaries within which registry operators are allowed to do so.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC097	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf	SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R-4	6/12/17	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.	Phase 4 Implement	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to clarify the Zone File Access (ZFA) metric and to support registry operators to increase the accuracy of the public reporting for Web based WHOIS query statistics (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN org continues to facilitate the conversation between SSAC and RySG. The SSAC and RySG met to discuss observations of SSAC during ICANN65 where RySG members raised concerns. ICANN org will work with registries to improve the accuracy of the Zonefile access metric. ICANN encourages SSAC to continue engagement directly with the Registries to potentially develop best practices that can be utilized across the gTLDs. ICANN has created an interim solution for zone file access statistics, which is available through CZDS. ICANN org will continue to increase the awareness of registry operators to provide reports with the information provided by CZDS. During the September 2020 meeting with ICANN Org, SSAC leadership agreed to work with the TechOps group, which includes registry operators for a solution to have a standardization about the reported data about web-based WHOIS query statistics.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-1	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.	Phase 4 Deferred	On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e). IDN ccTLD Fast Track process already limits labels at top level to IDNA2008 which does not allow for emojis (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-28mar19-en.pdf). Further, GNSO is considering limiting the TLDs to IDNA2008 (through the use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules) for the subsequent procedures for the gTLDs. The policy work is still under development by the community. Limiting TLDs to Root Zone LGRs is also recommended in the recent recommendations for IDN variant TLDs published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en and adopted by the ICANN Board at ICANN64 for further consideration by GNSO and ccNSO. Finally the recent work on technical use of Root Zone LGR by the study group also recommends the same: see recommendations 1 and 2 in the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/recommendations-rz-lgr-14may19-en.pdf .	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work. SubPro WG has included RZ-LGR based on IDNA2008 for validating TLDs. Existing IDN gTLDs and ccTLDs are also based on IDNA2008. So this advice is already addressed to a large extent. ccNSO is also doing its policy development to replace IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process and is most likely to utilize IDNA2008 as a base standard for IDN ccTLDs. Thus, this advice is being implemented both currently and in upcoming policies for GNSO and ccNSO.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC095	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf	SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-2	5/25/17	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names (see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-11-02-en#1.e). Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDNA2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs do not permit emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There is active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN org's GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN org has also translated the advice from SSAC to training materials, e.g. see the flyer and its translations at the bottom of the webpage www.icann.org/idn - which is being disseminated by the GSE team. ICANN org continues to conduct outreach to ccTLDs to inform them of the risks of registering emoji domains. Outreach has been done to ccTLDs since the advice, and materials were produced, distributed and presented at multiple forums. This item was requested to be closed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1	12/22/16	Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2	12/22/16	The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications, 20 ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied for new gTLD names, such as the "reserved names" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the "ineligible strings" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. 21 As described in RFC 676122, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined "special" way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names? If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-3	12/22/16	Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC090	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf	SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-4	12/22/16	Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC074	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-074-en.pdf	SAC074: SSAC Advisory on Registrant Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4	11/3/15	Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registries based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable parties to learn practical operational practices for preserving security and stability of the credential management lifecycle. SSAC welcomes the opportunity to advise training staff in the creation of a curriculum.	Phase 4 Implement	At GDD Industry Summit 2019 in Bangkok in May 2019 (https://www.icann.org/gddsummit), a session on Credential Management Lifecycle was conducted. A team of community experts presented an educational material that was shared with the SSAC prior to the session for input and guidance. A community wiki space has been established for the community to share good practices in credential management. The sharing of the good practices and community awareness will continue with the participation of the community.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC073	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf	SAC073: SSAC Comments on Root Zone Key Signing Key Rollover Plan	10/5/15	In this Advisory the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) addresses the following topics: - Terminology and definitions relating to DNSSEC key rollover in the root zone; - Key management in the root zone; - Motivations for root zone KSK rollover; - Risks associated with root zone KSK rollover; - Available mechanisms for root zone KSK rollover; - Quantifying the risk of failed trust anchor update; and - DNS response size considerations.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as is evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists (R-5)	5/28/15	IANA should host a PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. Such a PSL would be authoritative for those domains. Such a list should include, at a minimum, all TLDs in the IANA root zone.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4a, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC070	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf	SAC070: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD/Suffix Lists (R-3)	5/28/15	To close the knowledge gap between registries and popular PSL maintainers, ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation should collaboratively create informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4a, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC065	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf	SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DDoS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-1)	2/18/14	ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.09), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon SAC065's Recommendation 1. The Board considers SAC065 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-3A)	2/13/14	In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further action once the NCAP's work on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-3B)	2/13/14	In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. B. Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly delegated top-level domains. Such communication should complement the current ICANN effort in this area with findings and recommendations from this report.	Phase 2 Understand Request	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names delegated as new gTLDs from the 2012 application round for the New gTLD Program. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 23 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further action once the NCAP's work on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC064	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf	SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS "Search List" Processing (R-2)	2/13/14	The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-2 means that the SSAC recommends that ICANN organization work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior, beginning with the submission of an Internet-Draft to the IETF and advocating for its standardization within the IETF process. Updates to RFC 1535 and other RFCs related to this topic should be included within the Internet-Draft. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization's recommendation (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b).	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC062	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf	SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)	11/7/13	ICANN should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IETF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.08), the Board finds that ICANN org has implemented all of SAC062's Recommendations, and considers SAC062 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1	11/7/13	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) staff, in coordination with the other Root Zone Management Partners (United States Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and Verisign), should immediately undertake a significant, worldwide communications effort to publicize the root zone KSK rollover motivation and process as widely as possible.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as is evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 2	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative testbed for the purpose of analyzing behaviors of various validating resolver implementations, their versions, and their network environments (e.g., middle boxes) that may affect or be affected by a root KSK rollover, such that potential problem areas can be identified, communicated, and addressed.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as is evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC063	www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf	SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5	11/7/13	ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of as much information as possible about the impact of a KSK rollover to provide input to planning for future rollovers.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as is evidenced by the successful first KSK Rollover. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102 to be completed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC061	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-061-en.pdf	SAC061: R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services	9/6/13	The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). Subsequently, on 2 August 2018 the SSAC contacted the ICANN org to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN org change SAC061 Recommendation 2's status from 'Closed' to 'Open.' Upon review of SAC061 and SAC101v2, the ICANN org has returned 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 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council."	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (2 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must maintain a secure, stable, and objective process to resolve cases in which some members of the community (e.g., an applicant for a TLD) do not agree with the result of the Label Generation Rules (LGR) calculations.	Phase 4 Deferred	RZ-LGR-3 integrating 16 scripts was released in July 2019. The inclusion of RZ-LGR to validate TLD labels and their variant labels has also been recommended as part of managing IDN variant TLDs. GNSO and ccNSO are currently considering this recommendation. The Study Group on Technical Utilization of Root Zone Label Generation Rules took up this item to discuss. Recommendation four (4) of their report suggests a way forward. This work has been released for public comment and will be finalized afterwards for further consideration of the ICANN Board. See report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/recommendations-rz-lgr-14may19-en.pdf and public comment at https://www.icann.org/public-comments/technical-rz-lgr-2019-05-15-en .	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work. RZ-LGR procedure already suggests that the relevant script community can review their decision within the existing process and propose an updated version. The Technical Study Group on RZ-LGR supported this solution. This process is being considered by both GNSO and ccNSO in their respective policy development processes for IDN TLDs. This advice will be addressed through these PDPs.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)	7/23/13	A process should be developed to activate variants from allocatable variants in LGR.	Phase 4 Deferred	ICANN org recently developed the Recommendations for Managing IDN Variant TLDs, published at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en . These have been adopted by ICANN Board at their meeting at ICANN64, where the Board asked the GNSO and ccNSO to consider these in their policy and procedures.	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 30 June 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further work once the GNSO and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work. This has already been proposed by SubPro WG for gTLDs with more details being developed by the IDN EPDP underway. ccNSO is also working on a solution for variant TLDs through its ongoing IDN ccPDP4.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (9 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN must ensure that Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) providers support variant TLDs, and that parity exists for variant support in all relevant systems and functions associated with new TLD components.	Phase 4 Deferred	A detailed analysis has been published as part of recommendations for managing IDN variant TLDs, which has been approved by ICANN Board at ICANN64. The analysis has been forwarded to the GNSO and ccNSO for their consideration for relevant policy and procedure development. The analysis is available at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-variant-tld-implementation-2018-07-26-en . Specifically see section 3 of the report at https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-variant-tld-recommendations-analysis-25jan19-en.pdf .	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC060	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf	SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (4 of 14)	7/23/13	ICANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines; - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second-level domain labels (2LDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions	Phase 5 Close Request	The IDN Guidelines were updated to version 4 in May 2018 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-guidelines-10may18-en.pdf). However, these Guidelines are currently being held for review of GNSO, following the request from GNSO to the ICANN Board. In March 2020, the Guidelines for Developing Reference Label Generation Rules (LGRs) for the Second Level Version 2 were published for public comment, and the public comment staff report was issued in May 2020. The IANA Repository of IDN tables is also now being updated to address any gaps. ICANN org has been developing reference LGRs for the second level in consultation with the community and in-line with the RZ-LGRs. SubPro WG has included a recommendation for ROs to utilize reference LGRs when they design their IDN tables. Also, the updated IDN table review process now utilizes the reference LGRs. Therefore, this recommendation is now largely addressed. Additional reference LGRs will be developed against the additional RZ-LGR proposals received in the future. With the new IDN table review process now implemented, this item can now be closed.	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-1 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC recommends those issues that previous public comment periods have suggested were inadequately explored as well as issues related to cross-functional interactions of the changes brought about by root zone growth should be examined.	Phase 3 Deferred	The Org (OCTO) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 04 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.	Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: - Scaling the Root Report on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gTlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC059	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-059-en.pdf	SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone	4/18/13	The SSAC believes the use of experts with experience outside of the fields on which the previous studies relied would provide useful additional perspective regarding stubbornly unresolved concerns about the longer-term management of the expanded root zone and related systems.	Phase 3 Deferred	The Org (OCTO) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 04 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.	Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: - Scaling the Root Report on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-31aug09-en.pdf - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling: https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gTlds/summary-of-impact-root-zone-scaling-06oct10-en.pdf - Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment): https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cdar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC058	https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf	SAC058: R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation	3/27/13	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.	Phase 5 Close Request	The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques to be used by registrars and registries for validating registration data. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC051	https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-051-en.pdf	SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (R-2)	6/14/11	R-2 The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of Internationalized DNRD as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC 003, SAC 027 and SAC 033.	Phase 5 Close Request	The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC051 be developed (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2011-10-28-en#5). A roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012: https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-06-04-en . As of 26 August 2019 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN org expects to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.	

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Item Status
As of 31 March 2022

Advice Provider	Reference Number	Link to Advice Document	Advice Item	Issued Date	Advice Document Recommendation	Phase	Action(s) Taken	Dependencies
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC047	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf	SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 7)	4/15/11	The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition process can be studied and if needed, improved.	Phase 5 Close Request	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO or his designee to implement the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).	
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC046	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-046-en.pdf	SAC046: Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (R-4)	12/6/10	ICANN should update its "Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency," to include actual measurement, monitoring, and datasharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.	Phase 4 Deferred	The plan will be updated to include actual measurement, monitoring, and data sharing capability of root zone performance, in cooperation with RSSAC and other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.	Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 04 December 2019 pending external activity. ICANN org will take up further action once the implementation of RSSAC037-038 and the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group is complete.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	SAC045	http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf	SAC045: Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (R-6)	11/15/10	The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.	-	Resolved (2021.05.12.07), the Board finds that the actions called for in SAC045 can be considered resolved by the NCAP and that the remaining item related to SAC045 being tracked in the ICANN org Action Request Registry may therefore be completed.	