The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC's comment on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 20 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 03 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/ssr2-n-draft-report-2020-01-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 23 March 2020.

The ICANN org understands that this advisory is RSSAC024v1: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 23 March 2020.

The ICANN org understands that this advisory is RSSAC026v1: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN org understands that this item is RSSAC026v1: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC's comment on First Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR1) Review Team Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 16 March 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 09 April 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/ssr1-n-draft-report-2020-01-24-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 16 March 2020.

The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team's draft report and would like to thank the SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment proceeding on its draft report. In this document, the SSCAC provides input to the initial report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expanded Policy Development Process. In this document, the SSCAC provides input to the initial report of the Temporary Specification for the generic top-level domain (gTLD) Registration Data Phase 2 Expanded Policy Development Process (PDPP).


On 24 January 2020, the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team published a public comment proceeding on its draft report. This statement represents the RSSAC's full input to that public comment proceeding. The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team draft report, and would like to thank the SSR2 Review Team for preparing this draft report and submitting it for public comment.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13755

1/31/20

The Registry must ensure in this bylaws a commitment to free speech and a restraint to take demands with a political basis.

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

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13755

1/31/20

The Registry must provide 6 months prior written notice to its registrars of any increase in wholesale price of their domain names registration renewal fees and the option of a 20-year renewal thereof at the pre-increase price.

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

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13755

1/31/20

The Registry Agreement must establish a “DNS Abuse Ceiling.” The RA should contain both a reference to an ICANN community established definition of DNS Abuse as well as an explicit ceiling in terms of a percentage of second level domains engaged in DNS Abuse as material terms. Failure to address DNS Abuse above this ceiling will constitute a breach of the RA and grounds for terminating the RA and any re-delegation of .GR by ICANN.

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

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC046


1/31/20

The approval of the ICANN 254 Radioactive isotopes, the RSSAC would like to thank the IANA for developing a strong proposal. The SSAC does find this publication represents the full SSAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC108

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13759

1/31/20

The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on SSAC: Comments on the IANA’s Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers. The respective public comment period closed on 31 January 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 31 February 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the SSAC on 11 February 2020.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN

https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13747

12/24/19

Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The DNS 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 SSAC 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 1 - Evaluate & Phase 3 - Consider

CANN.org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct CANN.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 involving or that it interacts 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). CANN.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, CANN.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. CANN.org sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. CANN.org 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

12/24/19

Cann.org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct CANN.org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAF) or simplify the process of whois blocking, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.

Phase 1 - Evaluate & Consider

CANN.org understands ALAC to advise the Board to direct CANN.org to prohibit Contracted Parties from rate limiting WHOIS (eventually RDAF) requests or to require Contracted Parties to simplify the process of whois blocking, 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 require ICANN to prohibit Contracted Parties to adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data, but requests further clarification as to ALAC’s position on this.

As of 31 May 2020

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice item status
Committee (RSSAC) Root Server System Advisory At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) Advice Item Status ICANN Board Status Advice Report Advice Provider RSSAC045 EN 1219-03-00- EN ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5) 12/24/20 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 CANN 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 ICANN 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.

AL-ALAC-ST- Statements 1219-03-00- ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-4) 12/24/20 Provide an explicit mandate to ICANN Contractual Compliance to regularly use the audit function to root out “systems” abuse; not to regulate content, but to proactively exercise enforceability. Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider CANN 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 “systems” 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.

AL-ALAC-ST- Statements 1219-03-00- ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5) 12/24/20 Do not process registrations with “third party” payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request. Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider CANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board 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. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.

AL-ALAC-ST- Statements 1219-03-00- ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-6) 12/24/20 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 (i) 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.

AL-ALAC-ST- Statements 1219-03-00- ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7) 12/24/20 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 CANN 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 interacts 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.

AL-ALAC-ST- Statements 1219-03-00- ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-8) 12/24/20 Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN Contractual Compliance to adopt. Consider a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finalize resolve what additional tools might be needed by Compliance. Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider CANN org understands ALAC to advise the Board to 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. Furthermore, 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 commend the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System and how the ICANN Board could respond if threats to the RSS materialized. The RSSAC took this input back to the Root Server Operations (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.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) RSSAC045 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 Operations (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 and how the ICANN Board could respond if threats to the RSS materialized. The RSSAC took this input back to the Root Server Operations (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.
The ICANN org understands that this statement is SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is input to the NIST on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 10 December 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC044 is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) eighth workshop held from 01 October 2019 to 03 October 2019. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 05 Nov 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC’s confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC037: High-level Summary of Activities of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This documents how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board of Directors on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. The RSSAC's responsibilities are defined in the ICANN Bylaws, Article B1, Section 2.c. These Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is input to the NIST on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 10 December 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 1 means that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). This has been understood by the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 2 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 3 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 4 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 5 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is input to the NIST on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 10 December 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 1 means that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). This has been understood by the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 2 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 3 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 4 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 5 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC107: SSAC Comment to NIST on Quantum Cryptography Algorithms. As this item is input to the NIST on its post-quantum cryptography second round candidate algorithms, there is no action for the ICANN Board, and the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 10 December 2019.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 1 means that the SSAC recommends to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) that the SSAC be included as a voting member in the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG). This has been understood by the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 2 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 3 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 4 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.

The ICANN organization understands that SAC106 Recommendation 5 means 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 has sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendation 2 through 4 will be provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (GWG) as input for consideration.
The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily lives by seamlessly and autonomously sensing and acting upon our physical environment through tens of billions of connected devices. While this makes the IoT vastly different from traditional Internet applications like email and web browsing, we expect that a significant number of IoT deployments will use the DNS to locate remote services that they need, for instance to enable telemetry data transmission and collection for monitoring and analysis of sensor data. In this report, the SSAC provides a discussion on the interplay between the DNS and the IoT, arguing that the IoT represents both an opportunity and a risk to the DNS. It is an opportunity because the DNS provides functions and data that can help make the IoT more secure, stable, and transparent, which is critical given the IoT’s interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measurement studies suggest that devices may stress the DNS, for instance, because of complex DDoS attacks carried out by botnets that grow to hundreds of thousands or in the future millions of infected IoT devices within hours. We also identify and discuss five challenges for the DNS and IoT industries (e.g., DNS and IoT operators and software developers) to address these opportunities and risks, for instance by making the DNS’s security functions (e.g., response verification and encryption) available on popular IoT operating systems and by developing a shared system that allows different DNS operators to automatically and continually exchange data on IoT botnet activity. Unlike typical SSAC publications, the aim of this report is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. We therefore provide a tutorial-style discussion that is more forward looking than operational in nature. Our discussion partly falls within ICANN’s and SSAC’s remit, but also goes beyond it, for instance, because the challenges we identify will take a wider range of players to address. We explicitly do not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board.

Following 10 of RSSAC037 states, “RDS must be autonomous and independent,” and this must be preserved in future RRS governance models. RSOs must remain independent from each other as well as from any overarching organization, government, or community. This serves to prevent capture of the RRs by an entity that may diverge from the guiding principles of the RRS as set forth in RSSAC037. This document illustrates important aspects of Root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architecture and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RRS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS.

ICANN understands that this is the Joint SAC-ALAC Statement on the EPDP. As this item will not be considered via the Public Comment process, the item will be considered closed. The Board will provide its rationale for its action in the Board Resolution on the EPDP Recommendations. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 7 May 2019.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.

The ICANN org understands that the statement is the SAC103: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process. As this item will be considered via the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 January 2019.

Follow-up to the Joint Statement from ALAC to GAC

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement “Enabling Inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN”, issued at ICANN64 in Davos on 1 December 2019. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and synopses for all relevant issues, purposes. The EPDP Final Report of Phase 1 provides a sufficient basis for the work to progress to the subsequent Phase 2.

On 21 November 2018, ICANN opened a public comment proceeding to obtain input on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP). The SAC welcomes this opportunity to provide input. We thank the EPDP team for its hard work in developing such a substantive report. A new mandatory mechanism for collecting public comment was implemented for the purpose of the EPDP; an online tool that asks respondents specific questions about each recommendation in the report. This was meant to provide easy collection of responses from the public. The SAC has submitted feedback through the form. However, we have found that the form limited our ability to provide comment. The SAC therefore asks that the EPDP members consider comments in this document, and we would like your assurance that the below will be taken into account and incorporated into the Final Report as appropriate.


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

Follow-up to the Joint Statement to ICANN


Follow-up to the Joint Statement to ICANN


The ICANN org understands that the aims of SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges is to trigger and facilitate dialogue in the broader ICANN community. The ICANN org understands that SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN Community or Board and therefore the item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 3 June 2019.
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<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-6)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-7)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-24)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: B) tackle current expectations for the use of rate limiting under existing policy and agreements.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-3)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain-name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-5)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 May 2020

RSSAC040: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)

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 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)

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

Phase 3 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)

The ICANN organization should continue to use its RIR 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 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)

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 take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.

Phase 3 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)

If the ICANN organization determines that an 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 | Consider Evaluate &

SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report

This is an advisory to the ICANN Board, the ICANN Organization staff, the ICANN community and, more broadly, the Internet community from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report is organized by subject matter and includes regular references to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations given in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDF WG Initial Report. Each section begins with a list of relevant questions and/or preliminary recommendations from the Initial Report then follows with the SSAC’s comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.

Phase 3 | Consider Evaluate &

SAC102: SSAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root ESK Rollover

On 13 May 2018, the ICANN Board requested the SSAC to provide advice to the Board on the “Updated Plan for Continuing the Root ESK Rollover.” This comment represents the SSAC’s response to that request.

Phase 3 | Phase 5 | Consider

RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN’s Updated ESK Rollover Plan R-1

RSSAC has heard from some members of the technical community that have expressed concern that an increase in traffic from misconfigured resolvers may occur after the October 11th, 2018 date in the rollover data. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RRS even if such a load increase occurs.

Phase 3 | Consider

RSSAC039: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN’s Updated ESK Rollover Plan R-2

The ESK rollover back out plan was written in July of 2016, updated in April of 2018, and may become a critical procedure that needs to be invoked immediately in case of ESK rollover failure. This document, its procedures and triggers should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSCs, RIRs and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. RSSAC judges that all of the RRS should be prepared to participate in monitoring and measuring to ensure adequate data is available upon which a rollover decision can be made.

Phase 3 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-1

Recommendations 1: Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DPI Data. RSCs need to decide whether to pursue harmonization of anonymization data that comes from multiple operators, particularly the DPI Data. That decision needs to include consideration of the advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of the RSC, of the users of the RNS, and of researchers looking at the anonymized data. Harmonization using mixing full addresses or bit-by-bit will help the research community correlate sources of DNS queries across datasets that are collected from different RSOs. However, full harmonization inherently relies on sharing a secret value that will invalidate the anonymization if it is later revealed. Even if the RSCs decide not to harmonize with sharing of secret values, harmonizing the method used can help RSOs choose an anonymization strategy, and simply understanding the properties of the data for those who use data from multiple RSOs.

Phase 3 | Consider Evaluate &

RSSAC040: Recommendations on Anonymization Processes for Source IP Addresses Submitted for Future Analysis R-2

Recommendation 2: Each RSC should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually. Any of the proposals given in Section 4 of this document can be used as the anonymization specification for IP addresses, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC040</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/rssac-040-17aug18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/rssac-040-17aug18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Recommendation 3: Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. It should be possible for an operator to publish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the AS of the original data. Such a table should have a timeframe for when the mapping was made due to AS values changing over time.</td>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 3 is for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data if the origin AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose data that should have been anonymized. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC057-058</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/rssac-057-058en18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/rssac-057-058en18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC057: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The GNOS Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC057: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root Server System (RNS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). This model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RSN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-4</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-standing 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 Board and the ICANN/ORG staff. A ICANN policy-making should result in new registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN and the ICANN organization shall ensure contracted parties migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the RRSIP protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining this RRSIP registry to migrate to high status per the Top WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014-02-07-08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RRSIP access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support, of, and oversight of the technical access mechanism. E. The ICANN Board should arrange updates to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and registry contracts as necessary to ensure compliance with A through D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC102</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-102-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-102-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC102: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to incorporate the following principle into its contracts with gTLD RRSIP services providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain operational access to the registration data policy that says they are authorized to access, and must not be data limited unless the user poses a data intensive threat to a properly resources system. This recommendation is also made to policy-makers participating in the EPDP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC103</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-103-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-103-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC103: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RRSIP, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC104</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-104-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-104-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC104: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-6</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RRSIP access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-1</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy must 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC106</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/syspe/ry/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-7</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to amend registry and registrar contracts to ensure that RRSIP access is provided in a more measurable and enforceable fashion, which can be understood by all parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC037-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System II.1</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC037-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System II.1</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.3.5.2 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 efforts should not take more than six months.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC037-038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-038-1jun18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC038: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System II.1</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-51-0605-01-00-DN</td>
<td><a href="https://alac.statement.org/advisory/10017">https://alac.statement.org/advisory/10017</a></td>
<td>Release for Registration one .COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: .COM</td>
<td>6/5/18</td>
<td>Using the lack of both stability and competition concerns, the ALAC believes the introduction of .com represents no downside to end users. The ALAC further suggests that the proceeds of the auction be used to make concrete progress on universal acceptance, one of the primary frustrations of end users with regards to the introduction of new top-level domains.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement regarding Release for Registration one .COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: .COM. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment and there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC033</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee</td>
<td>5/2/18</td>
<td>This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2018 Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root Server System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the sixth RSSAC workshop held hosted by Veniam in early May.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this is a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) sixth workshop held from 1 May 2018 to 3 May 2018. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 15 May 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC033</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/stmts/files/rssac-033-24apr18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>5/2/18</td>
<td>RSSAC and Root-Ops are names for two separate communities that relate to the Internet’s DNS Root Server System. They have different missions and scopes. RSSAC provides this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC033 is the RSSAC’s statement on the distinction between RSSAC and Root-Ops. The RSSAC is providing this document to help explain the difference between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted. The document is informational only and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 16 May 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-51-0605-01-00-DN</td>
<td><a href="https://alac.statement.org/advisory/12183">https://alac.statement.org/advisory/12183</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy</td>
<td>6/26/18</td>
<td>The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: • The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years. In line with principle (ii), • A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $16 million; corresponding to the total amount of withdrawals from the Reserve Fund to finance the IANA Stewardship transition. • The remaining shortfall of US $17 million ($68m less $15m and less $36m above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: 1. Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD program, if any; 2. Additional contribution from ICANN Org.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/reserve-fund-replenishment-2018-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/reserve-fund-replenishment-2018-03-06-en</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0402-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN- proposed Interim Model</td>
<td>4/2/18</td>
<td>Following discussions over the last months, in an attempt to address the upcoming European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation’s impact on ICANN’s contracts and particularly on the collection, retention and display of registration data in the WHOIS service, ICANN published an “Interim Model for Compliance with ICANN Agreements and Policies in Relation to the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation” on the 8th of March 2018[1]. The ALAC wishes to thank the ICANN CEO for the opportunity to reflect on the model proposed.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Data Protection/Privacy Issues: ICANN proposed Interim Model. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/10507">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/10507</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0402-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests</td>
<td>4/2/18</td>
<td>ALAC and At-Large Community understand the need to roll the EPR but parts of the community have strong concerns for the potential impact on users worldwide. We believe that a holistic review is needed including a risk assessment of the alternatives, in time for further discussion at ICANN62. The advice should include then current information related to the RFC 8545 trust anchor reports, the progress for availability of the in-development IETF “certified” mechanism and the potential for using the sentinel mechanism to create a greater level of comfort prior to the EPR rollover.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/10497">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/10497</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment/process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0402-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1231</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (RSK) Rollover Process</td>
<td>4/10/18</td>
<td>The ALAC thanks the ICANN organization for the extended opportunity to provide comments to the Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 (“Draft Procedure”) for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community IDs are of crucial importance to At-Large administrative activities and outreach.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (RSK) Rollover Process and was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/11365">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-statements/11365</a>). As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC032</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-statements/11233">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-032-28mar18-statements/11233</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>Notice is the ALAC’s statement on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This was submitted as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-changes-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-changes-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en</a>. As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC’s Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation. This was submitted as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-recs-2017-11-13-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-recs-2017-11-13-en</a>. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisor Item Status**

As of 31 May 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**
  - SAC099 | [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-1044-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/sac-1044-en.pdf) | [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10444](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10444) | SAC099: Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Request Regarding Root Scaling | 12/24/2017 | The SSAC welcomes this opportunity to provide input on the issues related to root scaling. The SSAC understands the working group’s request on 14 September 2017 to be: 1. whether the limitations on delegations per annum (2000/year) could be revised given the results of the Continuous Data-driven Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) study and if so, what guidance can the SSAC provide to maintain the security and stability of the root; 2. suggestions on ways that might mitigate potential issues in the event the working group recommends to increase the maximum annual delegation rate; and 3. inputs on the total number of TLDs that could be delegated without negative impact to root server performance. | 1 | The ICANN org understands that SAC099 is a response to the SSAC’s Research Report to the 24th ICANN Meeting and to the CDAR study. There is no action for the ICANN Board. |}

- **Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**
  - RSSAC030 | [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/root-servers-030-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/root-servers-030-en.pdf) | RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Sources | 12/4/2017 | This is the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The document provides a brief statement about the DNS root server information contained in three key sources, which are the attributes of the organization responsible for the operation of the DNS. | 1 | CANN understands that RSSAC030 is a statement that outlines the three key sources maintained by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions operator necessary for identifying the DNS root servers. There is no action for the ICANN Board. |}

- **At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**
  - Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC | Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC | [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10443](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10443) | Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC | 11/2/2017 | 1. 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 items have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project. On 10 October 2018, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the prepared new proposal features for Board Meeting content for community input via the ITI Feedback site. The improved searchability, which is a 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 keyworts search within Board Meeting content with results available by relevance (number of instances of the keyword(s)) or relevance (results ordered by published 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. The new feature will be available for testing in January 2018. It’s aiming for an April 2020 soft launch of the new site. In September 2019 and October 2019, blogs were published to 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 updated new Public Comment feature for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improvements include: Closed Processings 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 site will also be available. During the development phase of this feature, the ITI convened a small group of community participants who assisted in providing requirements, recommendations, and feedback. Additionally, we conducted demos to this same group of community stakeholders from 10-27 February. Their feedback on the implementation of the new Public Comment feature has been very positive. The ITI team is aiming for a 22 April soft launch of the new feature. |}

- **At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**
  - Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC | Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC | [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10443](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/10443) | Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC | 11/2/2017 | 1. Produce easily understandable executive summaries, key points and synopses (using e.g. infographics, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information) for all relevant issues, processes and activities, 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. | | The ALAC has a joint IFR session during the ICANN67 in Cancun. |
This is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC October 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fifth RSSAC workshop held by the University of Maryland in early October.

The ICANN organization understands that this is a brief discussion on each of the apothetical mind map components developed in the previous workshop, and a high-level summary of the outcomes of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)’ fifth workshop held from October 10th to 12th. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 30 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.

CANN My understanding is that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document describes how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 30 November 2017. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.

RSSAC028: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Phase 3 | Close Request


RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Server R-4

8/3/17

The fundamental recommendation of the RSSAC is to not change the current root server system naming scheme until the studies listed in section 7.2 can be completed. However, during the preparation of this document, the RSSAC Caucus Root Server Working Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If no re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be signed with DNSSEC to enable a resolver to authenticate resource records within the priming response. • Because the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. • Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (5.3), or adding a new TLD under the root zone (5.4) are both viable options that would result in signing the root server addresses. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.

Phase 2 | Understood Request

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

Phase 1 | Consider

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand the feasibility and impact of 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 study. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 2/17/18.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current best practices 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 2/17/18.

Phase 1 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN organization understands that 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 2/17/18.
Advice Item
Monitor the implementation of gTLD zone access.
Phase 4 | Implement

This is the ICANN Board Status Advice Report on 31 May 2020.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
ISAAC027
ALAC Statement on the Advices Related to WHOIS Privacy and Security
Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CDS 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 roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CDS is expected to be available in 2QFY20.

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its 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). The number of complaints reporting Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption of the new auto-renew feature increased from 45% to 49% in June 2019. The number of TLDs that accepts requests for a period longer than 2 years is increasing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
ISAAC027
ALAC Statement on the Advices Related to WHOIS Privacy and Security
Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CDS 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 roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CDS is expected to be available in 2QFY20.

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its 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). The number of complaints reporting Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption of the new auto-renew feature increased from 45% to 49% in June 2019. The number of TLDs that accepts requests for a period longer than 2 years is increasing.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
ISAAC027
ALAC Statement on the Advices Related to WHOIS Privacy and Security
Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CDS 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 roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CDS is expected to be available in 2QFY20.

On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO to its 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). The number of complaints reporting Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption of the new auto-renew feature increased from 45% to 49% in June 2019. The number of TLDs that accepts requests for a period longer than 2 years is increasing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Stage(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advice Item:** SAC095: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names R-1

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC095
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

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

- **Date:** 5/30/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC096
- **Discussion:** The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of .NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 26 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 16 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-net-renewal-16aug17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC097: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R-2

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC097
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC098: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.1

- **Date:** 5/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC098
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC099: SSAC Comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights

- **Date:** 5/30/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC099
- **Discussion:** The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG-Accountability-WS2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC100: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.2

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC100
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC101: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.1

- **Date:** 5/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC101
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC102: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.2

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC102
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC103: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R-1

- **Date:** 5/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC103
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC104: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R-2

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC104
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC105: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.1

- **Date:** 5/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC105
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Advice Item:** SAC106: SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emojis in Domain Names R.2

- **Date:** 2/23/17
- **Reference Number:** SAC106
- **Discussion:** Because the risks identified in the 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 be universally accessible as expected.

---

**Decision:** The ALAC will take up further work once the SSAC and ccNSO have considered these items as part of their policy development work.
The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/02-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-05-22-en). This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN


As of 31 May 2020

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

0417-03-00-EN

Date

Welcome the African DNS study under ICANN strategy for Africa. It is key to understand the domain name market.

This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has went into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focused on the interests of end users of the Internet. Specifically, while increased competition may be considered as an important outcome of the new gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and decreased consumer choice.


The ICANN organization understands this is the ICANN’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/02-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-05-22-en). This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

SAC094: SSAC Response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2

2/26/17

This is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. In July 2017, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) opened a public comment forum to obtain input on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the DNS’s Policy Development Process Working Group that is evaluating what changes, if any, should be made to the current gTLD recommendations.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) SAC094

SAC Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget Public Comment, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

4/28/17

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments on behalf of the ALAC in response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ICAC Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

SAC Statement on the Draft Fiscal Year Operating Plan Update

5/19/17

This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Draft Fiscal Year Operating Plan Update. The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. The respective public comment period closed on 22 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 12 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/02-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-05-22-en). This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

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

5/18/17

This is the ALAC's Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has went into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT) analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focused on the interests of end users of the Internet.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

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

5/18/17

This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has went into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT) analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focused on the interests of end users of the Internet.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

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

5/18/17

This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Completion, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The ALAC appreciates the considerable amount of effort that has went into the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT) analysis and Draft Report (the report). It provides important information on outcomes of the first round of new gTLDs. The ALAC comments on the report are focused on the interests of end users of the Internet.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

SAC Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

4/28/17

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments on behalf of the ALAC in response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

SAC Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

4/28/17

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments on behalf of the ALAC in response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) AL-ALAC-ST-0517-05-00-DN

SAC Statement on the Draft FY18 Operating Plan & Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

4/28/17

Public Comment Statement: The ALAC Chair submitted additional comments on behalf of the ALAC in response on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 28 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.
The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the interim Paper Cross-Corresponding Work Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ICANN Board is now considering this statement for inclusion in its Report of Public Comments. The submission was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC’s documentation of the terms commonly used when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC confirmed this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands that the ICANN Board has decided jointly by the ccNSO and the GNSO prior to work proceeding.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s response on the Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 16 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-20170416-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition. The ICANN organization received confirmation of this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands that M0025 is intended as a comment for discussion by the Cross-Corresponding Work Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2, Human Rights. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition. The ICANN organization received confirmation of this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands ICANN's Transparency Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 10 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC confirmed this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands ICANN’s Transparency Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 10 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands ICANN’s Transparency Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed 10 April 2017 and this comment will be considered in its Report of Public Comments. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 05 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC confirmed this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC’s statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition. The ICANN organization received confirmation of this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC confirmed this understanding on 3/22/17.

The ICANN organization understands ALAC confirmed this understanding on 3/22/17.
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<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC090</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9919">https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9919</a></td>
<td>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9919">Public Comment Statement</a> The At-Large Community welcomes the drafting of a comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy for the whole community, well written, although there are several instances where the extensive listing of details could be counterproductive, as it makes the list look like an exhaustive list. As a result, this could be interpreted that anything not on the list, is actually acceptable. … Overall, our community would prefer that ICANN extract the diversity of our global community and the acceptance or otherwise of what are socially accepted norms within different cultures. With the growth of our community interaction within ICANN, ICANN should encourage a greater awareness of regional and cultural diversity across its communities, but to also emphasize that it is quite OK for individuals to say what they deem as acceptable behavior or not. The other main concern is that this policy could be misused as a weapon against someone. This policy is best produced by professional HR persons who are familiar with the language and legal implications.</td>
<td>12/23/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-04-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed SSAC Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-20jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-20jan17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC090</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9920">https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9920</a></td>
<td>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advicestatement/9920">Public Comment Statement</a> We concur with the report’s recommendations including gradual delegation of new gTLDs, continuous monitoring of the impact of new gTLDs, and continuous monitoring of the identified risk parameters as well as its recommendations regarding areas of potential risk. Additionally, special attention should be taken of the report’s warning about the impact on stability of removing new gTLDs from the root. This may be an area of future research. Finally, the report notes that the report was unable to identify causes for a number of related phenomena such as the growth in the total number of queries that are sent to the root, specifically in the growth of the invalid queries which we believe should pose a concern. While acknowledging the complexity of the DNS root system, nonetheless these problems merit further research including but not limited to referral to IETF and RSAC as appropriate. We would recommend to explore possible provisioning of a dedicated space on the ICANN website that tracks the performance status/health of the root going forward.</td>
<td>12/23/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-04-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed SSAC Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 15 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 9 February 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-09feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-09feb17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC090</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-090-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC090: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to define and use syntactically valid domain name labels for new gTLDs that are required. Recommendation 2: The SSAC recommends that the ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 10 December 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 23 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-fy18-0p-budget-23jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-fy18-0p-budget-23jan17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>12/23/16</td>
<td>On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-cdar-draft-09feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-cdar-draft-09feb17-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advice Provider | Reference Number | Link to Advice Document | Advice Item | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation | Phase | Action(s) Taken
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | --- | ---
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC080 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-080-en.pdf | SAC080: SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Name System, 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 1 | Closed Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC089 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-089-en.pdf | SAC089: SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084 | 12/12/16 | SAC089 is the second SSAC Response to ccNSO Comments on SAC084 | |Closed Request

4G-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-1116-03-01-DN | https://alt-alac.icann.org/advisory-statements/2011 | ALAC Statement on the Phase II Assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program | 12/26/16 | [Public Comment Statement] The outcome of assessment are, at best, equivocal. While there has been some expansion in registry numbers and new market entrants, only 25% of the new domains have the characteristics of primary registration. From an end user perspective, most of the resultant new registrations are speculative, defensive, unused or parked adding little value to end users. And from an industry, there is no clear evidence of lower prices or more choice. Based on this Assessment, there is little evidence of benefit to end users with the introduction of new gTLDs. | |Public Comment Statement

4G-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-1116-03-01-DN | https://alt-alac.icann.org/advisory-statements/2011 | ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy | 11/22/16 | [Public Comment Statement] The ALAC recommends that concerted steps be taken for ICANN to implement a concerted outreach campaign to each government in the region, with bilateral discussions to convey governments of ICANN’s willingness to work in partnership. This should be carefully timed and coordinated to proceed efforts involving other stakeholders. Additionally, we suggest a greater emphasis on academia in the region. Cultivating credentialed local expertise is an important step towards building trust with governments which views ICANN with a level of mistrust and are frequently called upon to support policymakers’ decisions. | |Closed Request

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC088 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf | SAC088: SSAC Response to the ccNSO Comments on SAC084 | 11/6/16 | SAC088 is the SSAC’s Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 | |Closed Request


Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC024 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-024-04nov16-en.pdf | RSSAC024: Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators | 11/16/16 | An Advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. RSSAC021 and RFC 7720 are considered as starting points, alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethos, etc) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not addressed herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as its current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root operator should meet. | |Closed Request

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC025 | https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf | RSSAC025: RSSAC October 2016 Workshop Report | 11/16/16 | Overview of RSSAC third workshop (October 11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the mind map constructed during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping. | |Closed Request


The ICANN organization understands SAC088 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC086 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC085 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC085 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC085 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC085 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s follow up to SAC085 and is a response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. There is no action for the SSAC. SAC082 can confirm this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017.
The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 is RSSAC’s statement regarding the question of whether the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root server system. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC’s statement on the Proposed Amendments to the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). This is the RSSAC’s response to the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review request for input, for which the RSSAC does not have any input and does not foresee any technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the ICANN Fellowship Program Application Process Review. The respective public comment period closed on 27 July 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/links/report-comments-proposed-amendnew-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). This is the ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no public comment period on this item, and no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the SSAC on 5 May 2017. The respective public comment period closed on 31 July 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/links/report-comments-proposed-amendnew-gtld-agreement-2016-05-31-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0816-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Name and DAC Policy. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). There is no further action required of the Board. This was recommended by the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0716-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). The respective public comment period closed on 5 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 27 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/links/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-beta-23sep16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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The ICANN Board considered this advice at CE5056, and determined that it would not be practical to establish a Review Committee, when the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT-RT) and the GNSO new GLEI Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group (GNSO PDP WG) are already dedicated to reviewing the 2012 application round of the New gTLD Program, including Public Interest Commitments. The Board has asked the CCT-RT and the GNSO PDP WG to review the concerns of the ALAC in the course of their work (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-zuck-21mar16-en.pdf).

.png
**ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace**

The ALAC is pleased to see the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index and has suggested further concepts that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace. However, the ALAC notes that this Health Index is restricted to the market purchasing, sale and resale of domain names under the new gTLD extensions. The ICANN Board plans to implement the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index.

**Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG-Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-05-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace**

The ALAC is pleased to see the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index and has suggested further concepts that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace. However, the ALAC notes that this Health Index is restricted to the market purchasing, sale and resale of domain names under the new gTLD extensions. The ICANN Board plans to implement the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index.

**Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG-Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-05-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace**

The ALAC is pleased to see the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index and has suggested further concepts that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace. However, the ALAC notes that this Health Index is restricted to the market purchasing, sale and resale of domain names under the new gTLD extensions. The ICANN Board plans to implement the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index.

**Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG-Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-05-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace**

The ALAC is pleased to see the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index and has suggested further concepts that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace. However, the ALAC notes that this Health Index is restricted to the market purchasing, sale and resale of domain names under the new gTLD extensions. The ICANN Board plans to implement the proposals for a Marketplace Health Index.

**Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the CCWG-Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-04-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars**

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-05-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 8 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs. The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1115-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on the Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D. The respective public comment period closed on 21 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 2 February 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-irtp-part-d-implementation-03feb16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 22 January 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017. The item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1115-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Planned Implementation of the New Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP). The statement was sent to the ICANN Board on 28 November 2015. The ALAC strongly argues that the RDAP implementation profile must include the feature set that will support differentiated access. This will ensure that when the future policies, which follow the EWS recommendations, on differentiated access to data are finalized, the protocols will be in place to ensure that these may be readily switched on and implemented. The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1115-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 30 November 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-rdap-profile-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 22 January 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017. The item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-rdap-profile-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 22 January 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-rdap-profile-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 22 January 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands that AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 7 December 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-rdap-profile-29jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 22 January 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
ICANN Board Status Advice Report
Advisor Item Status
As of 31 May 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC077</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-077-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC077: SSAC Advisory on Registrar Protection: Best Practices for Preserving Security and Stability in the Credential Management Lifecycle - Item 4</td>
<td>11/3/15</td>
<td>Item 4: The ICANN Board should direct ICANN staff to facilitate global hands-on training programs for registrars and registrars based on the best practices outlined in this document, with the goal to enable 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.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC073</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-073-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC073: SSAC Advisory on Root Zone Key Signing Key Rollover Plan</td>
<td>10/5/15</td>
<td>If this Advisory the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) addresses the following topics - Terminology and definitions relating to DNSSEC key rollback in the root zone; Key management in the root zone; Motivations for root zone KSK rollover; - Roles associated with root zone KSK rollover; - Available mechanisms for root zone KSK rollover; - Quantifying the risk of failed trust anchor update; and - DNSSEC data management considerations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-15-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/advice-statement/statement-ccwg-m/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/advice-statement/statement-ccwg-m/files/files/sac-071-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Bylaws Amendments - GDD Policy &amp; Implementation Recommendations</td>
<td>9/15/15</td>
<td>Advises the Board to carefully monitor both issues set forth in the statement to ensure that user and public interests are appropriately considered and that the implementation of complex policy can be accomplished in reasonable time-frames.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report. The respective public comment period closed on 09 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ngtld-registration-directory-services-public-comment-summary-final-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9719
ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making
9/9/15
(Public Comment Statement) ALAC provide community input into the Initial Report from the GNSO's Working Group with regards to possible recommendations for the use of Data and Metrics for Policy Making

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making. The respective public comment period closed on 09 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9720
ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal
9/9/15
(Public Comment Statement) ALAC strongly supports the research and recommendations in the Preliminary Issue Report. We are particularly impressed by the report's clear, coherent summary of the interdomain policy development activities, studies, and implementation efforts pertaining to WHOIS. Report of Public Comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ntt-ppl-07oct15-en.pdf

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report. The respective public comment period closed on 09 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ngtld-registration-directory-services-public-comment-summary-final-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC014
Comment to “Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...”
9/9/15
The Root Server System Advisory Committee, composed of the root server operators and others closely involved in the operations of the DNS root, has reviewed the IGD plan and observed the ICANN community process that has led to it.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC014 is RSSAC's comment detailing support for the "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..." and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
RSSAC003
RSSAC003: RSSAC Report on Root Zone TTLs
8/22/15
To address the DNSSEC problems identified in Section 6.1, the RSSAC recommends the Root Zone Management partners periodically increase the TTLs for the root zone to 21 days. This recommendation was incorporated in the Combined Transition Proposal released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/IANA-transition-proposal-07oct15-en.pdf).

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003 is RSSAC's report on the Root Zone TTLs, including the recommendation that the TTLs for the root zone should be increased to at least 21 days for DNSSEC reasons. This recommendation was included in the Combined Transition Proposal released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.ianacg.org/icg-files/documents/IANA-transition-proposal-07oct15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9886
ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on the Generic Names Supporting Organization
8/10/15
(Public Comment Statement) ALAC's response to the GNSO's Final Report on the Generic Names Supporting Organization

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 31 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 27 Aug 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gns-proxy-services-initial-review-27aug15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9889
ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on the Generic Names Supporting Organization
8/10/15
(Public Comment Statement) ALAC's response to the GNSO's Final Report on the Generic Names Supporting Organization

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 31 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 Sep 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gns-proxy-services-initial-review-15sep15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9888
ALAC Statement on the ICG Plan
8/10/15
(Public Comment Statement) ALAC's response to the GNSO's Final Report on the Generic Names Supporting Organization

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the ICG Plan. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
### Advice Document Recommendation

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

**AL-ALAC-ST-05jun15-en.pdf**

The ICANN organization understands the ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). A Response to the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

**RSSAC013: RSSAC Description of SSRAC's scope for developing a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.**

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

**SSAC070:** SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions Proposal

Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems". SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties.

This statement was considered as part of public comment period: see http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-cogx-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 19 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c.

**SSAC071:** SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability Enhancements

Concerning the role of SSAC in any new proposed structure, according to its charter, the role of SSAC is to "advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems". SSAC requests that its advice be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by affected parties.

This statement was considered as part of public comment period: see http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-cogx-accountability-draft-proposal-04may15/msg00072.html. On 19 March 2016, the ICANN Board accepted the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 Report and directed the President and CEO to proceed with implementation: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#c.

### Advice Item Status

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

- **ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship).**
- **Recommendation 4c: Application developers should also replace proprietary PSLs with well-known and widely accepted PSL implementations such as the Mozilla PSL and the proposed ANA PSL (Recommendation 8).**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070 E-6 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the ICANN to explicitly include the use of a PSLs and actions related to a PSL as part of their work. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to perform the ICANN organization's recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the ICANN considered the SSAC advice in its document UASG007 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-2016-05-05-en.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56990805/UASG007-version-2016-05-05-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands recommendation 5 of SAC070 as directing IANA staff to host an authoritative PSL containing information about the domains within the registries with which IANA has direct communication. This list should at least include all TLDs in the root zone. ICANN hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of November 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). As of 01 December 2019, IANA staff is now hosting an authoritative PSL for all TLDs in the root zone as stated in recommendation 5 of SAC070.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070 IAAC Advisory on the Use of Static TLD/Suffix Lists (B-5)</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this recommendation to mean that ICANN, in concert with the Mozilla Foundation, prepare educational materials on the Mozilla PSL covering the meaning of the resource and the impact of the resource. ICANN hired a contractor to provide the materials. Estimated time to completion is end of December 2019. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to perform the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-24-en#2.b</a>). As of 18 May 2020, “The Public Suffix List: A Guide for TLD Administrators” was published, (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/octo-011-18may20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/octo-011-18may20-en.pdf</a>) closing the knowledge gap between registries and popular PSL maintainers with the creation of informational material that can be given to TLD registry operators about the Mozilla PSL. This item is in Phase 5 - Close Request as of 5 June 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-AAC-51-0515-02-00-00</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-alac-statements/4941">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-alac-statements/4941</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: As noted within the General Comment: The ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft Proposal. That being said, the ALAC does have a number of critical concerns that will need to be addressed to allow us to fully support the final CWS proposal. As detailed under the comment on section II.A.1.c, the ALAC would prefer an IANA wholly integrated into ICANN, but is willing to accept a compromise of a separate legal entity if the details of its organization and governance are satisfactory - one very major concern that we believe must be addressed by the CWS, specifically the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight involvement and we will offer guidance as to how this might be addressed - one area where the ALAC had not yet reached consensus, but we have some concerns over the current direction of the CWS, specifically the Board (or other controlling entity) of the Post-Transition IANA (PTI); and - a number of lesser issues and requests for clarification. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-12jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-12jun15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC statement 51-0515-02-00-00 as a ALAC's statement on the 2nd Draft Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions. The respective public comment period closed on 20 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 Jun 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-12jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-12jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Advice Item Status**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Reference Number**: AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN
**Link to Advice Document**: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6541

**Advisory Committee**: ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget

- **Issue Date**: 13 Mar 2015
- **Advisory Document**: ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget
- **Action Taken**: This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Recommendation**: The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan & Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 13 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 05 Jun 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

---

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

**Advice Item Status**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Reference Number**: AL-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN
**Link to Advice Document**: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6541

**Advisory Committee**: ALAC Statement on the GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report

- **Issue Date**: 13 Mar 2015
- **Advisory Document**: GNSO Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report
- **Action Taken**: This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017.


---

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

**Advice Item Status**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Reference Number**: AL-ALAC-ST-0315-03-00-EN
**Link to Advice Document**: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6541

**Advisory Committee**: ALAC Statement on the MSR-2 TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2

- **Issue Date**: 16 Apr 2015
- **Action Taken**: This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.


---

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

**Advice Item Status**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Reference Number**: AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN
**Link to Advice Document**: https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6541

**Advisory Committee**: ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement

- **Issue Date**: 13 Mar 2015
- **Advisory Document**: Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement
- **Action Taken**: This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Recommendation**: The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement. The respective public comment period closed on 13 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 03 Apr 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03april15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
ALAC Statement on Translation and Transfer of Contact Information - FDP Initial Report

Recommendation 5: The ALAC proposes the following revision recommendations to the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20): - Include an assessment of the possible impact that the IANA stewardship transition may have on ICANN’s operations. – Change the wording to reflect the vision that a principle of accountability will be a key component of governance for the IANA Functions. – In the long-term, additional external controls are necessary for requirements that should be retained, and 3) if additional external controls are necessary, how and why they should be administered.

12/10/14

This statement refers back to RSSAC003 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone TTL work party to complete this work. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

Action(s) Taken

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone.” Per the Statement: “Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays, RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone. ? The change was completed on 22 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC's “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone.” The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone.” Per the Statement: “Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays, RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone.” The change was completed on 22 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Root Zone TTLs” and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ACUC-ST-0115-02-00-EN and AL-ACUC-ST-0115-03-00-EN. The respective public comment period closed on 31 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 Feb 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transformation-contact-init-19feb15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (FY16-FY20): - Include an assessment of the possible impact that the IANA stewardship transition may have on ICANN’s operations. - Change the wording to reflect the vision that a principle of accountability will be a key component of governance for the IANA Functions. - In the long-term, additional external controls are necessary for requirements that should be retained, and 3) if additional external controls are necessary, how and why they should be administered.

12/10/14

This statement refers back to RSSAC003 and requests Duane Wessels to lead the Root Zone TTL work party to complete this work. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

Action(s) Taken

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010 describes RSSAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Root Zone TTLs” and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ACUC-ST-0115-02-00-EN and AL-ACUC-ST-0115-03-00-EN. The respective public comment period closed on 31 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 Feb 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transformation-contact-init-19feb15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone.” Per the Statement: “Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays, RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone.” The change was completed on 22 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ACUC-ST-0115-02-00-EN and AL-ACUC-ST-0115-03-00-EN. The respective public comment period closed on 31 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 Feb 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transformation-contact-init-19feb15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone.” Per the Statement: “Based on discussion among members of RSSAC, we agree that this is a reasonable change that will alleviate potential validation problems in case of significant distribution delays, RSSAC hereby concurs with the recommendation to initiate appropriate steps to make this change to the root zone.” The change was completed on 22 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Versign to work together to develop a proposal for the IANA Functions Contract transition to the root zone. The change was completed on 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.
The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing suppliers should not be lowered increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNI balance among participants. preserve the delicate balance of advice coming from the ALAC, SSAC and RSSAC alongside the GAC. The ALAC consideration of GAC advice would add to this trend that we consider undesirable. Considering that the BGRI recommendations, specifically recommendation 11 of the ATRT1 and 6.5 of the ATRT2. Notwithstanding, the system. 1: The RSSAC recommends each root server operator implement the measurements outlined in this advisory. 2: The RSSAC should monitor the progress of the implementation of these measurements. 3: Measurements outlined in this document should be reviewed in two years to accommodate changes in DNS technologies. ICANN, as operator of L-Root, has implemented the advice and has made available a statement asserting its update-preservation-of-security-stability-and-resiliency) and was approved by the Board on 9 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c). ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC’s “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | ssac-068-en.pdf

RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers

RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC004: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC005: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC’s “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | ssac-068-en.pdf

RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers

RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC003: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall During IGF 2014

RSSAC004: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC005: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) While increasing DNI penetration, the standards of suppliers should not be lowered.

This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. The project document was released in May 2015.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC’s “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | ssac-068-en.pdf

RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers

RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC003: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall During IGF 2014

RSSAC004: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC005: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) education at all levels is key;

This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. The project document was released in May 2015.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008 provides RSSAC’s “Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum | 2 September 2014 | ssac-068-en.pdf

RSSAC001: Service Expectations of Root Servers

RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC003: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall During IGF 2014

RSSAC004: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

RSSAC005: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System

There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DNI without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) education at all levels is key;

This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dns-underserved-2014-05-14-en ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. The project document was released in May 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-0714-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/atlas-ii-declaration-with-appendix-6-of-6-en.html">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/atlas-ii-declaration-with-appendix-6-of-6-en.html</a></td>
<td>NAIC Statement on the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions (6 of 6)</td>
<td>3/31/14</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DR in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DR without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DR programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) the processes to become a registrar should be clarified and simplified with training and support; 2) the new second gTLD round should give preference to applicants from developing economies and undertake an outreach program to ensure a better understanding of the processes.</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en</a> ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in underserved Regions in September 2014: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions">https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-0714-02-01-EN</td>
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<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DR in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DR without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DR programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) the demands placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints.</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en</a> ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in underserved Regions in September 2014: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions">https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ruled-2014-05-24-en</a> ICANN published a Project Roadmap for supporting the Domain Name Industry in underserved Regions in September 2014: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions">https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions</a></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>3/31/14</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DR in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the DR without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of DR programs should adhere to the following principles: 1) the demands placed on registrars should be reasonable based on local cost-of-living and related financial constraints.</td>
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</table>

**RSSAC**

**AL-ATLAS-02-0714-02-01-EN**

**DCL-01-01-EN**

**0714-02-01-EN**

**RC9.pdf**


**RSSAC006**

**DCL-01-01-EN**

**0714-02-01-EN**

**RC9.pdf**


**RSSAC006: RSSAC Guideline to Representatives on the "RTA-IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group"**

**7/10/14**

The RSSAC gave guidance requested by its representatives on the "RTA-IANA Functions’ Stewardship Transition Coordination Group".

**RSSAC006: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Service Expectations of Root Servers"**

**7/10/14**

The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Service Expectations of Root Servers".

**RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement of Scope for "Measurements of the Root Server System"**

**7/10/14**

The RSSAC wishes to make a recommendation on "Measurements of the Root Server System".

**The RSSAC organization understands RSSAC006 describes RSSAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Service Expectations of Root Servers” (RSSAC001) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.**

**RSSAC007 describes RSSAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Measurements of the Root Server System” (RSSAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.**


**The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in KANN (R-18)**

**6/26/14**

R-18. ICANN should ensure that its Registrar-Guides are widely accessible.

**The Board in its 6 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:**

https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/PRJCTGDDURO/Project+Roadmap%3A+Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry+in+Underserved+Regions in September 2014:

https://community.icann.org/display/Grid?display=Project:Roadmap%20-%20Supporting+the+Domain+Name+Industry%20in+underserved+Regions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider (ALAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS) I Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.15. ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure to benefit a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf</a>. This specific advice item was addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS) I Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-31)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.15. ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf</a>. This specific advice item was addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of call times. See ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS) I Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.9. ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf</a>. This is part of day-to-day work of ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Several ICANN offices have been opened over the past years, most recently the Engagement office in Nairobi. See ALAC workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9">https://community.icann.org/display/ALAC/AtLarge+ADvice+Item+9</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS) I Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-26)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.29. Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SO/ACs, in order to: enhance Knowledge Management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activity, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multilingual engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf</a>. This is part of ICANN’s ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DEL-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS) I Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-27)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>0.27. The Board must implement ATRT2 Recommendation 0.1, regarding formal Advice from Advisory Committees.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/carlson-to-chalaby-25may18-en.pdf</a>. This is part of ICANN’s ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no actionable items for ICANN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider (ALAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-39: ICANN should encourage open data! Best practices that foster re-use of the information by any third party.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20Regional%20Outreach%20Program%20(ROCOP)%20Report.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20Regional%20Outreach%20Program%20(ROCOP)%20Report.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-40: ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP), but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This item is within the remit of the ALAC and is being handled by the Technology Task Force. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. For more information, see the latest update from Technology Task Force: <a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20Regional%20Outreach%20Program%20(ROCOP)%20Report.pdf?api=v2">https://community.icann.org/download/attachment/52891539/Discussion%20with%20At%20Large%20Regional%20Outreach%20Program%20(ROCOP)%20Report.pdf?api=v2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41: ICANN should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget [<a href="https://forum.icann.org/t/65204/comments-up-budget-15mar16/msg002013.html">https://forum.icann.org/t/65204/comments-up-budget-15mar16/msg002013.html</a>], which was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board/France committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-42: ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RAGO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget [<a href="https://forum.icann.org/t/65204/comments-up-budget-15mar16/msg002013.html">https://forum.icann.org/t/65204/comments-up-budget-15mar16/msg002013.html</a>], which was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board/France committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-43: ALAC should encourage its inactive ALE representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/al42/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+43">https://community.icann.org/display/al42/ATLAS-II+Recommendation+43</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ATLAS-02-DDEL-01-01-01 | http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-H-Declaration-with-appendices.pdf | The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-15) | 6/26/14 | R-44: ICANN should continue to support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to increase participation from all stakeholders. | The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e A Work has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided for students to attend ICANN55. The Meeting team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: https://community.icann.org/display/al42/ATLAS-II+Outreach+Event+Workspace https://community.icann.org/display/al42/AtLarge+ICANN55+Program
The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Work specific to this advice item is complete. There is ongoing work being conducted by task forces, and there are ongoing discussions about establishing a liaison to the GAC. For updates, see the ALAC workspace:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+6

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is complete. There is ongoing work being conducted by task forces, and there are ongoing discussions about establishing a liaison to the GAC. For updates, see the ALAC workspace:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+6

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2 Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on OEC’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/oec-activities-2015-06-08-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC’s consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en

There are no actionable items for ICANN.

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC has no further action on this advice item to the OEC workplan: “Holistic Assessment of ICANN structures”. The OEC agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2 Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on OEC’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/oec-activities-2015-06-08-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC’s consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all the above recommendations. See the ALAC workspace for updates:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+5

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Much has been done to establish a practice for declaring conflicts of interest. See the ALAC workspace for updates:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+4

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ALAC has taken steps to establish a practice for declaring conflicts of interest. See the ALAC workspace for updates:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+4

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2015. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-Accountability+Skill+Matrix

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2 Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on OEC’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/oec-activities-2015-06-08-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC’s consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2015. Development of Work Stream 1 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-Accountability+Skill+Matrix

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was discussed by the Board Organization Effectiveness Committee (OEC), which subsequently added the item to the OEC workplan: “Holistic Assessment of ICANN structures”. The OEC agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2 Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on OEC’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/oec-activities-2015-06-08-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC’s consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e There are no actionable items for ICANN.

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This recommendation was discussed by the Board Organization Effectiveness Committee (OEC), which subsequently added the item to the OEC workplan: “Holistic Assessment of ICANN structures”. The OEC agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of WS2 Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structures” is to be addressed. Updates on OEC’s progress on this work item are reported on the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/oec-activities-2015-06-08-en.pdf). For further information on the OEC’s consideration of this topic, see: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en; and latest OEC meeting minutes: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e ICANN has also revamped monthly and regional newsletters to share content in Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Turkish. Primary platform for content sharing remains icann.org, with additional content available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish and Turkish. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-Accountability+Skill+Matrix

The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 2 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2015. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-Accountability+Skill+Matrix

The Board in its 8 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the first ATLAS II Declaration:
https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 1, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/display/als2/CCWG-Accountability+Skill+Matrix
Operational Recommendation 3: ICANN should perform an evaluation of potential notification approaches for Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)-only hosts as well as IP Version 4 (IPv4)-only or dual-stack hosts.

Operational Recommendation 4: ICANN should implement a notification approach that accommodates the operational needs of the DNS system.

Operational Recommendation 5: ICANN should provide clarity to registries on the rules and the method of implementation for mitigation actions.

Strategic Recommendation 1: ICANN should consider not taking any actions solely based on the JAS Phase One report. If action is planned to be taken before the entire report is published, communications to the SSAC should be provided.

Strategic Recommendation 2: ICANN should in due course publish information about not yet disclosed findings of the JAS Phase One report. If action is planned to be taken before the entire report is published, communications to the SSAC should be provided.

Strategic Recommendation 3: ICANN should seek to provide stronger justification for extrapolating findings based on one kind of measurement or data gathering to other situations.
The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on the ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem, particularly its conclusion that the multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced. The diagram on Governance, grouped into the logical layer and infrastructure layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel’s discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN’s new role in: Globalization not internationalization, Consolidation and simplification of root zone management, and a web of affirmation of commitments. Globally, the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggestions contained in the Panel’s final report could be used to identify potential gaps, and fill in the missing pieces. The ALAC is impacted by a multistakeholder approach.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. They believe that the multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced. The diagram on Governance, grouped into the logical layer and infrastructure layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel’s discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN’s new role in: Globalization not internationalization, Consolidation and simplification of root zone management, and a web of affirmation of commitments. Globally, the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggestions contained in the Panel’s final report could be used to identify potential gaps, and fill in the missing pieces.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on the ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem, particularly its conclusion that the multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced. The diagram on Governance, grouped into the logical layer and infrastructure layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel’s discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN’s new role in: Globalization not internationalization, Consolidation and simplification of root zone management, and a web of affirmation of commitments. Globally, the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggestions contained in the Panel’s final report could be used to identify potential gaps, and fill in the missing pieces.

The ALAC strongly supports the report from the Panel on the ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem, particularly its conclusion that the multistakeholder model is by far preferable and should be elaborated and reinforced. The diagram on Governance, grouped into the logical layer and infrastructure layer is a very helpful way to conceptualize Internet governance issues. The Panel’s discussions under the following headings also have some very useful pointers on directions for ICANN’s new role in: Globalization not internationalization, Consolidation and simplification of root zone management, and a web of affirmation of commitments. Globally, the process of accountability through a web of relationships and suggestions contained in the Panel’s final report could be used to identify potential gaps, and fill in the missing pieces.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDOS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-3</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: Recursive DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure open recursive DNS servers. This involves: a. Identify unmanaged open recursive DNS servers operating in the network and take immediate steps to restrict access to these servers in order to prevent abuse; b. Follow SAC068 Recommendation 3 to [1] disable open recursion on name servers from external sources and [2] only accept DNS queries from trusted sources to assist in reducing amplification vectors for DNS DDOS attacks; c. DNS Application Service Providers should take all reasonable steps to prevent abusive use of their open resolvers so that they are not targets of abuse. This would include continuous monitoring for anomalous behavior, limiting or blocking known abuse queries (e.g., rpx.net/ANX), tracking likely target victim IPs (attacks reported or addresses of frequently targeted servers) and restricting or disallowing response to those IPs; and sharing information with similar operators to coordinate efforts to quell such attacks.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-3 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDOS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-4</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Authoritative DNS server operators should investigate deploying authoritative response rate limiting to slow the DNS amplification process for an attack. This involves: a. Investigate mechanisms to deter DNS amplification attacks (e.g., Response Rate Limiting (RRL) in DNS server software and implementation/usage of appropriate for their environment; b. Encourage DNS software vendors to provide such capabilities; and c. Frequently review the state of the art of such mechanisms and update their environment as necessary.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-4 is directed towards DNS server operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDOS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-5</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: DNS operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicate with their software vendors to keep abreast of latest developments. This should minimally include: a. Audit and update operational practices as necessary to ensure that a process is in place to systematically perform DNS software updates on both an on-going and an emergency basis; and b. Encourage DNS software vendors to implement and refine the relevant capabilities in their software.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-5 is directed towards DNS operators, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time (other than support of promotion of this effort described in SAC065 R-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DDOS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure - R-6</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: Manufacturers and/or configurators of customer premise networking equipment, including home networking equipment, should take immediate steps to secure these devices and ensure that they are field upgradable when new software is available to fix security vulnerabilities, and aggressively replace the installed base of non-upgradable devices with upgradeable devices. This minimally involves: a. Ensuring that the default configuration on these devices does not implement unmanaged open recursive DNS resolver; b. Providing updates and patches for their equipment to keep the installed base of networking equipment up-to-date to address current security threats, or as a necessary alternative replacing non-upgradeable equipment with appropriately configured devices; and c. Ensuring that large-scale participants in purchasing of customer premise networking equipment (e.g., ISPs, government procurement, large enterprises) insist that networking equipment meet the standards discussed in this document.</td>
<td>SAC065 R-6 is directed towards manufacturers and/or configurators of networking equipment, not ICANN. ICANN acknowledges this advice, but we do not believe that there is any action required of ICANN at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC065: SAC Advisory on DDOS Attacks Leveraging DNS Infrastructure (R-2)</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>CANDN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS &quot;Search List&quot; Processing - R-1</td>
<td>2/1/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The IAAAC advises the ICANN supporting organizations and Advisory Committees, the ICANN organization to consider the following proposed behavior for search list processing and comment on its correctness, completeness, usefulness and feasibility. As administrators (including DHCP server administrators) should configure the search list explicitly and must not rely on or use implicit search lists. Where DNS parameters such as the domain search list have been manually configured, these parameters should not be overridden by DHCP. b. When a user enters a single label name, that name may be subject to search list processing if a search list is specified, but must never be queried in the DNS in its original single- label form. c. When a user queries a hostname that contain two or more labels separated by dots, such as <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a>, applications and resolvers must query the DNS directly. Search lists must not be applied even if such names do not resolve to an address (AAAA). Therefore <a href="http://www.server">www.server</a> is always a FQDN.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-1 means that ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. This initiative, which should involve measurement efforts and outreach, should be supported by ICANN with appropriate staffing and funding to promote the recommendations made in SAC065 Recommendations 2-5. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/memos-2017-06-24-en.html">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/memos-2017-06-24-en.html</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNS &quot;Search List&quot; Processing - R-2</td>
<td>2/1/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The IAAAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the RIR to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/sysop/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SAC Advisory on DNS &quot;Search List&quot; Processing (R-2)</td>
<td>2/1/14</td>
<td>The IAAAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the RIR to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior. background with the submission of an Internet-Draft to the IETF and advocating for its standardization within the IETF process. Updates to RFC 3585 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/memos-2017-06-24-en.html">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/memos-2017-06-24-en.html</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Advisor Item Status**

**As of 31 May 2020**
<p>| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC064 | <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-064-en.pdf</a> | 12/16/14 | In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior (a). Complementary 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. (b) Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions 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 4 | Deferred | 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) SSAC 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. (b) ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with names delegated as new gTLDs from the .ds123 application round for the New gTLD Program. On 24 June 2017, the SSAC Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-29-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-06-29-en</a>). Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 25 September 2019 pending external activity. ICANN.org will take up further action once the RFC's works on analyzing the causes of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-0114-08-00-EN | <a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/conference/correspondence/17aug15-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/conference/correspondence/17aug15-en.htm</a> | 11/17/14 | The At Large Advisory Committee considers the submitted “ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan” a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan. The ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated. Nevertheless, as the most important concern today is about the security of the Internet and the trust in the Internet, the ALAC would prefer to include those aspects of trust and security in the paragraph describing the ICANN Vision in this way: &quot;to support a single, open, and globally interoperable Internet with a secure and trusted DNS&quot;. The same should be done in all focus areas paragraphs each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned. The ALAC recommends that it is necessary to add another bold point in the “Developing a world-class public policy infrastructure” section: “Engage and develop the End-Users community globally for full involvement in policy development and decision making processes.” The ALAC finds the other elements of the four areas express and detailed. It appreciates this preliminary work to prepare for a future-oriented and concept 5 years strategic plan and strongly supports that process. | ALAC Statement on ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Year Strategic Plan | This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/strategic-2013-10-29-09-16">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/strategic-2013-10-29-09-16</a>. On 16 October 2014, the Board took a resolution adopting the Strategic Plan: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en</a>. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-0114-04-00-EN | <a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/</a> correspondence/2-25jan14-en.htm | 12/16/14 | The ALAC recommends the adoption of Specification 13 to the Registry Agreement to Certify and GDT: The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by re-defining a clear and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must translate the Sovereignty and right of self-determination of States to let them choose their region of allocation and request, if they so desire, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geographic regions, we are speaking about regions, and the ALAC doesn’t believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on other consideration than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity is important but can’t impact the geographic regions framework. If we want it to be regions plus language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years period to five. | ALAC Statement on the Proposal for a Specification 13 to the ICANN Registry Agreement to Certify and GDT | This statement was submitted and considered as part of a request for community feedback on the Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations. The WG provided a Final Report in October 2015: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf</a> This Report was placed for public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en</a>. The ALAC also provided comments as part of this public comment period: <a href="https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en">https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en</a>. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a request for community feedback on the Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations. The WG provided a Final Report in October 2015: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf</a> This Report was placed for public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en</a>. The ALAC also provided comments as part of this public comment period: <a href="https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en">https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en</a>. This statement was submitted and considered as part of a request for community feedback on the Geographic Regions Working Group Recommendations. The WG provided a Final Report in October 2015: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-10oct15-en.pdf</a> This Report was placed for public comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-25-en</a>. The ALAC also provided comments as part of this public comment period: <a href="https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en">https://forum.icann.org/t360/geo-regions-2016-04-28-en</a>. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-0114-04-00-EN | <a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/</a> correspondence/12jan14-en.htm | 12/16/14 | The ALAC adopts the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG, as the Final Report of the DSSA WG. The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by re-defining a clear and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must translate the Sovereignty and right of self-determination of States to let them choose their region of allocation and request, if they so desire, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geographic regions, we are speaking about regions, and the ALAC doesn’t believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on other consideration than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity is important but can’t impact the geographic regions framework. If we want it to be regions plus language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years period to five. | ALAC Statement on the Final Report of the DSSA Working Group | This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2016-05-31-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2016-05-31-en</a>. On 23 May 2016, the ICANN Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaws and approved a resolution adopting the Bylaws: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-27-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-27-en</a>. |
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ALAC-ST-0114-04-00-EN | <a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/</a> correspondence/12jan14-en.htm | 12/16/14 | The ALAC adopts the Report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA WG, as the Final Report of the DSSA WG. The ALAC supports the recommendation for ICANN to adopt a more rigorous approach by re-defining a clear and consistent classification framework that assigns countries and territories to regions. Nevertheless, it would be helpful if the way and the criteria for such re-definition were suggested. The ALAC strongly supports that ICANN must translate the Sovereignty and right of self-determination of States to let them choose their region of allocation and request, if they so desire, a move to another geographic region. When we speak about geographic regions, we are speaking about regions, and the ALAC doesn’t believe that the geographic regions could be in any case built on other consideration than the regional one. The cultural and linguistic diversity is important but can’t impact the geographic regions framework. If we want it to be regions plus language, we have to call it diversity, not geographic regions. The ALAC supports the recommendation to amend the bylaws to modify the present requirement for review of the Geographic Regions from three years period to five. | ALAC Statement on the Final Report of the DSSA Working Group | This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2016-05-31-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/2016-05-31-en</a>. On 23 May 2016, the ICANN Board considered the public comments on the proposed bylaws and approved a resolution adopting the Bylaws: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-27-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-06-27-en</a>. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>We advise the ICANN Board to: (1) Place emphasis on recommendations on observations, and address issues outlined in the ATRT 2 Final Report &amp; Recommendations. The Board should exercise both recommendations in the ATRT 2 Final Report &amp; Recommendations.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>The ATRT 2 final report identifies a need for improvements in the current ICANN operations. The ALAC recommends that ICANN take action to address these issues.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>The Board should examine both recommendations and observations in the ATRT 2 report with equal weight. A careful review of the observations laid out in Appendix B and C on the reviews of the WHOIS Review Team and the Security, Stability and Resilience Review Team implementation reveals serious issues requiring Board attention. We recommend that the issues be addressed in a manner consistent with the ATRT recommendations.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Policy &amp; Implementation Working Group</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>The ALAC recommends that ICANN be better prepared organizationally to support future reviews and that the ATRT 2 be provided with a full year (12 months) for its review work, even if review commencement is delayed.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Policy &amp; Implementation Working Group</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>There must be a methodology to recognize when a decision will impact the community, and such decisions must involve a bottom-up process in addressing those decisions. The processes must be designed to be time sensitive. The issue of debate should not be an option. There must be a way to come to a closure when the community is divided, and this should not simply give executive powers to ICANN Staff. One of the key questions must be resolved is what part should the Board play in taking action if the community is divided. This question is one of the reasons that the ATRT believes that this should have been a Board-led initiative, but the fact that it isn't does not remove the importance of the question.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Draft Report &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>The ATRT2 appreciates the importance of recommendations for Public Comment. The ALAC believes that the ATRT2 recommendations are crucial for enhancing, on a consistent basis, the process and availability of accountability and transparency throughout ICANN. We strongly agree with the ATRT2 general recommendations that, in moving forward, ICANN needs to: Establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability, transparency, and performance can be measured. Communicate clearly and consistently about accountability and transparency mechanisms and performance; and Improve and priorize its AoC Review processes.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Nick WHOIS Process Development Process (PDP) Recommendations for Board Consideration</td>
<td>11/21/13</td>
<td>The ATRT2 strongly supports the recommendation of the final report on the Nick WHOIS Public Policy Development Process for all GLOD registrars to use the &quot;Nick WHOIS&quot; model. It is a position that the ALAC has supported, beginning with its response to the Preliminary Report and reflected in the ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Review Report on &quot;WHOIS, extreme disappointment&quot; that Verisign was not provided with a &quot;WHOIS&quot; model.</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2013-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm">http://www.atlarge.icann.org/content/responses/correspondence-3-21nov13-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Revised Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP)</td>
<td>12/14/13</td>
<td>The ATRT2 appreciates the radical changes made to the PICDRP in response to the comments of the final draft. The process seems quite appropriate for addressing potential harms caused by a registry failure to honor the Public Interest Commitments aspect of their registry agreements. However, the ATRT2 firmly believes that this process does not address the PUBLIC INTEREST aspect of Public Interest Commitments. There must be a provision for allowing reports of PIC violations, and particularly substantive PIC violations without the need to demonstrate harm. A significant aspect of the PIC is to ensure registrant and Internet user trust in the ICANN and to disallow reports of the perceived loss of that trust greatly lessens the benefit of the PIC, and could serve to make them completely ineffective. The ATRT2 offers the following more specific comments on the PICDRP: &quot;The use of the undefined term 'good standing' is both vague and inappropriate, there are criteria under which ICANN will consider not to follow up on a report, they must be clearly stated and subject to appeal. There is no requirement for interaction between a Reporter and Registry if the complaint issues identified in the report are factually identifiable; there is no need to negotiate evidence-subject to appeal. There should be no requirement for interaction between a Reporter and Registry if the complaint issues identified in the report are factually identifiable; there is no need to negotiate evidence-subject to appeal. An ALAC Statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT 2) Final Report &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>This was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/alac-recommendations-2014-03-06-en</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advisory Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances an delegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation for a security or stability issue. In the case where a TLD has an established namespace, ICANN should clearly identify why the risk and harm of the TLD remaining in the root zone is greater than the risk and harm of removing a valid and in-use namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of a delegation of a TLD.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what changes have been made and why as part of its decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis: Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it? Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency rollback decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and have the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? Termination of the trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)? What is to be done with the data collected? Who makes the decision on what the next step in the delegation process is?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of clear and objective metrics for acceptable levels of &quot;breakage&quot; resulting from a key rollover.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN should work with the wider internet community, including at least the ICANN board, to identify what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and if what type of namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the development of rollback procedures to be executed when a rollover has affected operational stability beyond a reasonable boundary.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>During the trial, ICANN should also undertake a significant, worldwide communications effort to publicize the root zone KSK rollover motivation and process as widely as possible.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid resolution of a delegation of a TLD.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>ICANN should work with the wider internet community, including at least the ICANN board, to identify what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and if what type of namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 1 November 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-03-en

The ICANN Board passed a resolution on 21 November 2013 that, "directs ICANN’s President and CEO to have the advice provided in SAC062 evaluated" (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2013-11-21-en). The recommendation was considered by ICANN while developing the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework. Recommendation was taken and included in the framework. See: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-03-en

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/root-statement-02-2018-07-03-en.pdf

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/root-statement-02-2018-07-03-en.pdf
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.

This statement was considered as part of a request for community review and input to the draft CPE Guidelines for the New gTLD Program: https://www.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-4-16aug13-en. On 27 September 2013, ICANN published the CPE Guidelines produced by the Economist Intelligence Unit after considering ICANN community feedback on the first draft.

The ICANN Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN’s remit) directed at finding a solution to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy has been developed and accepted in the community.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

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.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

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.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

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.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

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.

This statement was considered as part of a public comment period on the initial report: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread.html. A Final Report was published in June 2014: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLAXC</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0813-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention</td>
<td>8/9/13</td>
<td>ALAC recommends additional community-related expertise in community priority evaluation and stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors.</td>
<td>On 9 September 2013, the Chair of the ICANN Board called GTLD Program Committee (NGPC) responded to some of the concerns raised by ALAC (<a href="http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf">http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf</a>). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: “The NGPC appreciates the offer made by the ALAC to provide community volunteers to serve as Panel members or advisors. However, the NGPC determined that it would not be appropriate to introduce external parties to the EIU’s evaluation process.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAXC</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposal to Mitigate Name Collision Risks</td>
<td>8/27/13</td>
<td>The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the “Name Collisions in the DNS” [PDF, 3.34 MB] study report by Interica Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN to the GTLD Collision Risk Management Proposal [PDF, 166 KB]. The ALAC wishes to reiterate its previous advice to the Board that it is pursuing mitigation actions to minimize residual risk, especially for those strings in the “uncalculated risk” category. ICANN must assure that such residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrars, consumers and individual end users. In particular, the direct and indirect costs associated with proposed mitigation actions should not have to be borne by registrants, consumers and individual end users. The ALAC remains concerned that this matter is being dealt with at such a late stage of the new gTLD Process. The ALAC urges the Board to investigate how and why this crucial issue could have been ignored for so long and how similar occurrences may be prevented in the future.</td>
<td>On 30 July 2014, the NGPC adopted the Name Collision Management Framework: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtlds-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtlds-2014-07-30-en</a>. Implementation and general information about the Name Collision efforts can be found at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAXC</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0813-04-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposal to Mitigate Name Collision Risks</td>
<td>8/9/13</td>
<td>ALAC recommends additional community-related expertise in community priority evaluation and stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors.</td>
<td>On 28 September 2013, the Chair of the ICANN Board called GTLD Program Committee (NGPC) responded to some of the concerns raised by ALAC (<a href="http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf">http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf</a>). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: “The NGPC appreciates the offer made by the ALAC to provide community volunteers to serve as Panel members or advisors. However, the NGPC determined that it would not be appropriate to introduce external parties to the EIU’s evaluation process.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAXC</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0813-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm">http://atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-27aug15-en.htm</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposal to Mitigate Name Collision Risks</td>
<td>8/9/13</td>
<td>ALAC recommends additional community-related expertise in community priority evaluation and stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors.</td>
<td>On 9 September 2013, the Chair of the NGPC responded to the ALAC (<a href="http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf">http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/attachments/20130910/0567b418/ResponseNGPCtoAL-ALAC-ST-0813-03-00-EN-0001.pdf</a>). In the response, the NGPC Chair stated: “The NGPC appreciates the offer made by the ALAC to provide community volunteers to serve as Panel members or advisors. However, the NGPC determined that it would not be appropriate to introduce external parties to the EIU’s evaluation process.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Active Variant TLDs

- **7/23/13**
  - The ALAC welcomes the completion and publication of the “Name Collisions in the DNS” [PDF, 3.34 MB] study report by Interica Consulting Group and the subsequent response by ICANN to the GTLD Collision Risk Management Proposal [PDF, 166 KB]. The ALAC wishes to reiterate its previous advice to the Board that it is pursuing mitigation actions to minimize residual risk, especially for those strings in the “uncalculated risk” category. ICANN must assure that such residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrars, consumers and individual end users. In particular, the direct and indirect costs associated with proposed mitigation actions should not have to be borne by registrants, consumers and individual end users. The ALAC remains concerned that this matter is being dealt with at such a late stage of the new gTLD Process. The ALAC urges the Board to investigate how and why this crucial issue could have been ignored for so long and how similar occurrences may be prevented in the future.

- **8/9/13**
  - ALAC recommends additional community-related expertise in community priority evaluation and stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors.

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

- **9/13/13**
  - Regarding ICANN’s Report on Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs, The root zone must use one and only one set of label generation rules. (LGR).

- **10/14/13**
  - Regarding ICANN’s Report on Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs, The root zone must use one and only one set of label generation rules. (LGR).

- **11/14/13**

- **12/14/13**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/ssac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/ssac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that it is not implemented: denial of service versus misconnection.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>CANN responded to the SSC in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. The specific advice item is part of project 2.1 LGR Procedure. Information on Project 2.1 of the LGR can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WPP/2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WPP/2.1</a>. Label Generation and Registrar Process for the Root Zone Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variant TLDs. Some of this work can be found at the links listed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC058</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC058: Active Variant TLD (4 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICAAN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the DNS Implementation Guidelines - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second-level domain labels (SIDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC059</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-059-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-059-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC059: R-1 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>4/18/13</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLD (4 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>ICAAN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the DNS Implementation Guidelines - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second-level domain labels (SIDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-061-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>4/18/13</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC062: 3rd party interception of domain name registration data</td>
<td>6/4/13</td>
<td>The SSAC urges the Board to take further consideration of measures SAC058 advice and recommendations to ensure that residual risk is minimized and specifically that residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers and individual end users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-065-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-065-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC065: 3rd party interception of domain name registration data</td>
<td>6/4/13</td>
<td>The SSAC urges the Board to take further consideration of measures SAC058 advice and recommendations to ensure that residual risk is minimized and specifically that residual risk is not transferred to third parties such as current registry operators, new gTLD applicants, registrants, consumers and individual end users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN Board Status Advice Report (SSAC) provides, in its report to the ICANN Board, an overview of the status of the various advice items and the status of the Board's actions on those advice items. The report also includes a summary of the relevant public comments and other feedback received on the advice items. The report is intended to provide transparency and accountability in the decision-making process of the ICANN Board.
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC058 | https://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC058 | 2/27/13 | 9-1 R-3 SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation | Phase 5 | Close Request | The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that trust 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. | As of 31 May 2020 |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC058 | https://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC058 | 2/27/13 | The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that trust 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. | As of 31 May 2020 |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC056 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC056 | 10/9/12 | SAC056 concludes that “Governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content” | - | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC055 | 9/14/12 | The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data. | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a | 3/27/13 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC055 | 9/14/12 | The Board should direct the CEO to create a registration data policy committee that includes the highest levels of executive engagement to develop a registration data policy which defines the purpose of domain name registration data, as described elsewhere in this document. | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a | 3/27/13 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC055 | 9/14/12 | The Board should explicitly define any other activity (within ICANN’s reach) directed at fixing a hole in the WHOIS problem? until the registration data policy identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community. | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a | 3/27/13 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC055 | 9/14/12 | Internationalized-Domain Names: Internationalization MUST be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the IDN-WG final report. | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a | 3/27/13 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC055 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC055 | 9/14/12 | An accuracy policy should define each data element and require that it be examined and indicate for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data. | This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a | 3/27/13 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC054 | https://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC054 | 6/11/12 | The SAC invites all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and in particular Registry and Registrar Stakeholder groups to: (a) consider this data model and comment on its completeness, and (b) comment on the utility of the model in furthering the definition of a directory service for domain name registration data as outlined in SAC053 and SAC051. | This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a) | 6/11/12 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC054 | https://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC054 | 6/11/12 | The SAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work. | This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a) | 6/11/12 | - | - | - |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC053 | http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ids | SAC053 | 2/23/12 | Recommendation: dotless domains should not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use of DNS resource records such as A, AAA and MX in the apex of a Top-Level Domain (TLD) be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases. | As of 31 May 2020 | 2/23/12 | - | - | - |

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SAC: (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a) | 2/23/12 | - | - | - |
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SSAC052


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

13/3/12

Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends a very conservative approach to the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains. In particular, until ICANN completes work on user confusion (string similarity and IDN variants), the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single-character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be slowed down by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of potential confusability, both within and across scripts. Such consideration should involve comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from SSAC's advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each applied-for single-character TLD label should be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts. 4. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of single-character TLDs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be relaxed if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the RFT work on the creation of a specific identification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs. 5. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding its consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be PAVAUD according to IDNA2008. b) The code point is from one of the Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Ll) as defined by the Unicode Standard. c) Some single-character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-ASCII code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. 4) The script in which an exception is made and a single-character IDN is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Cyrillic/Lao/Thai, etc.). 5) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Delegation of a single-character TLD application does not imply blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. 6) If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is

SSAC050


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

1/31/12

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

SSAC053


DNS Blocking: Benefit vs. Harm

6/14/11

Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain Name or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organization from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate access. DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

SSAC054


DNS Blocking: Benefit vs. Harm

6/14/11

Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain Name or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be viewed by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that aimed to block people within an organization from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a privately or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate access. DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

SSAC055


SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure

6/24/11

Recommendation (1): The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions, in particular: Domain Name Registration Data (DNSRD). The data that a domain name registrant provides when registering a domain name and that registrars or registrars collect. Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNSRD-AP). The components of a standard communications exchange - queries and responses. The protocol that provides access to DNSRD - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNSRD-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registries and registrars to implement the DNSRD-DS and to provide access to DNSRD-DS. Additional terminology includes: DNSRD, TLD Policy, TLD-DS Policy, Internationalized DNSRD, and TLD-DS Policy. The term WHOIS/DS should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 2181.

SSAC056


SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure

6/24/11

Recommendation (2): The ICANN community should develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing DNSRD that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of verification methods, credential verification, and access control capabilities.

Advice Item

Issued Date

Advice Document Recommendation

Phase

Activity Taken

This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

Considerable work has been performed or ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en A String Similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules (Project 5), but this project was de-registered based on public comment, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken. This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN as it is general advice to organizations implementing DNS blocking rather than advice directed to the ICANN Board.

ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook. On 12 November 2012, the ICANN Board approved resolution directing that work begin related to the development of new directory service policy and that it incorporate the language used by the SSAC. The new policy building block guidance states that the delegation of IDN TLDs in all scripts should be slowed down by default. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of potential confusability, both within and across scripts. Recommendations that are intrinsically confusible with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Cyrillic/Lao/Thai, etc.). The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Delegation of a single-character TLD application does not imply blocking of the script. Similarly, acceptance of a single-character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is
### SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN Registry Transition Procedures Model (4 of 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisor Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC047: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (4 of 7)</td>
<td>4/16/11</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that registrars consider implementing WHOIS safeguards and practices to manage the risk associated with loss, destruction, or unavailability of name service. (1) Thoroughly document all aspects of your DNS architecture and operations; (2) Design for resiliency; Recommendation (3) Actively manage DNS information; (4) Protect domain registration and hosting accounts against unauthorized access or misuse; (5) Monitor the health and well being of your name service; (6) Track operational statistics and trends; (7) Develop a continuity plan for recovering from DNS; (8) Before making changes in provisioning, plan carefully, and; (9) Make informed choices when selecting DNS providers.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>The Board accepted this advice in October 2011 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC047 be developed (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/meetings/2011-10-28-en/10">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/meetings/2011-10-28-en/10</a>). A roadmap to implementing SAC047 was published for public comment in February 2012: <a href="https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2012-02-06-en">https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2012-02-06-en</a>. As of 26 August 2019 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN is working to improve the normal process for amending the gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC048: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)</td>
<td>5/12/11</td>
<td>The SSAC notes that in certain operating circumstances, registry functions, especially critical services such as data backup, are required to provide an RDAP service in addition to the WHOIS service.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAC049: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisor Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC049: SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)</td>
<td>6/3/11</td>
<td>The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of domain names during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain ownership during a transition.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAC051: SSAC Comment on the ICANN Registry Transition Procedures Model (5 of 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advisor Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/sac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (5 of 7)</td>
<td>5/12/11</td>
<td>(4) The SSAC notes that the Explanatory Memorandum makes no provision to ensure that a registrant retains the registration of domain names during transition. The process must have a provision to lock domain ownership during a transition.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (1 of 4)</td>
<td>12/6/15</td>
<td>Recommendation (1): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including IDNs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates.</td>
<td>4/15/16</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-048-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC049: ICANN should assist in defining the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework. Further implementation of this item is deferred as of 16 December 2013 pending further activity.</td>
<td>12/6/15</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should commission and support interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone more than an order of magnitude, particularly for enterprises and other user communities who may implement strong assumptions about the number of TLDs or other root zone management participants to define the specific measurements, monitoring, and data sharing framework.</td>
<td>5/24/14</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC49: Report on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (9-10)</td>
<td>12/6/15</td>
<td>ICANN should update its “Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability, and Resiliency,” to include actual implementation of the New gTLD Program, ICANN regularly published the expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs. For example, ICANN’s estimates were published as part of a plan to utilize a drawing method to prioritize new gTLD applications [<a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-23jun12-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/root-scaling-23jun12-en.pdf</a>] as well as in other regular New gTLD updates.</td>
<td>50 of 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-050-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC50: Report on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (11-12)</td>
<td>12/6/15</td>
<td>ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity.</td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The SSAC recommends that ICANN restrict operational data about it receives. 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. | 12/6/15 |

The Board requested the CEO to direct staff to work with the root server operators via RSSAC to complete the documentation of the interactions between ICANN and the root server operators in respect to root zone scaling: [https://www.icann.org/en/news/statements/2013-08-13-ssac-to-icann-board-rssac-paris-en]. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO to designate staff to implement the advice [https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-21-en#4].

The SSAC recommends that ICANN promote a general awareness of the potential problems that may occur when a query for a TLD string that has historically resulted in a negative response begins to resolve to a new TLD. Specifically, ICANN should: 1) Write a study into TLD query data at the root level of the DNS and contact hardware and software vendors to fix any programming errors that might have resulted in those invalid TLD queries. The SSAC is currently exploring one such problem as a case study, and, and the vendor is reviewing that software. Future efforts to contact hardware or software vendors, however, are outside SSAC’s remit. ICANN should consider what if any organization is better suited to continue this activity. | 12/6/15 | 4/15/16 | Delivered |

The Board recommended that ICANN should consider extending the application window for the new gTLD Program. ICANN has already made all the necessary changes to its processes and other measures toward that end. ICANN also has developed materials to help IT professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-2013-12-06-en.pdf ICANN has also developed materials to help IT professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-2013-12-06-en.pdf ICANN has also developed materials to help IT professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/en/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-2013-12-06-en.pdf
| Advice Provider                                      | Reference Number | Link to Advice Document                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Advice Item                                                                                                                                  | Issued Date | Advice Document Recommendation                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Phase | Action(s) Taken                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)   | SAC045           | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-045-en.pdf                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 6)                                                   | 11/15/10    | ICANN should contact organizations that are associated with strings that are frequently queried at the root. Newcomer organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, so they may integrate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NXDOMAIN responses from root servers.                                                                                   | Phase 5 | Close Request                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)   | SAC045           | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-045-en.pdf                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 6)                                                   | 11/15/10    | Recommendation (2): The SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the new gTLD program. - Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606. | Phase 5 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)   | SAC045           | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-045-en.pdf                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (5 of 6)                                                   | 11/15/10    | The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the preexistence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic observed at the root as the basis for such notification.                                                                                                               | Phase 5 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)   | SAC045           | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-045-en.pdf                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (6 of 6)                                                   | 11/15/10    | The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the preexistence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic observed at the root as the basis for such notification.                                                                                                               | Phase 5 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)   | SAC045           | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/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.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Phase 5 | Close Request                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 addresses the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm; https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en. As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision-Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-#resources. Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf.