ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advisory Committee Status

As of 31 May 2021

<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 &amp; Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC/OPF/2013-01-001</td>
<td><a href="https://ssac.icann.org/document/15887">https://ssac.icann.org/document/15887</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-10)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC asks the ICANN Board to consider the Top-level Zone (TLD) privatization and ensure that the privatization process is transparent and open to community input.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC also asks that the ICANN Board consider the potential for a Notification Tool to be used in the Subsequent Procedures to facilitate Community Objections.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC asks that the ICANN Board consider the Top-level Zone (TLD) privatization and ensure that the privatization process is transparent and open to community input.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Lastly, the ALAC is disappointed that the lack of community input has been evident from the ICANN Org-provided opt-out update system for interested parties to automatically keep them informed on application(s) for specified strings.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11D)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC also asks that the ICANN Board consider the Top-level Zone (TLD) privatization and ensure that the privatization process is transparent and open to community input.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11E)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Therefore, the ALAC strongly recommends that it be granted, under no uncertain terms, automatic standing to the Community Objections in Subsequent Procedures and in future rounds of the New gTLD Program.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Advice Item Status**

ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

### Advice Document Recommendation

**Phase**

- Receive & Acknowledge

**Action(s) Taken**

- ICANN received AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN on 16 April 2021 and is currently reviewing.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider (ALAC)</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-1A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) Report of 2018 focused on two things: intention (goals, objectives) and data, therefore the relevant recommendations represent important inputs.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-2B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Our concern stems from the obvious lack thereof by the SubPro WG with respect to CCTRT Recommendations #4, #5, #6 (to do with DNS Security Abuse) and #29, #31, #32 (to do with the Applicant Support Program), resulting in deficiencies which we hope the ICANN Board will address. The community and ICANN Org in addressing.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-2F)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Our concern also stems from the overly weak policy direction in respect to CCTRT Recommendations #13 (to do with user expectation regarding the relationship of content of a TLD to its name), an omission which we hope ICANN Board will address considering.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-2O)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>While noting ICANN Board’s action on the CCTRT recommendations through its resolutions of 1 March 2020 and 22 October 2020, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to ensure that all prerequisite and high priority FRG recommendations are implemented in a timely manner, prior to the release of the new version.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-3B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC states that a new application round represents a carrot and a few intermediate awards to contract parties to negotiate improvements to their own DNS Abuse mitigation efforts; absent this incentive, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulations.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-3C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Notwithstanding, the ALAC believes that the landscape of DNS Abuse continues to evolve and that anti-abuse strategies must be continuously updated. It is not intended, to also recognize and address new forms of harm being perpetrated by bad actors.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-3D)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Therefore, if the ICANN Board sought to agree with the suggested &quot;holistic approach&quot;, then the ALAC strongly urges the Board to also ensure that not only must those community discussions take place promptly, but that they be conducted with outcomes put in place prior to the launch of the next round of applications for new gTLDs. To this end, we believe it is imperative for the ICANN Board to consider the following inputs: prior ALAC Advice on DNS Abuse; the SRDTO Final Report recommendations touching on contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS Abuse; the SSA's proposition in SAC14 Recommendation 3 regarding best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse; the SSA's proposition in SAC15 for a Common Abuse Response Fix (to streamline abuse reporting and minimizing of abuse victimization), as well as the call to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contract parties; and an expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG).</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Reiterated the ICANN Board's expressed concern that ICANN may up enforcing contract provisions that recur in its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside its remit must not displace the entirety for all provisions in contract with ICANN to be enforceable and be enforced by ICANN Contractual Compliance.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Any provision that ICANN does not intend to enforce should not appear in contracts with Registrars and/or Registrars.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Should a jurisdictionally competent dispute resolution procedures determine or ruling of unenforceability (on whatever grounds) be seen on ICANN, the ICANN Board must take action to remedy such unenforceability, by proceeding, where feasible, the original intention of the affected PIC or PICC through negotiation with all impacted contracted parties or other actions. Such actions could, if necessary, include bylaw amendments.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4D)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC notes that the Bylaws (by Article I, Section 1.1) states &quot;ICANN shall not regulate,&quot; i.e., impose rules or restrictions on services that use the Internet’s unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 1.1(a). The parenthetical expression clearly says that ICANN cannot impose its own rules or restrictions in regard to content. There is therefore no restriction on ICANN enforcing commitments made by TLD operators in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4E)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ICAC believes that SubPro WG’s Action 4.1 and Recommendation 4.2, which apply equally to PICs and PICCs, and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that ICANN Contractual Compliance is publishing more information on compliance action to encompass information on standards and thresholds for assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how such thresholds is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or PICC for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering Affecting Registry Agreement termination.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-4F)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>At the time that PICs were first introduced, the ALAC was assured that they would be enforceable Contractual Compliance and not solely through PIC Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP). PICDRP require that the entity initiating the dispute must show measurable harm. It should not be necessary to show harm to have contracts enforced and the Board must ensure that the original commitment is honored.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Advisor Item Status**

As of 31 May 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-40)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>As such, the ALAC recommends that the Board mitigate a review of the PDP in order to allow for complaints against an alleged registration of a TLD or TLD to be taken and determined not only by the claimant but also on the grounds of foreseeable harm to themselves or even a third party.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-5A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC recommends that the proposed market test is used effectively to evaluate the impact of the next billion Internet end-users, i.e. those who depend on internationally recognized Domain Names (DNS) and DNS-emails and that Universal Acceptance (UA) is key to ensuring this outcome.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-58)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Therefore, the ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board pursue greater action towards UA-adoptions through specific measures such as, including metrics on UA adoption by third parties as a measure of success for the New gTLD Program, and encouraging increased promotion for UA-realisations by contracted parties and with new applicants.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC continues to have keen interest in the outcome of the SAIC Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-66)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>With the SAC’s recommendation that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the initiation of new gTLDs into the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.10.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Further, we strongly advocate for the recommendations of SAIC resulting from the NCAP Studies 2 and 3 (as approved by the ICANN Board) to be implemented prior to the launch of the next round of applications for new gTLDs, or in the alternative, that delegation of any applicant for string(s) which pose a risk of name collisions be withheld until the NCAP studies are completed and recommendations are addressed in implementation, retroactively for the next round.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-7)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>In the recent absence of consensus policy recommendations by SAIC-Pro WSs with respect to Closed Generics, the ALAC advises the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to suspend any processing or acceptance of any applications for Closed Generics until such time consensus policy is adopted on how to address applications for Closed Generics which serve a legitimate public interest.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC continues to strongly oppose not only allowing private actions in subsequent procedures but also the ability for a loser to apply proceeds from one private auction to fund their other private auctions only if it leads to less competition among registries.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We also question the wisdom allowing any key aspects for development by a dedicated implementation review team (IRT) – such as addressing a risk of gaming, assessment of willful gaming and penalties to deter gaming, and development of the Bid Credit for Applicant Support qualifiers – since these would necessarily involve questions of policy where the community’s input would prove crucial. With this situation, we call for priority for ALAC membership in the Dedicated IRT.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6D)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>From an implementation standpoint, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org, firstly, to see if there’s a legal, financial argument to adopt the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.10.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-7A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We share the Board’s concern towards applicant’s ability to “shovel” funds between private auctions. This ability for a loser to apply proceeds from one private auction to fund their other private auctions only really benefits incumbent multi-TLD registry operators or multiple-string applicants, and clearly disadvantages single-TLD/service applicants. With ongoing and increasing consolidation of the domain name industry, allowing private auctions will likely exacerbate the advantage for merged contracted parties, leading to less competition among registries.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-6A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We also believe that the issue of a bona fide intent affirmation – whether for all applicants or otherwise – bias factor for establishing a stack of bona fide intent is too subjective, and without determiners through penalty, serves little purpose.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13823">View Document</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-9E)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>After the proposed Commission Resolution Transparency Requirements framework, we do not agree with the protection to disclosing applicants and submits Board to ensure that at all times of early concluded private resolution be disclosed to ICANN Org (subject to a nondisclosure commitment by ICANN Org where necessary) as data to support and inform future policy work.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abuse reporting and minimize abuse victimization; and (2) define the role and scope of work for the Common Abuse Response Facilitator, using SAC115 as an input.

The ICANN community understands this to be a request directed at the SSAC community recommending that they work towards finding a new body. That body being a neutral facilitator on matters related to “Abuse”, titled as “A Common Abuse Response Facilitator. The proposed facilitator is suggested to be a new entity and should ideally be a fully independent non-governmental, not-for-profit organization” As this recommendation is directed to the community and does not solicit any action from the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. ICANN Org sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 March 2021. This item is considered complete as of the SSAC’s confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.

Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)

2/11/21
2/12/21
2/12/21
3/19/21
3/22/21

RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3

The root zone maintainer and root server operators should verify and confirm that the addition of a ZONEMD resource record will in no way negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RRS.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN understands this request to be a recommendation to the SSAC to consider implementing ZONEMD in the root zone, and to provide feedback to the community regarding the potential impacts of implementing ZONEMD. This recommendation is directed to the community and does not solicit any action from the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. ICANN Org sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 March 2021. This item is considered complete as of the SSAC’s confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.

ICANN org understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with the Root Zone Maintainer and the Root Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the Root Server. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.

RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2

The DNS and Internet community should be made aware of the options available via ZONEMD in the root zone, and be given an opportunity to offer feedback. This feedback may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the Internet Protocol Address Analysis and Research Center (RIPE), the North American Network Operators’ Group (NNOG), the French IP Europeans (BFIP), etc.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN understands this recommendation to have ICANN org develop a plan for the deployment of ZONEMD in the root zone and make relevant technical/bodies aware of plans by making presentations in appropriate forums. ICANN org further understands opportunity for feedback from the community resulting from those presentations should be provided and any input provided should be included as appropriate in the final ZONEMD deployment plan. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.

RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-1

Developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default when the software is configured to locally serve root zone data.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with resolver software developers to encourage them to implement ZONEMD and enable checking of ZONEMD when resolver software is configured to locally serve root zone data. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.

Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)

2/28/21
2/28/21
4/5/21
4/5/21
4/5/21

RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-4

Public Technical Identifier (PTI) and the RIPE should jointly develop a plan for deploying ZONEMD in the root zone, and make this plan available for review by RZERC.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN understands this recommendation to have ICANN org develop a plan with its contractors and make the plan available to the RZERC for review. ICANN org further understands that the plan should be incorporated into the final plan as appropriate, ICANN org sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21

SAC114: SSAC Comments on the ENS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-1)

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to increase the number of gTLDs is consistent with ICANN’s strategic objectives to “evolve the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base.” This review should be considered as input towards updating ICANN’s strategic goals in conjunction with implementing the GNSO Review Team’s recommendations. Such a fundamental review should include at least the following areas of study based on prior rounds of the New gTLD program: impacts on root server operators; impacts on DNS resolver operations; impacts on SIR ISS; and impacts on overall DNS operations. Analysis of new metrics for success were not included. The SSAC recommends this recommendation be given an opportunity to offer feedback. This feedback may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the Internet Protocol Address Analysis and Research Center (RIPE), the North American Network Operators’ Group (NNOG), the French IP Europeans (BFIP), etc.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21

SAC114: SSAC Comments on the ENS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board adopt a protocol for measuring progress against stated goals of the program and thresholds, which if crossed, may require mitigation actions. Such measurements and actions should consider the entirety of the DNS ecosystem.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21

SAC114: SSAC Comments on the ENS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, ICANN develop and adopt a protocol for measuring progress against stated goals of the program and thresholds, which if crossed, may require mitigation actions. Such measurements and actions should consider the entirety of the DNS ecosystem.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21

SAC114: SSAC Comments on the ENS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-4)

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board create the Common Abuse Response Facilitator. The proposed facilitator is suggested to be a new entity and should ideally be a fully independent non-governmental, not-for-profit organization. As this recommendation is directed to the community and does not solicit any action from the ICANN Board, the item will be considered closed. ICANN Org sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 March 2021. This item is considered complete as of the SSAC’s confirmation of understanding on 22 April 2021.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21
2/17/21

SAC114: SSAC Comments on the ENS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-5)

The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the Name Collision Analysis Project, pursuant to Board Resolution 1017.11.02.30.

Phase 2 | Understand Request

ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.
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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>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 2 of 54: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-18)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response; Would this result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 2 of 54: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-18)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response; Would this result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/files/files/rzerc-002-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 2 of 54: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-18)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN org conduct the further studies called for in Recommendation 2 of RSSAC028 and focus on these aspects of the research: Understand and document the behavior of authoritative DNS software currently in use by root server operators with respect to a signed priming response. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the size of a signed priming response; Would this result in a lot of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC054</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2054-ssaac-02dec20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2054-ssaac-02dec20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 4 of 54: Statement on ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>On October 27, 2020, the ICANN Organization published a public comment proceeding on Recommendations for ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. This public comment proceeding asks for feedback on OCTO-016: ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The RZERC welcomes this public comment proceeding and recognises ICANN’s operational, scope and independence over IMSI operations. Root Server Operator independence is one of the key features of the Root Server System and RZERC has stated the importance of this feature as one of key values and strength points of the whole system. Keeping that in mind, there are areas in the publication that RZSEC finds refer to a scope larger than just IMSI operations.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC053</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2053-stsac-02dec20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2053-stsac-02dec20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 3 of 54: Statement on DNS NAMING Function Review Initial Report</td>
<td>12/20/20</td>
<td>The RSSAC welcomes this opportunity to comment on the DNS Naming Function Review initial report, and would like to thank IRR for preparing this initial report and submitting it for public comment.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC052</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2052-rssac-12dec20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/2052-rssac-12dec20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Number 2 of 54: Statement on Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling</td>
<td>11/20/20</td>
<td>In response to the ICANN Public Comment Proceeding of the same name, the RZSEC considers OCTO-15 to be well written. However, the RSSAC has several comments on OCTO-15, which are discussed in RSSAC053.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understood Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC113</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/113-ssaac-27nov20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-en/tech/tech-docs/en/113-ssaac-27nov20-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC113 SSAC Advisory on Private-Use TLDs</td>
<td>11/18/20</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board ensure a string is identified using the criteria specified in Section 4.1.2 and reserved at the top level for private use. This particular string must never be delegated.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC's comment on Statement on Recommendations for an Early Warning System for Root Zone Scaling. The respective public comment period closed on 25 November 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 7 December 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/early-warning-root-scaling-2020-10-25-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RZERC on 4 December 2020.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC028: Statement on ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The respective public comment period closed on 8 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments is due on 5 January 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/root-name-service-implementation-2020-10-27-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 January 2021.

The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on Statement on ICANN’s Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The respective public comment period closed on 22 December 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 5 January 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration https://www.icann.org/public-comments/root-name-service-implementation-2020-10-27-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 January 2021.
The ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) appreciates the circulation of an early draft of the findings and recommendations from the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. We welcome the opportunity to comment on this important topic.

The ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) publishes the results of an early draft of the findings and recommendations from the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report. We welcome the opportunity to comment on this important topic.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The RSSAC limits its comments to its remit. With that in mind, the RSSAC supports the following five strategic objectives outlined on the draft strategy plan: ● Maintain stakeholder’s trust that the ICANN is the proper home for enabling global interoperability through unique identifier coordination. ● Monitor and adapt to security threats and ensure resilient and secure ICANN operations. ● Continue to drive the implementation of operational initiatives to enhance the delivery of services based on the needs of the ICANN customer. ● Monitor the delivery and performance of the IAAS functions to achieve operational excellence. ● Support ICANN org on its governance efforts to sustain and improve openness, inclusivity, accountability, and transparency.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The role of the RSSAC is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). This document means that the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for process et al., in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.
This Advisory is to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Members (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICAAN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.

In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICAAN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.

This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Members (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICAAN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.

This Advisory is to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Members (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICAAN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.

This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Members (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICAAN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers, engaging in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the root server system and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and root zone. The RSSAC has no authority to regulate, enforce, or adjudicate. Those functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits.
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### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

#### As of 31 May 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td>The ALAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG’s report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its findings and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of grant-making processes.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for additional work to be done in the future. The work would be initiated by ICANN, and would be done in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This recommendation is in RSSAC itself. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 27 March 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 April 2020. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.33.25.06: RSSAC’s recommendation 3 calls for additional work in the future, so there is no action for the Board at this time. The future work would be initiated by the RSSAC (or a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC016), and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC047</td>
<td>The ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board adopt the recommendations made in RSSAC038 as a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request as of 31 May 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC2020-06: SSAC Public Comment on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Country Working Group</td>
<td>The ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board adopt the recommendations made in RSSAC038 as a successor organization as a result of implementing the recommendations in RSSAC038, and would be performed in collaboration with ICANN org and the Internet community. This item is in Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request as of 31 May 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-1)</td>
<td>The Registry for .BRA must be organized as a for-profit entity (501(c)(3) or a &quot;B Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must receive and maintain a B Corporation certification.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-2)</td>
<td>One-third of the Registry Corporate Board must be representatives of charitable nonprofits. The designation of such nonprofits in the .BRA Registry is in the general interest of individual end users.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-3)</td>
<td>One Board member selected by the ALAC must be a &quot;real&quot; individual, at least one member or small group of members of the Corporate Board should have the explicit mandate to focus on the specific interests of individual end users.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-4)</td>
<td>The Registry for .BRA must enshrine in its bylaws that the principal focus of the domains nonprofits and individuals and not commercial interests.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-5)</td>
<td>The Registry must enshrine in its bylaws a commitment to free speech and a resistance to takeon demands with a political basis.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-6)</td>
<td>The Registry could provide members with prior written notice to its registrants of any increase in wholesale price of their domain names registration renewal fees and the option of a 20-year renewal thereof at the pre-increase price.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-7)</td>
<td>The Registry Agreement must enshrine PIR prohibited practices such as bulk sales to commercial registrars.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: ISOC/PIR Issue (R-8)</td>
<td>The Registry Agreement must establish a &quot;DNS Abuse Ceiling&quot;. The RA should contain both a reference to an ongoing evolution of DNS governance on how they should interpret and act on data from the measurement systems.</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-hilyard-20mar20-en.pdf</a>) dated 20 March 2020. This acknowledgement was sent to the ALAC on 31 March 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This publication represents the full SSAC input to the Proposal for Future Root Zone KSK Rollovers [ICANN Public Comment Proceeding]. The SSAC reviewed the proposal in order to assess (i) and, others, that the proposal will not introduce any stability or reliability issues to the root zone, the Root Server System (RSS), or the larger DNS ecosystem. Overall, the SSAC finds no issues with the proposal that should prevent the IANA from moving forward, and would like to thank IANA for developing a strong proposal. The SSAC does feel some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects IANA to produce a more detailed final plan for public consultation prior to rolling the KSK again. This comment also includes future considerations that IANA should take into account for subsequent rollovers.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Committee (SSAC)

Security and Stability Advisory

As of 31 May 2021

ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)

12/24/19

Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The SSAC has already produced consensus definitions of "abuse" and "malicious use of domain names" that are more expensive. According to that definition, "abuse" is an action that: (1) Causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material pretense 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: (i) spam, (ii) malware distribution, (iii) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, (iv) phishing, (v) botnet command and control. ICANN should clarify the purposes and applications of "abuse" before further work is done to define DNS abuse. Once those purposes are identified, ICANN should determine whether abuse definitions used by outside sources can serve as reference for the ICANN community, or whether a new, outcomes-based nomenclature could be useful (including impersonation, fraud, or other types of abuse) to accurately describe problems being addressed.

Highly recommend WHOIS eventually no-fail or simply the process of whitelisting, so that it can report on the registration ecosystem. Adopt a uniform and timely access framework for publicly available registrant data.

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.

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

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

Advisory Status

As of 31 May 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>RSSAC000v4: RSSAC Operational</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Do not process registrations with &quot;third party&quot; payments, unless they have been approved prior to the request.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>RSSAC044: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Adopt an &quot;anti-crime, anti-abuse&quot; Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and include enforcement.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1219-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Compel industry-wide good behavior: for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>AL-SSAC-R000v4</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN Contractual Compliance to adopt. 5 Converse a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finally review what additional tools might be needed by Compliance.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>AL-SSAC-R000v4</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC017</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>AL-SSAC-R000v4</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>AL-SSAC-R000v4</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13743</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RSSAC000v4: RSSAC Operational**

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

**RSSAC044: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System**

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

**RSSAC045: RSSAC Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System**

- Compel industry-wide good behavior: for example, by increasing per domain transaction fees for registrars that continually demonstrate high abuse rates.

**ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)**

- Implement the above in agreements/contracts, with clear enforcement language for ICANN Contractual Compliance to adopt. 5 Converse a discussion between the Contracted Parties and ICANN Compliance to finally review what additional tools might be needed by Compliance.

**ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-7)**

- Evaluate & Consider
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Committee</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to 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>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-3)</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the SSAC not begin any operational roles in any standing committees, operational committees, or other bodies that emerge from the deliberations of the GWG, but is open to invitations to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with SSAC charter, experience and capabilities.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC106</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that bodies involved in the ongoing oversight of the RSS be reviewed regularly to ensure that the RSS is both meeting its commitments and that it remains responsive to evolutionary needs and changing environmental factors as appropriate.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Comments on Enabling the Governance of the Root Server System (R-3)</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN org understands that SAC105 does not contain any recommendations nor does it solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 10 Jul 2019.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges**

1. **SAC105: The DNS and the Internet of Things (IoT): Opportunities, Risks, and Challenges**
   - The Internet of Things (IoT) promises to enhance our daily lives by enabling us to seamlessly and autonomously sense and act 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 its interaction with the physical world. It is a risk because various measures must be put in place to address the risks. The SSAC does not provide any recommendations and do not solicit any actions from the ICANN community or Board.

2. **RSSAC043: Report from the RSSAC April 2019 Workshop**
   - The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) held its seventh workshop from April 23 to 25, 2019, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Twelve root server operator (RSO) organizations, three liaisons to the RSSAC, and four RSSAC ex-officio members attended the workshop. The primary purpose of this workshop was to advance the work of root server operator accountability. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 15 August 2019. SAC106 Recommendations 2 through 4 were provided to the Root Server System Governance Working Group (RSSG) and is in operation on the basis of consensus. The Root Server System Governance Working Group operates transparently and makes decision by consensus. This item is in Phase 5 | Close Request as of 07 April 2021.

**Recommended Action**

- No action

**Rationale**

- No action

**Phase**

- Implementation

**Status**

- Closed
<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>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/policy/documents/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/policy/documents/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-10)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must address deferred problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RDDS access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support of, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Name</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>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>Implement</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>Implement</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-14)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-deferred problems regarding domain name registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board oversee the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data, as of 31 May 2021.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states: “Advice item seven suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that RDDS access is provided in a measurable and enforceable framework, which can be understood by all parties. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.” The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#1.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 23 May 2021. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-02-08-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-03-25-en#1.c) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SSAD on 23 May 2021.
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to include in the annual report that reports on ICANN org and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified the advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%B0%D0%BB/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.b</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</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 data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.” As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should have, with sufficient detail, 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.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to include in the annual report that reports on ICANN org and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.a</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.” As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to (1) work with the ICANN Community to: i. Develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDAP rate limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.” As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10/5/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should have, with sufficient detail, 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.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to include in the annual report that reports on ICANN org and the community's progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.a</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.” As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to (1) work with the ICANN Community to: i. Develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDAP rate limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
<td>On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC 101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c</a>). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item 1A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org with the work with security practitioners and law enforcement authorities to access to domain name data and contact data through RDAP, to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.” As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of RDAP.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC102: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Initial Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the 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 plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC advises the KSK rollover back out plan should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC recommends 3 for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data in 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.

The ICANN org understands the 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 plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC recommends 2 for the root server operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by SSAC, RSSAC, the root zone management partners, and IANA’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCIO). At this time, the RZERC does not have significant additional advice to add to what those assessments have already provided. Additionally, the RZERC is not aware of any reason for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the root KSK rollover. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RZERC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC recommends the KSK rollover back out plan should be reviewed by all parties in the rollover (RSOs, RZERC, and IANA) to ensure it remains adequate and implementable. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by SSAC, RSSAC, the root zone management partners, and IANA’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCIO). At this time, the RZERC does not have significant additional advice to add to what those assessments have already provided. Additionally, the RZERC is not aware of any reason for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the root KSK rollover. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RZERC on 7 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the 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 plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Initial Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC102: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Initial Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the SAC103: SSAC Response to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Initial Report. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the RSSAC recommends 2 for the root server operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DITL Data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.

The ICANN org understands the 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 plan. RSSAC is not aware of any method able to estimate such a potential load increase. However, RSSAC believes that there is little risk of this occurring and that there will be no impact to the stability of the RSS even if such a load increase occurs.

The ICANN org understands that this statement is the RSSAC036: RSSAC Statement on the Draft Final Report– Addressing the issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the RSS. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC037</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-m/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-038-15jun18-m/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1:</strong> The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must establish a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than six months.</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC037. SAC037 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC038</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2:</strong> The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to incorporate the following principles into its contracts with gTLD RDDS service providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain access to the registration data, regardless of whether they are registered with the ICANN.</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC038. SAC038 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC039</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3:</strong> The ICANN Board 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>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC039. SAC039 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC040</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 4:</strong> The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC040. SAC040 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 5:</strong> The ICANN Board 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>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC041. SAC041 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC042</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-101-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 6:</strong> The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC042. SAC042 recommendations under Version 1 of 12 December 2018 upon receipt of Version 2. As stated by the SSAC in SAC101v2, “Version 2 of SAC101 was published to reflect evolving circumstances related to ICANN’s Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, and the ongoing Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Version 1 of SAC101 has been retired and version 2 is in force.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1: Evaluate & Consider
The ICANN org understands FFSSAC1038 Recommendation 3 for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 24 July 2018.

Phase 2: Implement
The ICANN org understands FFSSAC1038 Recommendation 2 for the ICANN Board to extend the scope of the RRSAC to include the scope of the Final Model for implementation. ICANN sent this understanding to the RRSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. As the GWG begins its work to develop a final governance model for the root Server System, ICANN is working on a methodology for estimating the cost of the Final Model. ICANN is also working with the GWG to estimate the cost of the final governance model.
<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>RSSAC037-05/18</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=38460">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=38460</a></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>4/18/18</td>
<td>Phase 5 Close Request</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 1 is for the ICANN Board to initiate a process to produce a final version of the model for implementation based on RSSAC037. ICANN wants this understanding to be reflected in the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018. On 17 November 2019 a Board Resolution addressed RSSAC037 Recommendation 1 ([<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model%7D">https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model}</a>). As this will be handled via the public comment process, 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>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0405-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements">https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements</a></td>
<td>Release for Registration one. COM Domain Name with a Single-Character Label: .COM</td>
<td>5/3/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that 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>RSSAC038</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=31264">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=31264</a></td>
<td>The RSSAC welcomes the opportunity to participate in the public comment proceeding on the draft final report of the second organizational review of the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom).</td>
<td>5/11/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC's statement on the Draft Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the Nominating Committee submitted during the public comment period to the independent examiner. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 6 May 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC039</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33490">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33490</a></td>
<td>ICANN Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that RSSAC039 is the RSSAC's statement on the distinction between RSSAC and Root-Ops. The ICANN is providing this document to help explain the differences between the two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted. The document informational only and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 17 August 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root-SAC040</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33521">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33521</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that RSSAC040 is the ICANN Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model">https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model</a>). As this will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 17 August 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0405-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements">https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements</a></td>
<td>Approval of withdrawal from the Reserve Fund to finance the IANA Stewardship transition. The remaining shortfall of US $17.0 million ($68.6 million less $51.5 million and $16.6 million above) could possibly come from one of the following sources, in no specific order of preference: (i) Contribution from leftover funds from the new gTLD program, if any; (ii) Additional contribution from ICANN Org. (iii) Additional contribution from the Auction Provisions. The ALAC supports this overall strategy but with the following conditions and additions:</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that ALAC040 is the ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model">https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model</a>). As this 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>RSSAC041</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33547">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33547</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy</td>
<td>6/20/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ICANN Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model">https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model</a>). As this will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0425-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements">https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>7/18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that 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>RSSAC043</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33573">https://atlarge.icann.org/adviceviewpage.action?id=33573</a></td>
<td>ICANN Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>7/18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that 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>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0425-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements">https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>8/18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that 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>All-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-0426-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements">https://atlarge.icann.org/al-academy/announcements</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP)</td>
<td>9/18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops. This statement was submitted as part of a public comment (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model">https://www.icann.org/news/blog/data-protection-update-more-details-published-on-icann-proposed-interim-model</a>). As this will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 May 2021
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-001-01-DK

ALAC Statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (RKS) Rollover Process

11/17/17

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on Plan to Restart the Root Key Signing Key (RKS) Rollover Process and was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2017-11-17-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-006-01-DK
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/100-en.pdf

ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests

12/22/17

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC's statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests and was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2017-12-22-en. As this statement will be handled via the public comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/105-en.pdf

ALAC Statement on DRAFT FY18 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update

1/19/18

The ICANN org understands this is the ALAC statement on DRAFT FY18 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2018-01-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-EN

ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy

2/8/18

This is the ALAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/public-comments/proposed-changes-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Host Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC-02
http://www.icann.org/app-tpl/comm/Statements/13999.pdf


2/19/18

On 27 February 2018, Internet-Consulting Group, the independent examiner performing the second independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report. The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK

ALAC Statement on IANA Staff Accountability

2/19/18

This is the ALAC's statement on IANA Staff Accountability. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2018-02-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-EN

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

1/15/18

This is the ALAC statement on ICANN Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2018-01-15-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK

ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy

2/20/18

This is the ALAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Host Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC-01
http://www.icann.org/app-tpl/comm/Statements/12225.pdf


2/2/18

On 27 February 2018, Internet-Consulting Group, the independent examiner performing the second independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) published its assessment report. The RSSAC has reviewed the report and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the initial assessment.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-EN

ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy

2/8/18

This is the ALAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK

ALAC Statement on IANA Staff Accountability

2/19/18

This is the ALAC's statement on IANA Staff Accountability. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2018-02-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK

ALAC Statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy

2/20/18

This is the ALAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-05-ST-018-01-DK

ALAC Statement on IANA Staff Accountability

2/19/18

This is the ALAC's statement on IANA Staff Accountability. This was submitted as part of a public comment: https://www.icann.org/en/system-status/announcements/2018-02-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Collections, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team – New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations

2/15/18

This is the ICANN's comment on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team – New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations. This was sent to the RSSAC on 24 April 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC-100

SSAC-100: SSAC Response to the ICANN TNC's Call to Action for Public Comment on SSAC's Assessment Report on Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) Study

2/22/17

The ICANN org understands this is the SSAC's response to the ICANN TNC's call to action for public comment on the SSAC's assessment report on the Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) Study. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC-100
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/100-en.pdf

SSAC-100: SSAC Response to the ICANN TNC's Call to Action for Public Comment on SSAC's Assessment Report on Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) Study

2/22/17

The ICANN org understands this is the SSAC's response to the ICANN TNC's call to action for public comment on the SSAC's assessment report on the Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) Study. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

The ICANN org understands this is the SSAC's response to the ICANN TNC's call to action for public comment on the SSAC's assessment report on the Analysis of Root Stability (CDAR) Study. There is no action for the ICANN Board.
Committee (SSAC)
Committee (RSSAC)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

As of 31 May 2021
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advice Provider
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Reference Number
RSSAC030
Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/10456

Advice Item
RSSAC030: RSSAC Statement on Entries in DNS Root Sources

Issued Date
11/14/17

Advice Document Recommendation
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.

Phase 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
ICANN 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. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.

RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Advice Item
10/23/17

Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint

Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Reference Number
RSSAC029
Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Link to Advice Document
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/statement/10453

Advice Item
Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (R1)

Issued Date
11/17/17

Advice Document Recommendation
1. Develop a simple and effective 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 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSAC and the ICANN community reporting the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted a copy of a Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted a copy of our letter to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The ICANN Board understands that the SSR2 effort may bring a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The ICANN Board believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. ICANN recommends the ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community to take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.

RSSAC030: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Advice Item
10/24/17

Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint

Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Reference Number
RSSAC000v3
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Issued Date
10/24/17

Advice Document Recommendation
These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document form how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for the processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

Phase 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
On 10 November 2017, the ALAC received a copy of the RSSAC statement on entries in the DNS Root Sources. The ALAC received confirmation of understanding on 24 February 2018. ICANN 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. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 January 2018.

RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Advice Item
10/24/17

Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint

Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Reference Number
RSSAC000v3
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Issued Date
10/24/17

Advice Document Recommendation
These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document form how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for the processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

Phase 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSAC and the ICANN community reporting the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted a copy of our letter to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The ICANN Board understands that the SSR2 effort may bring a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The ICANN Board believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. ICANN recommends the ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community to take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.

RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Advice Item
10/24/17

Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint

Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Reference Number
RSSAC000v3
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Issued Date
10/24/17

Advice Document Recommendation
These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document form how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for the processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

Phase 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSAC and the ICANN community reporting the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted a copy of our letter to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The ICANN Board understands that the SSR2 effort may bring a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The ICANN Board believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. ICANN recommends the ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community to take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.

RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Advice Item
10/24/17

Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint Enabling Inclusive, Informed and Meaningful Participation at ICANN: A Joint

Joint Statement from ALAC and GAC

Reference Number
RSSAC000v3
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Link to Advice Document

Advice Item
RSSAC000v3: RSSAC Operational Procedures

Issued Date
10/24/17

Advice Document Recommendation
These are the Operational Procedures of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). The Operational Procedures document form how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for the processes where it seems helpful. In case of conflict with the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws take precedence.

Phase 1
Implement

Action(s) Taken
On 28 October 2017, the Board issued a letter to the SSAC and the ICANN community reporting the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2) and submitted a copy of our letter to the Board on 4 October 2017 on the same topic. The ICANN Board understands that the SSR2 effort may bring a consequential loss of credibility in the accountability processes of ICANN and its community. The ICANN Board believes that the existing composition, structure, and processes of the SSR2 Review Team lack the necessary effectiveness to achieve the desired results. ICANN recommends the ICANN Board of Directors and the ICANN community to take immediate action to temporarily halt the SSR2 review and produce a detailed plan before resuming work.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

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

8/3/17

Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size. When considering the priming response under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.5 generates the smallest possible size, as expected. However, some implementations would become brittle if this naming scheme was adopted. Future work in this area could include modeling and proposing protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. RSSAC should study having a specific upper limit on the size of priming responses where the query has DO=1. Research to reduce the response size might consider: • Choosing a naming scheme with a single root server name. • Noting the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set. • Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a naming scheme that supports naming schemes. • Using DNS to support a naming scheme that supports naming schemes. • Designing a DNS protocol to support a naming scheme with a single root server name. • Noting the consequences of all large responses having the TC bit set. • Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a naming scheme that supports naming schemes. • Designing a DNS protocol to support a naming scheme with a single root server name.

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size and any protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. The ICANN org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

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

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 Naming Party also made some observations that could be considered as recommendations based on particular outcomes in the further studies, and based on the risk analysis in Section 6. If node re-delegation attacks pose a serious risk that needs to be mitigated, the following seem reasonable to consider: • The root server addresses should be agreed upon in a way that reduces the potential for operational breakage. • Because the root server IP address information and the root zone are closely correlated, both sets of information should continue to be hosted on the same servers. This can be done using delegations or including the root server names in the root zone. All information necessary to validate the root servers’ A/AAAA RRs and the root zone should be hosted on the root servers. Among the various options considered in this document, moving the root server names to the root zone (5.3) or adding a new TLD under the root zone (5.4) are both viable options that would result in improving the root server system. Additional studies are needed to determine which of these options, if any, would be more favorable than the other in practice.

Phase 4 | Implement

Upon further review of our original understanding, the org would like to revisit. Because this recommendation is listed as speculative, the org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-2

8/3/17

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

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for well-defined scenarios, such as the DO bit, are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-3

8/3/17

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

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that protocol or conceptual solutions to these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 3, relating to conducting a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC028: Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers-R-1

8/3/17

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

Phase 1 | Close Request

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.01 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, calling for the current naming scheme used in the root server system to remain unchanged until more studies have been conducted.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC-01-0717-01-01-DN

Retain ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Process and Next Steps

7/14/17

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

Phase 1 | Close Request

The ICANN organization understands the ALAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean that the ICANN should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost–benefit ratio of different models against 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 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 4 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size and any protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost shown by such a model might exceed the accompanying total benefit. The ICANN org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take.

Phase 1 | Close Request

The ICANN organization understands the ICANN028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for well-defined scenarios, such as the DO bit, are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for well-defined scenarios, such as the DO bit, are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that protocol or conceptual solutions to these scenarios should be made available to others in the DNS community for further studies. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.03 and the Board accepts Recommendation 3, relating to conducting a study to understand the feasibility and impact of node re-delegation attacks, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such a study.

Phase 4 | Implement

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 1 to mean that no changes should be made to the current naming scheme used in the root server system until more studies have been conducted. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.01 and the Board accepts Recommendation 1, calling for the current naming scheme used in the root server system to remain unchanged until more studies have been conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Advice Document</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC-097</td>
<td>SAC-097</td>
<td>6/12/17</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN Staff to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system to address the problem of subscriptions terminating automatically by default, for example by allowing subscription to automatically renew by default. This could include an option allowing a registry operator to depart from the default on a per-subscriber basis, thereby forcing the chosen subscriber to reapply at the end of the current term. The CZDS should continue to provide registry operators the ability to explicitly terminate a problematic subscriber’s access at any time.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 1.** New gTLDs, the CZDS subscription agreement conform to the changes executed as a result of implementing Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-matериал/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zone files. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in 2Q/20F. Despite not implementing new features in 2017, ICANN did work to expand the utility of CZDS by adding the five largest legacy TLDs, biz, com, info, net, and org and most other to the platforms that archivist contracts were being renewed or renewed. |

**Recommendation 2.** ICANN encourages SSAC to continue engagement directly with the Registries to potentially develop best practices for zone file access complaints, and seek ways to resolve complaints in a timely fashion. The recommendation to be considered for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. |

**Recommendation 3.** On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to implement an auto-renew feature in the CZDS system (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). CZDS platform migration is complete, making it possible to add new features to address the problem of gaps in user access to zone files. The feature has been scoped and is in the process of being added to the next product roadmap for future system enhancements. Due to additional updates to the roadmap, substantial updates for new features on CZDS is expected to be available in 2Q/20F. Despite not implementing new features in 2017, ICANN did work to expand the utility of CZDS by adding the five largest legacy TLDs, biz, com, info, net, and org and most other to the platforms that archivist contracts were being renewed or renewed. |

**Recommendation 4.** On 23 June 2016, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to adjust the zone file access subscription agreement to the extent necessary to accommodate the implementation of Recommendation 1 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). ICANN continues to work with the Policy team to inform the community to have the recommendation to be considered for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. |

**Recommendation 5.** On 23 June 2016, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN’s expectations with respect to zone file access (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g). The number of complaints requiring Contractual Compliance follow-up is decreasing. The adoption rate of the new auto-approve feature increased to 45% from 40% in June 2018. The number of complaints increased 22% in 2017 and 11% in 2018. This statement will be included in the report of public comments, which will be published on 16 August 2017 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-2017-05-05-ssac). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |

**Recommendation 6.** On 23 June 2016, the Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN President and CEO or his designee to produce educational materials for registry operators to increase their awareness of ICANN’s expectations with respect to zone file access. The recommendation to be considered for the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC report from the RSSAC May 2017 Workshop. The document provides a high-level summary of the outcomes from the fourth RSSAC workshop held in Reston, Virginia. The ICANN organization notes that the dominant theme of this workshop was DNS root service accountability and that this workshop will soon yield advice and a statement on this theme. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding approved by the RSSAC on 23 June 2017. |
Committee (SSAC) Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

Advice Item Recommendation

Issue Date

Action(s) Taken

23 of 54

This is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SSAC Accountability. The ALAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected. Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.

5/25/17

null

null

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

5/30/17

null

null

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on the CWG-IDN Accountability-W52 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 August 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 29 November 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cwg-idn-accountability-w52-16aug17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 June 2017.

6/4/17

null

null

The ICANN Board confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

5/25/17

null

null

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

5/30/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

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

5/29/17

null

null

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of .NET Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments was published on 13 June 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/netregistry-agreement-renewal-13jun17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Group</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Chair FDD 6-9 Apr 2017</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2017-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-094-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. It outlines the SSAC's position on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Process Recommendation Processes Responsibility to Another Board Committee.</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group Community Comment 2. It outlines the SSAC's position on the Proposed Fundamentals Bylaws Changes to Move the Board Governance Process Recommendation Processes Responsibility to Another Board Committee.</td>
<td>5/22/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure 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. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-04-04-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-04-04-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Chair ST 5/18/17</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2017-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-095-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/22/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Chair ST 5/17/17</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2017-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-096-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/22/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Chair ST 5/17/17</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2017-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/22/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Chair ST 5/17/17</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-2017-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-m/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC's statement on 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 an important outcome of this round of gTLDs, the ALAC is focused on whether the introduction of new gTLDs has resulted in increased consumer trust and increased consumer choice.</td>
<td>5/22/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs. The respective public comment period closed on 10 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 19 June 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-accountability-2017-05-12-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 22 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<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>SAC091</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9951</a></td>
<td>SSAC Comment on Identifier Technology Health</td>
<td>3/13/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on Identifier Technology Health. This is the ALAC's statement on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC welcomes the feedback received under ICANN's strategy for Africa. This is key to understanding the domain name industry issues in the region.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC092</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9953">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9953</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-EN</td>
<td>3/31/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Identifier Technology Health. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>SAC093</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9955">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9955</a></td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-EN</td>
<td>4/25/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's statement on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC appreciates the effectiveness experienced by the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains (CWG-UTCN) in attempting to fulfill its objective to &quot;develop a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SDs and ACs.&quot; We make the following comments with regards to the CWG-UTCN's Recommendations 2, 3, 4 and 5. With regard to Recommendation 3, the ALAC supports option 3B. Any work being done must be both inclusive and transparent, which is consistent with both the Community Policy Development Process (CDP) and as well as the GNSO FDP governed by the ICANN Bylaws Appendix A coupled with the GNSO FDP Framework. Where this will include a CWG or some other form of group(s) will need to be decided jointly by the ccTLDs and the GNSO prior to working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSDA026</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rsd-africa-2017-03-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rsd-africa-2017-03-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Comment on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study</td>
<td>3/13/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC acknowledges the feedback received under ICANN strategy for Africa. This is key to understanding the domain name industry issues in the region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSDA028</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rsd-africa-2017-03-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rsd-africa-2017-03-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Comment on the Draft 2016 African Domain Name System Market Study</td>
<td>3/13/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC acknowledges the feedback received under ICANN strategy for Africa. This is key to understanding the domain name industry issues in the region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC094</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9959">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9959</a></td>
<td>ALAC Comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition</td>
<td>3/27/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC appreciates the effectiveness experienced by the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains (CWG-UTCN) in attempting to fulfill its objective to &quot;develop a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SDs and ACs.&quot; We make the following comments with regards to the CWG-UTCN's Recommendations 2, 3, 4 and 5. With regard to Recommendation 3, the ALAC supports option 3B. Any work being done must be both inclusive and transparent, which is consistent with both the Community Policy Development Process (CDP) and as well as the GNSO FDP governed by the ICANN Bylaws Appendix A coupled with the GNSO FDP Framework. Where this will include a CWG or some other form of group(s) will need to be decided jointly by the ccTLDs and the GNSO prior to working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC095</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9961">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9961</a></td>
<td>ALAC Comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition</td>
<td>3/27/17</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's comment on the Interim Paper Cross-COmmunity Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains. The ALAC acknowledges the feedback received under ICANN strategy for Africa. This is key to understanding the domain name industry issues in the region.</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>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1216-03-00-EN</td>
<td>[<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9909](<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9909)</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy</td>
<td>1/10/17</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement](<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9909): 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 note should be taken of the report’s warning about the impact on stability of removing new gTLDs from the root. This may be an area of future research. Finally, the report notes that the report was unable to identify causes for a number of related phenomena such as the growth in the total number of queries that are sent to the root, specifically in the growth of the invalid queries which we believe should pose a concern. While acknowledging the complexity of the DNS root system, nevertheless these problems merit further research including but not limited to referral to SSAC and RSSAC as appropriate. We would recommend to explore possible provisioning of dedicated space on the ICANN website that tracks the status/health of the root going forward.</td>
<td>Close Phase</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-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>AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN</td>
<td>[<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9919](<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9919)</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Updated Independent Review Process (IRP) Draft Report</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement](<a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice</a> statements/9919): The ALAC recognizes the effort put in drafting an updated set of IRP Supplementary Procedures that address the delicate balance between due process and expedited resolution times that will help provide, both, certainty and clarity to applicants in IRP processes. A. The ALAC recommends that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvement.</td>
<td>Close Phase</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-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>SA0350</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/resolutions-2016-06-23-en?pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/resolutions-2016-06-23-en?pdf</a></td>
<td>Recommendations: 1. The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/resolutions-2016-06-23-en?pdf">Public Comment Statement</a>: The SSAC recognizes the continued effort to maintain an up-to-date list of rules and procedures applicable to the ICANN's day-to-day operations in a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus driven process. 2. The ALAC appreciates that detail has been carefully addressed to avoid any misleading situations between the IRF Supplementary Procedures being updated and those proposed in new IRP Supplementary Procedures. 3. The ALAC specifically recognizes the effort put in drafting an updated set of IRP Supplementary Procedures that address the delicate balance between due process and expedited resolution times that will help provide, both, certainty and clarity to applicants in IRP processes. A. The ALAC recommends that as we gain experience with these new procedures, there is ongoing monitoring to ensure continued improvement.</td>
<td>Close Phase</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1216-04-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Updated Independent Review Process (IRP) Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 1 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-irp-supp-procedures-2016-11-28-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-irp-supp-procedures-2016-11-28-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ATLAS II Recommendations evaluation of SAC084
21 As described in RFC 7812, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined "special" way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) What should ICANN's response be to changes in policy from others that create a potential for new or modified lists? What new names are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are randomly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names? Should ICANN formalize the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution?

The ATLAS II Recommendations evaluation of SAC084
21 As described in RFC 7812, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined "special" way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) What should ICANN's response be to changes in policy from others that create a potential for new or modified lists? What new names are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are randomly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names? Should ICANN formalize the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution? Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names differently from the normal process of DNS resolution?
The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, for which the RSSAC does not have any input and does not foresee technical issues provided future plans for more TLDs are consistent with the past expansion program. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC's response to the GNSO PDPWG on the Review of UDRP and URS provisions in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) and ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service. Similarly, ICANN should structure its obligations to and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service. Additionally, ICANN should structure its obligations to and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service. Similarly, ICANN should structure its obligations to and root server operators to implement coordination procedures so that root server operators can notify ICANN in the event of stress on the root name service.

The ICANN organization understands SAC087: SSAC Response to the GNSO Comments Workshop Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input, and notes the WSG to review IDA, publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0916-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/public-comments/marketplace-health-beta-2016-09-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 16 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). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/public-comments/marketplace-health-beta-2016-09-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 16 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). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/public-comments/marketplace-health-beta-2016-09-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 16 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). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/public-comments/marketplace-health-beta-2016-09-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 16 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). The respective public comment period closed on 9 September 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 24 September 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/public-comments/marketplace-health-beta-2016-09-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 16 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC019</td>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC strongly supports the Working Group’s proposal observations on the process around conflicting similarity of TLD strings. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group’s suggested way forward. The ALAC congratulates the GOSTP Working Group for making significant, positive impact on the overall ICANN policy for the selection of Global TLD strings. The ALAC believes that the proposed guidance helps to promote linguistic diversity, mitigate the risk of user confusion, and preserve and ensure the security, stability, and interoperability of the DNS.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC020</td>
<td>7/15/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC039</td>
<td>8/6/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC040</td>
<td>8/24/16</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC059</td>
<td>29 of 54</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC060</td>
<td>29 of 54</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC061</td>
<td>29 of 54</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: This is the ALAC’s Statement on the Proposed Amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>No Action for the ICANN Board</td>
<td>ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link to Advice Document


SSAC080 is informational and there are no actionable items for the Board within that document.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-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-0416-02-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Final Report Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-03.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 SAC 076 provides SSAC's comments on on the third draft proposal from the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. A Report of Public Comments was issued 23 February 2016 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-ccwg-framework-principles-draft-06may16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 18 March 2016. This understanding was confirmed by the RSSAC on 18 March 2016. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0416-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-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.

SSAC079 is primarily information and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operation should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. any action is taken. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-05.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-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-0416-02-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Final Report Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups. The respective public comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-03.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 SAC 080 is informational and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operation should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. any action is taken. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-05.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.

SAC 079 is primarily information and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operation should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. any action is taken. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-05.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-0416-01-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-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 SAC 080 is informational and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operation should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technologies, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well as, or better, than they currently support IPv4. any action is taken. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 May 2016. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-prcp-2016-05.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

The ICANN organization understands this is ALAC's Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings. The respective public comment period closed on 30 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-6y-2016-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 RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC002 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC002v2 was published on 26 January 2016. 3 While working on the v2 update, a number of more substantial issues came to light, but were postponed. At this time the RSSAC wishes to address these other issues and again update RSSAC002. It requests Duane Wessels to lead a caucus work party to produce version 3 of RSSAC002. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC017 describes RSSAC’s scope for producing version 3 of RSSAC002 and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 21 February 2017.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 recommends the extension of the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum to identify any known vulnerabilities in CA operation, and to determine whether any such vulnerabilities were used to conduct denial of service attacks. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/Browser forum), which passed Ballot 86.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 describes the creation of a proactive vulnerability disclosure plan. 1. A contingency plan to be executed if the vulnerability is leaked to the public prematurely, as well as a communication plan on informing affected parties as determined by the disclosure policy. This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/Browser forum), which passed Ballot 86. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines.
### ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal

**Advice Item:** AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN

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

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN

**Link to Advice Document:** [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9745](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9745)

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN

**Issue Date:** 12/10/15

**Action(s) Taken:** The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 29 January 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf)) 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 GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document:** [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9737](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9737)

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN

**Issue Date:** 12/7/15

**Action(s) Taken:** The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-02-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report. The respective public comment period closed on 21 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-review-draft-report-29jan16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-review-draft-report-29jan16-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 Preliminary Issue Report on a GNSO Policy Development Process to Review All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1115-02-01-EN

**Link to Advice Document:** [https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9723](https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9723)

**Reference Number:** AL-ALAC-ST-1115-02-01-EN

**Issue Date:** 11/30/15

**Action(s) Taken:** The ALAC recognizes the need to review Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) as they relate to Intellectual Property rights and domain names. The ALAC is concerned that these RPMs are not more focused on protecting Intellectual Property rights of corporations, and as a result, they easily afford the fees (see: [http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/](http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/)). The current structure of RPMs makes serious barriers to access for end users, especially the ones from developing regions. The cost of registering a trademark may already be a burden to many end users. The additional cost of protecting that trademark against unlawful or abusive registration in the DNS may render end users unable to access the RPM. The ALAC supports the suggested list of potential issues included in the Preliminary Issue Report, and the ALAC further recommends to add the following questions and remarks to the potential issues concerning Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution (UDRP), Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS), Trademark Clearinghouse (TMD), Trademark Claims and Sunrise Period. a. Are there any barriers that can prevent an end user to access any of all RPMs. b. How can costs to be lowered so end users can easily access RPMs? c. There should be a review on accessibility to TMD for individuals, private trademark holders and trademark agents in developing countries. The ALAC is concerned that, so far, the TMD has not achieved its goals of protecting a large number of trademark owners in the DNS. This concern is based on the fact that between March 2013 and May 2015, the Clearinghouse verified and accepted for inclusion 32,667 nationally or regionally registered trademarks, 42 trademarks protected by statutes or treaty, and two court-validated trademarks. These numbers amount to a little over 10% of the 2015 Year-to-date registered trademarks only in the United States Patent and Trademark Office. This, of course, is a clear signal that although the reasons are not clear. One of the possible reasons may be that there is only one provider of the service. In that sense, the ALAC recommends that the TMD services be open to more providers as that competition will drive prices down and lower the barriers to entry for end users to this specific RPM. A single provider for the TMD services harms the market and the end users’ rights insuring its monopoly constitutes a serious barrier to access its services.

### Action(s) Taken:

- The ALAC recognizes the need to review Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) as they relate to Intellectual Property rights and domain names. The ALAC is concerned that these RPMs are not more focused on protecting Intellectual Property rights of corporations, and as a result, they easily afford the fees (see: [http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/](http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/fees/)). The current structure of RPMs makes serious barriers to access for end users, especially the ones from developing regions. The cost of registering a trademark may already be a burden to many end users. The additional cost of protecting that trademark against unlawful or abusive registration in the DNS may render end users unable to access the RPM. The ALAC supports the suggested list of potential issues included in the Preliminary Issue Report, and the ALAC further recommends to add the following questions and remarks to the potential issues concerning Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution (UDRP), Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS), Trademark Clearinghouse (TMD), Trademark Claims and Sunrise Period. a. Are there any barriers that can prevent an end user to access any of all RPMs. b. How can costs to be lowered so end users can easily access RPMs? c. There should be a review on accessibility to TMD for individuals, private trademark holders and trademark agents in developing countries. The ALAC is concerned that, so far, the TMD has not achieved its goals of protecting a large number of trademark owners in the DNS. This concern is based on the fact that between March 2013 and May 2015, the Clearinghouse verified and accepted for inclusion 32,667 nationally or regionally registered trademarks, 42 trademarks protected by statutes or treaty, and two court-validated trademarks. These numbers amount to a little over 10% of the 2015 Year-to-date registered trademarks only in the United States Patent and Trademark Office. This, of course, is a clear signal that although the reasons are not clear. One of the possible reasons may be that there is only one provider of the service. In that sense, the ALAC recommends that the TMD services be open to more providers as that competition will drive prices down and lower the barriers to entry for end users to this specific RPM. A single provider for the TMD services harms the market and the end users’ rights insuring its monopoly constitutes a serious barrier to access its services.

### Action(s) Taken:

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf)) 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.

### Action(s) Taken:

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf)) 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.

### Action(s) Taken:

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf)) 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.

### Action(s) Taken:

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-03-00-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 22 January 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 February 2016 ([https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-05feb16-en.pdf)) 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.

Public Comment Statement: Item 2: A provision similar to 2013 RAA paragraph 3.20 should be incorporated into all future registry agreements.

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

20 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-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-1015-04-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. The respective public comment period closed on 30 Oct 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 07 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposal-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-04dec15-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.

Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC102, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Rollout. The Board considers SACD03, SACD02, and SACD01 to be completed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making**

3/8/15

(Public Comment Statement) ALAC provides 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 ALAC supports the possibility of using independent third parties in order to address any concerns relating to collection, anonymization and aggregation of data. - The ALAC supports the introduction of a "pull" where service providers or entities whereby the collection and assessment of fact-based data and metrics can become the basis for the initial identification and analysis of issues and/or problems. - Support the view that any funding required to implement the pilot should be considered an investment in the improvement of the policy process rather than a cost against budget. - The ALAC supports the revision of the timeline for the Issue Report, Charter and Final Report to update earlier WHOIS guidelines and also the development of a decision tree. Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-03aug15-en.pdf

**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9687

**Action(s) Taken**

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Initial Report on Data & Metrics for Policy Making. The respective public comment period closed on 07 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Dec 2015 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-09dec15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board.

**Reference**

- AL-ALAC-ST-0915-01-00-EN

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal**

8/6/15


**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9695

**Action(s) Taken**

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Sep 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community was released on 29 Oct 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-transition-final-report-29oct15-en.pdf). In addition, an ICG Summary Report on Comments Released during the Public Comment Period on the Combined Transition Proposal was released on 30 Nov 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comment-summary-final.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Reference**

- AL-ALAC-ST-0915-02-00-EN

---

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC014 - Comment to "Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions..."**

9/2/15

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 ICG plan and observed the ICANN community response process that followed. We have identified additional changes to the proposal to make it more robust and consistent with the ICANN community's requirements. If this proposal is adopted in its current form, we recommend the following: This recommendation includes an update to the section titled "Public Comment Statement" which is included in this document.

**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9688

**Action(s) Taken**

- 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. SCANN understanding of the request is reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.

**Reference**

- RSSAC014

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)


8/3/15


**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9689

**Action(s) Taken**


**Reference**

- AL-ALAC-ST-0815-01-00-EN

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)


7/16/15

(Public Comment Statement) ALAC response to the following questions in the Initial Report of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group: - When must contact requests to the customer be forwarded to the WHOIS customer? - Should or must the provider forward a further request(s), at whose costs and should there be mandatory publication for certain types of activity e.g. malware/viruses or violation of terms of service violations (illegal activity)? - What (if any) should the remainder be for unaunrted Publication? - Should requests be allowed to escalate every request to a 3rd party forum or should the WHOIS domain standards and thresholds? Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-whois-proxy-initial-07jul15-en.pdf

**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9690

**Action(s) Taken**

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Draft Report: Review of the WHOIS Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report. The respective public comment period closed on 07 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 11 Sep 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-whois-proxy-initial-11sep15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Reference**

- AL-ALAC-ST-0715-02-00-EN

---

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**ALAC Statement on the Proposition Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AAC and Organizational Reviews**

7/16/15


**Advice Item Status**

- ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Link to Advice Document**

- https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9691

**Action(s) Taken**

- The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Proposition Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AAC and Organizational Reviews. The respective public comment period closed on 08 Jul 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 Jul 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-aac-organ-reviews-08jul15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 Feb 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

**Reference**

- AL-ALAC-ST-0715-01-01-EN

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC070 R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC070 R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 2). The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-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>SAC072 R-4b Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC072 is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG Naming Related Functions Proposal confirming that the policy satisfies the recommendations in SAC070. There is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC072 R-4c Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC072 is the SSAC's comment on the CCWG Naming Related Functions Proposal confirming that the policy satisfies the recommendations in SAC070. There is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017 and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC071</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC071 R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 2). The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-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>SAC071</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC071 R-4b Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 2). The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-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>SAC071</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC071 R-4c Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 2). The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-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>SAC071</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>ICANN received SSAC's approval of understanding acknowledging there is no action for the Board.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC071 R-4b Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) - Proposed Accountability Enhancements (Work Stream 2). The respective public comment period closed on 12 June 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 19 August 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-draft-proposal-20150819-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>

**Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)**

**RSSAC012 Draft Report**

- The RSSAC: wishes to make a recommendation relating to the naming scheme used for individual root servers for the document 3. Document the historical data of the names assigned to individual root servers since the creation of the Root Server System; 3) Consider changes to the current naming scheme, in particular whether the names assigned to individual root servers should be moved into the root zone from the ROOT-SERVER-NRT zone; 3) Consider the impact on the prime zone of including DNSSEC signatures over root server addresses; 4) Perform a risk analysis, and 5) Make a recommendation to root server operators, root name management partners, and ICANN on whether changes should be made, and what those changes should be.

**RSSAC012 Draft Report**

- The ICANN organization understands RSSAC012 R-4a Advisory on the Use of Static Suffix Lists is ALAC's statement on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). A response to the ICANN Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). If released on 11 June 2015 (https://community.icann.org/page/news#action?paged=57778196) and there is no further action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. |
<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-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/secureandstability-0515-02-00-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/secureandstability-0515-02-00-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070-EN: Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL as part of the work related to universal acceptance.</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the URSG to explicitly include the use of a PSL 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 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>). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the URSG considered the SAC advice in its document UAG007 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56910805/UAG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56910805/UAG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf</a>).</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands recommendation 6 of SAC070 as encouraging those parties working on universal acceptance such as the URSG to explicitly include the use of a PSL 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 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>). Based on the implementation recommendations, ICANN has determined that Recommendation 6 is now closed, as the URSG considered the SAC advice in its document UAG007 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56910805/UAG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf">https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56910805/UAG007-version-8-2016-05-05.pdf</a>).</td>
<td>Released (2017.06.24.2017.06.24). The Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org. specifically Recommendations 3, 4a, and 5, have been completed by ICANN.org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC070-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/secureandstability-0515-02-00-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/secureandstability-0515-02-00-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC070-EN: Recommendation 6: ICANN should collaboratively create informational material that can be begun to TLD registry operators about the Multi-PSL.</td>
<td>5/28/15</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC070-EN as advising action for ICANN org. specifically Recommendations 3, 4a, and 5, have been completed by ICANN.org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</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>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN as 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-11jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-11jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan &amp; Budget</td>
<td>5/1/15</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-01-EN as ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft FY16 Operating Plan &amp; Budget. The respective public comment period closed on 30 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 05 Jun 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy16-05jun15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice/advise-m/files/files/sac-070-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the GNSO Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report</td>
<td>3/17/15</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-01-00-EN as ALAC’s statement on the GNSO Policy &amp; Implementation Initial Recommendations Report. The respective public comment period closed on 17 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 10 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pgp-10apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pgp-10apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://alirc-atlarge.org/alac-statement/6531">https://alirc-atlarge.org/alac-statement/6531</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2</td>
<td>3/16/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit several million users of non-English alphabets, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs are not active or active, others have been less active or inactive. It is important that the IDN program is harmonized in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building, etc., with the IAP. The ALAC also recommends that the IAP be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IDN program. MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7.0 and limits the Unicode 6.3 subset. Given that the Unicode 6.2, scheduled for release in 2015, there may be limitations from the community on the stability of the contents of MSR-2, particularly if the Generation Panels are not immediately commencing. Their work may be based on MSR-2. The ALAC recommends that ICANN clarifies the impact, if any, of changes to the underlying Unicode standard on MSR-2. Once MSR-2 becomes operational and provides the basis of LGR-1, and once IDNs start getting registered, it would not be possible to change the once-registered names or add more PVALID codepoints to the MSR without causing serious erosion of trust in the global Internet in general and IDNs in particular. The ALAC recommends extensive consultations with end-users and language communities to discuss the MSR-2 recommendations, as they have long-term ramifications. The ALAC assures support to the IDN team in stimulating participation of end-user communities. The ALAC would welcome joint actions/initiatives in At-Large Structures in relevant geographies. Report of Public Comment: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ldn-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ldn-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands ALAC-ST-0315-02-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 16 May 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 09 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ldn-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-ldn-procedure-08apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-ALAC-ST-0315-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://alirc-atlarge.org/alac-statement/6521">https://alirc-atlarge.org/alac-statement/6521</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Potential Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement</td>
<td>3/16/15</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - The evolution of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles: Registrars and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNI penetration; education at all levels is key to increasing demand and local suppliers; requirements placed on registrars must be reasonable based on local cost of living and related financial constraints; the insurance required for registrars is a real concern for underserved regions; the second round of the new TLD program should give preference, first exclusivity, to applicants from underserved regions, with adequate outreach efforts. In response to the five questions posted in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrant rights must be secured through the CSL insurance or any other mechanism(s); 2) No opinion; 3) ICANN determines that a permanent fund reserved by ICANN and provided by the registrars based on their transaction volumes for covering any harm caused to registrants is a &quot;best practice,&quot; registrants using registrars that do not follow the practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) The CSL requirement is maintained; the $500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrar can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) ICANN decides to eliminate the CSL requirement, it should be applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrant and user rights. The elimination of the CSL requirement could be the best way to support underserved regions to participate in the DNS. Registrant rights must be secured by another mechanism. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands 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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-raa-insurance-03apr15-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<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>RSSAC011</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rssac-003-scope-2015-12-22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rssac-003-scope-2015-12-22-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IAB-Liaison RSSAC</td>
<td>7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>Historically, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has provided a liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). With the recent re-establishment of the RSSAC, this statement confirms this ongoing liaison.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC011 is informational only and is confirmation that with the re-establishment of RSSAC, the IAB will continue to provide a liaison to the RSSAC. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC10</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rssac-003-scope-2015-12-22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-rssac-003-scope-2015-12-22-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IAB-Liaison RSSAC</td>
<td>7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>This statement refers back to RSSAC010 and requests Beacon Whales to help the Root Zone TTLs, work partly to produce RSSAC10 I RSSAC Advisory on Root Zone TTLs, with adherence to RSSAC causus procedures.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC10 describes the request for developing a recommendation on &quot;Root Zone TTL&quot; (RSSAC010) and there are no actionable items for the RSSAC Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC009: RSSAC Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone

In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the increase of DNSSEC signature validity period for the DNS Root Zone:

"The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009 provides RSSAC’s “Statement on the Increase of the DNSSEC Signature Validity Period for the DNS Root Zone”. For 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 12 January 2015, and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board. ICANN understanding of the request / item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017."

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC069: SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition

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

Recommendation 2a: Each of the operational communities should consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of external controls are necessary, how and by whom they should be administered.

Recommendation 2b: Each of the operational communities should also consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of the IANA Functions might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>RSSAC001: Service Operations of Root Servers</td>
<td>7/31/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC002: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System</td>
<td>9/2/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>SSAC-005: SSAC Guidance to Representatives on the &quot;NTIA IANA Function's Stewardship Transition Coordination Group&quot;</td>
<td>9/12/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICANN organization understands the RISAC007 describes RISAC’s scope for developing a recommendation on “Measurements of the Root Server System” (RISAC002) and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN’s understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RISAC in May 2017.

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 ongoing work and commitment to a continued improvement of the policy management processes.

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of day-to-day Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work.

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+10

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item was discussed at ICANN53 in Buenos Aires (June 2015). The implementation of a range of services is part of ICANN’s strategic objectives: https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-15oct14-en.pdf. This is part of the Global Stakeholder Engagement team’s ongoing work.

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+12

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+16

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e The At-Large Advisory Committee conducted a survey and analysis assisted by senior ICANN staff in 2015, the results of which were discussed at ICANN52 in Buenos Aires (June 2015). The implementation of a range of services is part of ICANN’s strategic objectives: https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-15oct14-en.pdf. This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+18

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e Implementation is ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+11

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+20

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+21

The Board in its September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+22

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+23

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+24

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+25

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+26

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+27

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+28

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+29

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+30

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+31

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+32

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+33

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+34

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+36

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+37

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+39

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 is part of Global Stakeholder Engagement ongoing work. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+40
<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>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-27).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-27).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-27. The Board must implement ATLAS Recommendation R-3, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation work is underway on the ATRT2 recommendations and general information about the implementation efforts can be found and tracked here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35.">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+35.</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-28).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-28).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-28. The ALAC should work with all MOs and NGos to map the current expertise and interests in their membership, to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-29).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-29).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-29. The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RIAs, and accessible by everyone.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-31).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-31).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments, and the use of crowdsourcing.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-33).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-33).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-33. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building Workshops.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-34).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-34).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-34. In collaboration with the global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users, and the Public Interest. (R-34)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-35).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-35).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-35. The ALAC Board should hold at least one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-36).pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-Declaration---At-Large-Community-Engagement-in-ICANN(R-36).pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-36. The At-Large Community should envisage conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN Public Meetings to improve collaboration and engagement.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-59)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-59. 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/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-40)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-40. ICANN should offer ariances 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> Work has been completed on this specific advice item, including: meeting staff offered ALAC a shuttle for future meetings, additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The AC 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> 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/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-42)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-42. ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO 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 Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-43)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-43. RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete per ALAC workspace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-3. ICANN should continue support outreach programmes that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.</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> 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 Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-2)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-2. ICANN should increase support [budget, staff] in programmes having brought valuable members to the community.</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 Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C; 30 for Meeting B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AL-ATLAS-02-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ALATLAS II) Final Declaration -- Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-8. ICANN should consider how accountability models reaching not only board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.</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> 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 Meetings team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace">https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/AFRALO+Outreach+Event+Workspace</a>.</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>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-4)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-4. ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of liaisons between its different Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (ASOSO) to do away with the “holy trinity”.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-5)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-5. ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end-users remain at the heart of the accountability process in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-6)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-6. ICANN should include the role of DIACs to serve as the voice of the Internet community in engaging with the ICANN Board and the various Working Groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-7)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-7. A periodic review of ICANN’s CSR strategy should be performed to ensure that the process and the composition of ICANN’s constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirements in the Corporation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-8. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-9)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-9. Support end-users to take part in policy development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-18)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-18. Support end-users to take part in policy development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-19)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-19. Foster barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-20)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-20. Input the user perspective, wherever necessary, to advance accountability, transparency and policy development within ICANN.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-21)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-21. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-22)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-22. Members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue-by-issue basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-DCL-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – ICANN Transparency and Accountability (R-23)</td>
<td>7/20/14</td>
<td>R-23. The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action for ICANN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 May 2021

Advice Item Status

ICANN Board Status Advice Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>H.21.7: To enhance ICANN’s community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as detailed in the recommendations of ATLAS, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-DCL-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>H.24.2(b): Both areas of the Ombudsman and (b) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>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 community should be provided to indicate this clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>Operational Recommendation 1: ICANN should perform an evaluation of potential notification approaches against at least the requirements provided by the SSAC prior to implementing any notification approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>Operational Recommendation 2: Instead of a single controlled interruption period, ICANN should introduce rolling interruption periods, broken by periods of normal operation, to allow affected and user options to continue function during the 120-day test period with low risk of catastrophic business impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>Operational Recommendation 1: The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) should expand the range of situations that would trigger an emergency response, for example national security, emergency preparedness, critical infrastructure, key economic processes, commerce, and the preservation of user and order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC001</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>6/6/14</td>
<td>RSSAC should not delay comments regarding the draft proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC065</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-066-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>2/18/14</td>
<td>ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-055-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-1)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: The SSAC notes at ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community to consider the following aspects of searching list processing to keep a balance between privacy and security.</td>
<td>SAC055 R-1 is directed towards ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the IETF, and the DNS operations community to consider the following aspects of searching list processing to keep a balance between privacy and security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-055-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC065: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-3A)</td>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following aspects to address list processing behavior: a. Commission additional research studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries.</td>
<td>Phase 2: Understand Request</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands that SAC055 R-3A means that the ICANN should consider the following aspects to address list processing behavior: a. The ICANN should consider whether to commission additional studies to further understand the cause of invalid queries to the root zone and the significance of search list processing as a contributor to those queries. On 24 June 2017, the ICANN Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN organization to implement per the ICANN organization’s recommendation (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/resolutions-2017-06-24-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/resolutions-2017-06-24-en.pdf</a>). Further implementations of this item are defined as of 23 September 2017 pending external activity. ICANN will take up further action once the NGP’s work on analyzing the cause of queries for non-existent TLDs to the root is complete.</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>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-064-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-9)</td>
<td>2/16/14</td>
<td>In the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior. 1. Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collisions with names proximated 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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC064</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-064-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-064-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC064: SSAC Advisory on DNS “Search List” Processing (R-2)</td>
<td>2/16/14</td>
<td>the SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community to mitigate the problem of standardization of search list processing behavior.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC062: SSAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT should work with the wider Internet community, including at least the IAB and the IRTF, to identify (1) what strings are appropriate to reserve for private namespace use and (2) what type of private namespace use is appropriate (i.e., at the TLD level only or at any additional lower level).</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 1</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>Internet Corporation for Assigned Numbers (ICANN) staff, in coordination with the other Root Zone Management Partners (United States Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), and VeriSign), should immediately undertake a significant, worldwide communications effort to publicize the root zone DNS key rollover motivation and process as widely as possible.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 2</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative, representative method 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 zone key rollover.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 3</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of much information as possible about the impact of a root zone key rollover to provide input to planning for future rollovers.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC063: SSAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT staff should lead, coordinate, or otherwise encourage the collection of much information as possible about the impact of a root zone key rollover to provide input to planning for future rollovers.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/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 un-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-name namespace from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone management partners, to make additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential for rapid removal of the delegation of a TLD.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC073</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-073-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-073-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clarify artifactually chosen choices have been made and why as part of their decision as to whether or not to delegate any TLD on a trial basis. What type of RRs is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? - Operation of the trial. Should CANNOT (or a designated agent) be the rollover entity or should the operation be Emergency Roll-Back? - What is the emergency roll-back operation and execution procedure 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 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT 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 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC073</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-073-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-073-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 6</td>
<td>11/7/13</td>
<td>CANNOT 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 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-01</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/atlarge/atlarge-statement-on-constellarity-similar-terms-11-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/atlarge/atlarge-statement-on-constellarity-similar-terms-11-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Item 1 - ALAC Statement on Constellarity Similar Terms</td>
<td>1/16/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to revisit the issue of TLD strings, which are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are currently in use to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-02</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/atlarge/atlarge-statement-on-constellarity-similar-terms-11-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/atlarge/atlarge-statement-on-constellarity-similar-terms-11-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Item 2 - ALAC Statement on Constellarity Similar Terms</td>
<td>1/16/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to revisit the issue of TLD strings, which are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are currently in use to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

ICANN agrees with this recommendation. The implicit assumption of the current LGR work is that the root zone will use one and only one set of label generation rules. Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found below:

- Information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en

IDN Variant TLD Root Zone will use one and only one set of Label Generation Rules. Considerable work has been underway on IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found below:

- Information: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/variant-tlds-2012-05-08-en

IDN Variant TLDs (1 of 14)

Active Variant TLDs (10 of 14)

The current rights protection regime associated with the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMD) process is susceptible to tautologic attacks. The roles of the involved parties, specifically registrars, registries, and TMCH, related to matching must be made clear.

ICANN responded to the GNSO's most recently in early 2016, and is considering a request for further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of DNS Variant TLDs are ongoing. TMD Resources: General information on TMCH: http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse-information-on-tmch-and-registries-and-registrar-views-en#b. Comparison of Label Registration: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/label-registration-2012-05-08-en?language=en

Community Wiki on Root Zone LGR Project: https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Root-Zone-LGR-Project

Active Variant TLDs (11 of 14)

When registries calculate variant sets for user validation during registration, such calculations must be done against all of the implemented LGRs covering the script in which the label is applied for.

This specific advice is directed at registrars and contains no actionable advice for ICANN.
As of 31 May 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (12 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>The matching algorithm for TMCH must be improved.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. TMCH Resources - General information on TMCH: <a href="https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse-information-on-tmch-and-registries-and-regexchesters-tra-trademark-clearinghouse-and-internationalized-domain-names">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse-information-on-tmch-and-registries-and-regexchesters-tra-trademark-clearinghouse-and-internationalized-domain-names</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agreed with this recommendation and the number of strings that may be activated as a result of the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone (LGR) procedure should be minimal. Similar to SAC060 Recommendation 5, the LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>Be very conservative with respect to the code points that are permitted in root zone labels.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>ICANN agreed with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>Because the removal of a delegation from the root zone can have significant non-local impact, new rules added to the LGR must, as far as possible, be backward compatible so that new versions of the LGR do not produce results that are incompatible with historical (existent) activations.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agreed with this recommendation and backwards compatibility will be one of the main considerations in the Label Generation Rulesets. The LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place (Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program) and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>Should ICANN decide to implement safeguards, it should distinguish two types of failure modes when a user requests a variant to work, but it is not implemented: denial of service versus misconnection.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>This 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/WPP2.1-Label-GenerationInRelayProcessor/DenialOfServiceConsiderable">https://community.icann.org/display/WPP2.1-Label-GenerationInRelayProcessor/DenialOfServiceConsiderable</a> work has been underway on IDN variants. Some of this work can be found at the links listed below: IDN Implementation Guidelines: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-05-08-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/implementation-guidelines-2012-05-08-en</a> - IDN Variant TLD Root LGR Procedure and User Experience Study Recommendations: <a href="https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations/access">https://features.icann.org/idn-variant-tld-root-lgr-procedure-and-user-experience-study-recommendations/access</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Active Variant TLDs (8 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/11</td>
<td>ICANN should concentrate foremost on the rules for the root zone (versus rules for TLD registry operators).</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN responded to the SSAC most recently in early 2016, and is awaiting a response before taking further action. However, projects focused on planning and implementation of IDN variant TLDs are ongoing. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/root-zone-lgr-2015-06-21-en</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in Phase 4 of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement incorporates terminology used within SAC058.

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.
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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 Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC058</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC058: R-3 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may enable a significant investment in the quality and accuracy of registration data to be substantial.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques to be used by registrars and registrars for validating registration data. On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed the CEO to his designee to implement the advice: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-22-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC056</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-056-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-056-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on Impacts of Content Blocking via the Domain Name System</td>
<td>10/9/12</td>
<td>SAC 056 concludes that “governments and others should take these issues into consideration and fully understand the technical implications when developing policies that depend upon the DNS to block or otherwise filter Internet content.”</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>SAC 056 is an Advisory that contains no recommendations that require board action. The information in the conclusion of the Advisory has been disseminated through published articles referenced within SAC056 and has been acted upon in various outreach and engagement with governments to help explain the technical implications of policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC055: R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC055</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-055-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC055: R-3 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>The Board should explicitly state its other active (within ICANN's remit) directed and concluding a resolution to this WHOIS problem until the registration data policy defined in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-05-11-en#1.a</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC054: R-1 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>The SSAC encourages the community to adopt the labeling and terminology used in this data model in future work.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SAC: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC054</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/communities/sac/documents/sac-054-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC054: R-2 WHOIS: Blind Men And An Elephant</td>
<td>9/14/12</td>
<td>Recommendation: Dotless domains will not be universally reachable and the SSAC recommends strongly against their use. As a result, the SSAC also recommends that the use of DNS resource records such as A, AAAA, and MX in the apex of a Top-Level Domain (TLD) be contractually prohibited where appropriate and strongly discouraged in all cases.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>This specific advice item contains no action for ICANN. However, the Board in its November 8, 2012 resolution directed that work related to the development of new directory service policy begin and that it incorporate the language used by the SAC: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 13 August 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) adopted a resolution affirming that the language used by the SSAC: [https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g](https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).
<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>SAC051</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-51-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-51-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure</td>
<td>5/14/11</td>
<td>4. The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in its documents and discussions, in particular: - Domain Name Registration Data (DNID). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name and that registrars collect - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNID-AP). The components of a standard communications exchange - queries and responses - that specify the access to DNID - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNID-DS). The service(s) offered by domain name registrars and registrars to implement the DNID-AP and to provide access to DNID-DS. Additional terminology includes: WHOIS, TLD DNS Policy, TLD-DS Policy, PSE myriad and EDNS, TLD-S and TLD-DS. The terms PSE myriad should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 1232.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Development Document to allow for the delegation of single-character IDN top-level domains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC052</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-52-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-52-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (1 of 2)</td>
<td>6/14/11</td>
<td>Recommendation (1) Given the potential for confusion and the currently unformed work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single character IDN TLDs in all scripts should be delayed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of operational exposure and whether both within and across scripts. Such consideration should include comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN's advisory committees. 3. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each application for a single character TLD label must be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within or across scripts.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board took into consideration the outcome of the IEP's work on the creation of a new specification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs. 11. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding the consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a. The code point must not be in use according to IDN-DAR010. b. The code point is in one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), or other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard. c. Some single character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-Lx-class code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. d. If 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/Directly-Kyrgyz, Latin/Thai, etc.). e. The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Detail 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 allowed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC053</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-53-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-53-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>DNS Blocking: Benefits versus Harms. II. An Advisory from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Blocking of Top Level Domains at the Domain Name System</td>
<td>6/14/11</td>
<td>Blocking or altering responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain name or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering for 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 traffic with 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 blocking of the script. Similarly, a 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 allowed.</td>
<td>Consider whether blocking has been performed or is ongoing relating to IDNs and IDN variants. Some of this work can be found on the Internationalized Domain Names page of the ICANN website: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en</a> A string similarity study was proposed as part of the Root Zone Generation Rules Project (RZGR), but this project was deprioritized based on public comment, and the work suggested by this recommendation will not be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC051 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-051-en.pdf | SAC051: SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure (4 of 2) | 6/24/11 | 6.2 The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of internationalized DNS as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC020, SAC037 and SAC038. | Phase 5 of 5 | Act(s) Taken: The Board accepted this advice in October 2013 and requested that a roadmap to implementation of SAC051 was developed (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6-2012-09-04-en). A roadmap to implementing SAC051 was published for public comment in February 2012: https://www.icann.org/en/announcements-6-2012-09-04-en. As of 26 August 2019 all contracted parties are required to provide an RDF service in addition to the WHOIS service. ICANN may expect to initiate the formal process for amending the Base gTLD Registry Agreement and 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement respectively to incorporate robust requirements for RDF and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDF including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC049 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-049-en.pdf | SAC049: SSAC Comment on the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3) | 1/17/11 | 2. Orphaned glue can be used for abusive purposes; however, the dominant use of orphaned glue supports the correct and ordinary operation of the DNS. Thus it is inappropriate to include the management of orphaned glue in the rubric of “abuse prevention and mitigation” and we suggest that it be removed. | Action(s) Taken: The ICANN Board sent the SSAC a letter regarding this advice item on 7 July 2017 with information on and rationale for the decision not to implement this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-faltstrom-07jul17-en.pdf). Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017. |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC047 | http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-047-en.pdf | SAC047: SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (3 of 3) | 1/15/11 | 1. The ICANN Advisory Committee on Operations (ACO) was established in response to a FidoAX (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jul14-en.pdf) recommendation to create an advisory committee to the Board as part of the ACO. The ACO provides advice in various areas to the Board on matters of interest as it relates to the deployment of gTLDs. Since the implementation of ICANN’s gTLD Program, the ACO has responded to over 475 recommendations and 200 requests for information. The ACO is a valuable resource for the Board and a critical element in ensuring a successful transition to the new gTLD program. | Action(s) Taken: ICANN implemented this advice in the language of the Applicant Guidebook (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf) and the New gTLD Base Registry Agreement (https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jul14-en.pdf). |
### ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisory Status**

As of 31 May 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Acted on Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td>Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5) Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scaling (2 of 5)</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td>SAC046</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td>SAC047</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td>SAC048</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td>SAC049</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td>SAC050</td>
<td>2/26/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (5): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including ICANN's 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. The Board recommended the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected maximum growth rates of TLDs: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-09-13-en#1.c</a> As part of the 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/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf">https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rnd-2012-04-22-en.pdf</a>) as well as in other regular new gTLD updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (3 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>ICANN should contact organizations that are associated with strings that are frequently queried at the root. Forewarn organizations who send many invalid queries for TLDs that are about to become valid, or they may mitigate or eliminate such queries before they induce referrals rather than NXDOMAIN responses from root servers.</td>
<td>- The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 address the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm</a>; <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en</a>. Apart of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf</a>. ICANN has also developed materials to help IT Professionals understand and address the root cause of name collision: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-collision-2013-12-06-en#resources</a>. Materials include a guide for IT departments to identify and manage the name collision risks in their networks among other measures towards that end: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-mitigation-01aug14-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (4 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>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, &quot;Reserved Top Level Domain Names,&quot; currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost. A 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.</td>
<td>- The ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 address the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm</a>; <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en</a>. As part of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (5 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the pre-existence 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.</td>
<td>- The NGPC resolutions on name collision adopted on 7-Oct-2013 and 30-Jul-2014 address the issues related to invalid Top Level Domain queries at the root level of the DNS: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-07oct13-en.htm</a>; <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-07-30-en</a>. Apart of the 30 July 2014 Board Resolution, a Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework was also published, which can be found here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (6 of 6)</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that ICANN define circumstances where a previously delegated string may be re-used, or prohibit the practice.</td>
<td>- Resolved (2021.05.12.07), the Board finds that the actions called for in SAC045 can be considered resolved by the NCAP and that the remaining item related to SAC045 being tracked in the ICANN org Action Request Registry may therefore be completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>