<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>RSSAC057</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC118: Steakholders in the Local Perspective on the Root System</td>
<td>9/1/21</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that a set of tools, based on the requirements articulated in Section 6 of this document. The tools described in Section 6 of this document could be used as building blocks. The tools should be made available for the Internet community.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC057</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/rssac-057-09sep21-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC119: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>8/12/21</td>
<td>Other reject the SSAC's comments and request that the RSSAC focus further development of data specification. The reasons for such a rejection is to make a specific proposal for a data repository, including: A. Implementation of the data specification mechanism. Whether or not the measurement results should be public or limited due to privacy concerns. B. How to ensure data quality and prevent abuse. C. Proposed database schema and tools. D. Proposed data exchange format (e.g., JSON-LD). Cost estimates for the conceptual development and ongoing operation. E. Identification of groups or parties that could operate the data repository</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0821-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/al-ac-0821-01-01-at-large-0821-01-01-EN.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/al-ac-0821-01-01-at-large-0821-01-01-EN.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC117: Feedback to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP WG</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL15</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-115-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-115-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC116: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC113 is the SSAC's feedback to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP WG and that the SSAC believes that it is important for registrants to experience secure, stable, and smooth transition when transferring registrations between registrars. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL16</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-116-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-116-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC117: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC118 is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC119: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC121 is the ICANN's understanding of the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC116: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC118 is the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC119: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC121 is the ICANN's understanding of the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SACL18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC117: Specification for gTLD Registration Data Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A (R-2)</td>
<td>7/15/21</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the ICANN's understanding of the SSAC's comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration (<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-phase-2a-initial-report-2021-06-03-en</a>). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Understand Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Committee (RSSAC)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSAC056</td>
<td>Phase 2A</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC's comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-056-07jul21-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-056-07jul21-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC118</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the CANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC118</td>
<td>Phase 2A</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-118-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Security and Stability Reporting System (SSRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSAC055</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSAC055</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSAC056</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSAC056</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSAC056</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC117 is the SSAC’s comment on the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. This advice document is now in Phase 2A. The respective public comment period closed on 19 July 2021. A Report of Public Comments is due on 02 August 2021 and this comment will be included in that consideration. (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssac-117-en.pdf</a>) There is no action for the SSAC. This understanding was sent to the SSAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-054</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC-054 on 02-01-2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-054</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC-054 on 02-01-2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-054</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>ICANN received ALAC-054 on 02-01-2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-018)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Program Objectives must be sufficiently reviewed and particularized to enable formulation of suitable metrics for effective evaluation beyond just general consumer choice, and Domain Name System (DNS) marketplace competition experts.</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Any expansion of the domain namespace must not compromise the stability, security and resiliency of the DNS.</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCRT) 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01B)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCRT) 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Our concerns remain over the actions (or lack thereof) by the SubPro WG with respect to CCRT Recommendations R-01, R-02 (to do with DNS Security) and R-03, R-04 (to do with the Applicant Support Program) resulting in deficiencies which we hope the ICANN Board will address to 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-02C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Our concerns remain over the actions (or lack thereof) by the SubPro WG with respect to CCRT Recommendations R-01, R-02 (to do with DNS Security) and R-03, R-04 (to do with the Applicant Support Program) resulting in deficiencies which we hope the ICANN Board will address to 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-010)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>While noting ICANN Board’s action on the CCRT recommendations through its resolutions of 3 March 2020 and 21 October 2020, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to ensure that all principles and high priority CCRT recommendations are implemented, at the latest, prior to the launch of 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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC reviews the SubPro WG’s approach of Recommendation 0.15 (which is to defer the release of DNS Abuse mitigation solely to a wider ICANN community effort or “holistic approach”) as bring[ing] a valuable opportunity to modernize existing contracts with Registrars and Registrars in order to contractually compel more immediate, increased efforts to stem “abuse” (as defined by the contracted parties themselves).</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-018)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>The ALAC agrees that a new application round represents a carrot and a more immediate avenue to draw contracted parties to negotiate improvements to their own DNS Abuse mitigation efforts; absent this incentive, such improvements are likely perceived as merely expensive new regulation.</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-010)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>By withdrawing the ALAC believes that the latest round of RAC continues to evolve and that anti-abuse measures must be continuously updated, if not revised, 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-010)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Therefore, if the ICANN Board sought to agree with the suggested “holistic approach”, then the ALAC strongly urges the Board to also ensure that not only must those community discussions take place promptly, but that they be completed with outcomes put in place prior to the launch of the next round of applications for New gTLDs. To this end, we believe it is imperative for the ICANN Board to consider the following inputs: o Prior ALAC Advice on DNS Abuse: The SGAC Final Report recommendations touching on contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS Abuse; o The SSAC’s proposal in SAC115 for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to streamline abuse reporting and minimizing of abuse victimization, as well as call to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties; and, in an expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the SAC 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-010)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Therefore, if the ICANN Board sought to agree with the suggested “holistic approach”, then the ALAC strongly urges the Board to also ensure that not only must those community discussions take place promptly, but that they be completed with outcomes put in place prior to the launch of the next round of applications for New gTLDs. To this end, we believe it is imperative for the ICANN Board to consider the following inputs: o Prior ALAC Advice on DNS Abuse: The SGAC Final Report recommendations touching on contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS Abuse; o The SSAC’s proposal in SAC115 for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to streamline abuse reporting and minimizing of abuse victimization, as well as call to ensure a much wider community participation in broadening the definition of DNS Abuse to one that is not merely confined to the perspectives of contracted parties; and, in an expected proposal for concrete action on DNS Abuse Mitigation arising from the work being undertaken by the SAC 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-0421-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13823">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We noted the ICANN Board’s expressed concern that ICANN may end up enforcing contract provisions that lie outside its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside its remit must not display the exigency for all provisions in contract with ICANN to be enforceable and to be enforced by ICANN.</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-01A)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>We noted the ICANN Board’s expressed concern that ICANN may end up enforcing contract provisions that lie outside its remit. However, the ALAC opines that any need to minimize ICANN regulation that falls outside its remit must not display the exigency for all provisions in contract with ICANN to be enforceable and to be enforced by ICANN.</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">Link</a></td>
<td>ALAC: Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-04C)</td>
<td>4/16/21</td>
<td>Should a jurisdictionally competent dispute resolution procedure determine or ruling of unenforceability (on whatever grounds) be served on ICANN, the ICANN Board must take action to remedy such unenforceability, by proceeding, where feasible, the original intention of the affected PIC or RVC through negotiation with all impacted contracted parties or other actions. Such actions could, if necessary, include bylaw amendments.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Receive &amp; Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article I, Section 1.1(b) reads “ICANN shall not regulate, e.g., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC continues to strongly oppose not only allowing private actions in Subsequent Procedures but also to secure a larger fund to meaningfully support the ASP in the next round, and secondly, to take a more active situation, we call for priority for ALAC membership in the Dedicated IRT.

From an implementation standpoint, we strongly advise the ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org, firstly, to review the use of a second-price, sealed bid auction instead of the Vickrey auction solution as the mechanism to generate revenue. Secondly, we advise the ICANN Board to direct the ICANN Org to consider the use of a new funding model for the ASP that would allow for more robust and reliable funding for the next round.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s keen interest in the outcome of the SSAC’s Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

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

The ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board should ensure that the pursuit of additional revenue towards UA adoption through specific metrics such as, including a metric on UA adoption by third parties as a measure of success for the New gTLD Program, and encouraging increased promotion for UA readiness by contracted parties and new applicants.

The ALAC supports the ICANN Board’s continued broad interest in the outcome of the SAIC’s Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) and its impact on Subsequent Procedures and the future rounds of the New gTLD Program.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate” (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC believes that SubPro WG’s Affirmation 41.1 and Recommendation 41.2 are to apply equally to PICs and RVCs; and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that ICANN Contractual Compliance’s role in processing PICs/RVCs; and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that ICANN Contractual Compliance’s role in assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or RVC for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering Adverse Registry Action termination.

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.10.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC believes that SubPro WG’s Affirmation 41.1 and Recommendation 41.2 are to apply equally to PICs and RVCs; and recommends that the ICANN Board direct that ICANN Contractual Compliance’s role in assessing registry practices, including guidelines on how each threshold is derived and applied to determine compliance or noncompliance of a PIC or RVC for purposes of imposing sanctions and/or triggering Adverse Registry Action termination.

We join the SSAC in recommending that the ICANN Board, prior to authorizing the addition of new gTLDs to the root zone, receive and consider the results of the NCAP, pursuant to Board Resolution 2017.11.02.10.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Bylaws Article 1, Section 1.1(c) reads “ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose standards or criteria, that use the Internet’s unique identifier in 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 to TLDs in their contracts with ICANN that are in the pursuit of their own business interests.
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is the body charged with advising the ICANN Board on matters of concern to the broader Internet community. This advice is often in the form of objections to proposed TLDs, or other matters that may impact the Internet community. The ALAC is composed of representatives from various Internet stakeholders, including governments, non-profit organizations, and industry.

As of 31 October 2021, the ALAC has reviewed and provided advice on several matters, including:

1. **Subsequent Procedures (R-12C) Advice**
   - **Issue:** Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-12C).
   - **Action:** Received & Acknowledge.

2. **Subsequent Procedures (R-11B) Advice**
   - **Issue:** Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-11B).
   - **Action:** Received & Acknowledge.

3. **Subsequent Procedures (R-10) Advice**
   - **Issue:** Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-10).
   - **Action:** Received & Acknowledge.

4. **Subsequent Procedures (R-09D) Advice**
   - **Issue:** Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09D).
   - **Action:** Received & Acknowledge.

5. **Subsequent Procedures (R-09C) Advice**
   - **Issue:** Advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures (R-09C).
   - **Action:** Received & Acknowledge.

The ALAC's advice often includes recommendations for the ICANN Board to consider, with a focus on ensuring a fair and transparent process for all stakeholders involved. The ALAC's recommendations are based on extensive consultations and discussions with the broader Internet community, and are designed to protect the interests of all parties involved in the TLD naming process.

The ALAC's work is crucial in ensuring that the ICANN process is fair and transparent, and that the interests of all stakeholders are protected. The ALAC's recommendations are often based on careful consideration of the potential impacts of proposed TLDs, and the ALAC strives to ensure that its advice is aligned with the broader goals of the Internet community.

For more information on the ALAC's work and advice, please visit the ALAC's official website.

[Link to ALAC's official website](https://atlarge.icann.org)
As of 31 October 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>SAC115</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-115-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-115-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC115: SAC Report on an Interoperable Approach to Addressing Abuse Handling in the DNS</td>
<td>2/19/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community continue to work together with the extended DNS infrastructure community in an effort to: 1) examine and refine the proposal for a Common Abuse Response Facilitator to be created to streamline abusive 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.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-3</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>Developers of name server software are encouraged to implement ZONEMD and consider enabling it by default if the software is configured to locally serve root zone data. Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The root resolver and root server operators should verify and confirm that the addition of a ZONEMD record will not in any way negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the RRD. Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>ICANN understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with the root zone Maintainers and the Root Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the Root Server. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC003</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/rzerc-003-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RZERC003: Adding Zone Data Protections to the Root Zone R-2</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The DNS inter-domain connectivity should be made aware of practices such as ZONEMD in the root zone, and be given an opportunity to offer feedback. This may include technical presentations at meetings hosted by ICANN, the DNS Operations Analysis and Research Center (DNS-OARC), the North American Network Operators’ Group (NANGO), the Reuse of IP Addresses (RIPE), etc. Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>ICANN understands this recommendation to have ICANN org engage with the Root Zone Maintainers and the Root Server operators to ensure the addition of a ZONEMD resource record to the root zone will not negatively impact the distribution of root zone data within the Root Server. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC115</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-115-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-115-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC115: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-5)</td>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a fundamental review to determine whether continuing to increase the number of gTLDs is consistent with ICANN’s strategic objective to “evolve the unique identifier systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant partners to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base.” This review should be considered in light within updating ICANN’s strategic goals and in conjunction with implementing the CDT 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: 1) impacts on root server operations; 2) impacts on SIR issues; 3) impacts on overall DNS operations; 4) Analysis of the structure of root zone data as it is configured to locally serve root zone data. ICANN sent this understanding to the RZERC for review on 5 April 2021. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 20 July 2021.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-6)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that, as part of the process for creating new gTLDs, ICANN develop and adopt a protocol for measuring progress against stated goals of the program and timelines, which, if needed, may require mitigation actions. Such measurements and actions should consider the entirety of the DNS ecosystem. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-5)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-4)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-3)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC114</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/sac-114-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC114: SAC Comments on the ENDS New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report (R-2)</td>
<td>2/11/21</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board, prior to launching the next round of new gTLDs, commission a study of the causes of, responses, and best practices for mitigation of the domain name abuse that occurred during the new gTLDs from 2012. This activity should be done in conjunction with implementing the CDT Review Team’s recommendations. Such a study should be incorporated into the RZERC’s recommendations, as appropriate, for at least all future rounds. Phase 2</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>ICANN received SAC114 on 17 February 2021 and is currently reviewing.</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 Item Recommendation</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>1/18/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to 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 loss of UDP fragmentation? Should root server operators expect to see a significant increase in TCP traffic?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data? What fraction of priming queries today have the DO bit set?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Decision Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RSSAC002</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/ru/files/files/rssac-004-en.pdf">rssac-004-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC002: Recommendations Regarding Signing Root Zone Name Server Data (R-3B)</td>
<td>2/4/21</td>
<td>The RZERC recommends that ICANN conduct further studies and allow for Recommendation 2 of RSSAC019 to focus on these aspects of the research. Understand and document the behavior of recursive name servers with respect to validating signed priming responses. Do they validate and detect incorrect data?</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC051 | https://www.icann.org/en/sys- teem/files/files/rssac-002-en.pdf | RSSAC051: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan | 3/2022 | For the ICANN family, 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 RSSAC limits its comments to its terms of reference. With that in mind, the RSSAC supports the following five strategic objectives outlined on the draft strategic plan:
- Maintain stakeholder trust that 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 VAIN customer.
- Monitor and understand the performance of the VAIN functions to achieve operational excellence.
- Support ICANN’s governance efforts to sustain and improve openness, inclusivity, accountability, and transparency. In particular, RSSAC welcomes the following goal on the strategic plan: act aligns with RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on VAIN Proposal for Future Root Zone ISK Followers. “2. Performing key functions with high levels of transparency and accountability and improving key management facilities to mitigate security threats and maintain facility quality” | | |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC050 | | RSSAC050: RSSAC Statement on Identification of Root Server Operators | 3/13/20 | As described in RSSAC033 (History of the Root Server System), the organizations operating root servers and the way in which they are identified have evolved over time. As capacities grow, new operators and new root servers were added. In 1995, to accommodate further growth, a consistent nomenclature was adopted, which remains in use today. For example, Verisign currently operates a root names, not which has the IPv6 address 198.41.0.4 and IPv6 address 2001:503:ba3e::2:30. As an outcome of the 1995-era growth is that it became common to refer to root server operators (RSOs) with "letters" (i.e., the leftmost label in the root name) and more commonly as abbreviated identifiers (e.g., C-root, F-root). However, the way by which operators over the years back led to misconceptions within the global community in how root servers are architected and contributed to a lack of clarity around the organizations responsible for providing the service. | | |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SACE11 | | SACE11: SSAC Comment on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process | 3/9/20 | This is a comment to the ICANN General Names Supporting Organization from the SSAC Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about its Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process. In this document, the SSAC provides input on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for the Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Registration Data Phase 2 Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP). | | |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC049 | | RSSAC049: RSSAC Statement on Joining the Empowered Community | 4/14/20 | Given the timing and the broad impact of such changes, including ICANN rules that would need amending, and the knowledge that this type of change has historically been implemented once the inception of the Empowered Community, RSSAC believes that the best way to pursue this change is through the ICANN Board’s implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC038. | | |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SACE110 | | SACE110: SSAC Comments on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report | 3/13/20 | 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. This is the first opportunity for the SSAC to comment on the ICANN.org on its governance efforts to sustain and improve openness, inclusivity, accountability, and transparency. In particular, ICANN.org understands Recommendation 1 to mean that the RSSAC believes that the best way for the RSO community to join the Empowered Community is through the implementation of the recommendations in RSSAC108. Also, the RSS GWG should note the expectations and needs of the RSO community. There is no immediate action for the ICANN Board. For the purpose of the ARR, this item will remain in Phase 3 until the RSS GWG delivers its proposed final governance model for the RSS to the ICANN Board for consideration. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC on 04 May 2020. RSSAC049 is under consideration by the Root Server System Governance Working Group as it develops its proposal for root server system governance and root server operator accountability. | | |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC052v4 | | RSSAC052v4: RSSAC Advisory on Measurements for the Root Server System | 3/12/20 | This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly from the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) in this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies and recommends a set of parameters that would be useful for monitoring and establishing baseline trends of the root server system. The RSSAC seeks to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s root server system. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the root servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocols and best common practices related to the operational 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. These functions belong to others, and the advice offered here should be evaluated on its merits. The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC102: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan. The respective public comment period closed on 01 June 2020. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 15 June 2020 and this comment will be included in that consideration. The ICANN organization understands this is the RSSAC’s comment on RSSAC102: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan 2020-04-20-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020. | | |

The ICANN organization understands this in the RSSAC comment on RSSAC110: RSSAC Statement on Draft Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) FY21-24 Strategic Plan 2020-04-20-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 12 June 2020.
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC047:** RSSAC Advisory on Metrics for System R-1  
3/12/20

This is an Advisory to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Board of Directors and the Internet community more broadly by the RSSAC Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC). In this Advisory, the RSSAC defines terms related to root server operations for the ICANN Community. The RSSAC calls on the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet’s Root Server System. This includes communicating on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the technical and ICANN community, gathering and articulating requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revisions of the protocol 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 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.

The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.

---

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC048:** RSSAC Input on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report  
3/12/20

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

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

---

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**SSAC109:** The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS  
3/12/20

This report analyses the initial effects of these two technologies by identifying some groups whose online experiences around privacy could change with the deployment of these technologies. Detailed analysis of effects will have to wait for more widespread deployment and measurement. This report discusses implications occurring now, and raise some longer-term questions for the future. This report focuses on the perspectives of interested parties, with the understanding that the issues are nuanced, and that readers coming from different perspectives will have different sensitivities: readers from different perspectives are likely to view a single issue in two different ways. The intended audience for this report is both the ICANN community and the Internet community. This includes network operators, DNS software implementers, policy makers, and concerned Internet users.

The ICANN organization understands that this report is SSAC109: The Implications of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 19 March 2020.

---

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC047v2:** RSSAC Lexicon  
3/12/20

The RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board request an initial implementation of the measurement system described in this document to gather operational data and experience from actual monitoring of the RSS. The initial implementation should ensure that it can transform into the official implementation as described in Recommendation 2 below. The insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary.

The ICANN organization understands that this recommendation is asking for an initial implementation of the measurement system described in RSSAC047. The "initial implementation" is assumed to be functional, but not necessarily up to the operational expectations that a long-term service would have. This understanding was sent to the ICANN Board on 23 March 2020.

---

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC048:** RSSAC Input on Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Team Draft Report  
3/12/20

The ICANN organization understands that this advisory is RSSAC047v2: RSSAC Lexicon. As this item is purely informational and there is no specific action for the ICANN Board, this item will be considered closed. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 20 March 2020.
<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>SSAC2020-06</td>
<td><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></td>
<td>SSAC2020-06: SSAC Public Comment on the Final Report of the New TLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that, following the completion and submission of the CCWG's report, the next step in the process be to have an outside expert with a demonstrated track record in designing funding programs review the report, comment on its findings and recommendations, and use it as a basis to inform the Board on the design of grant making processes for the auction proceeds that implements grant making best practices. This step should be undertaken before the Board formally considers the CCWG's Final Report as its advice would assist the Board in its consideration of the CCWG's recommendations.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0120-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/13759</a></td>
<td>SAC108: SSAC Comments on the ICANN Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group</td>
<td>1/31/20</td>
<td>The Registry for ICANN must be organized as a charitable non-profit [501c(3) in the US] or a &quot;Benefit Corporation&quot; (B Corporation). Additionally, the Registry must have an independent Board of Directors that is responsible for the management and operation of the Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Some aspects of the proposal could use more detailed explanations and further consideration, and expects the ICANN organization to continue working with ALAC to refine the proposal further.**
<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/13747">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/13747</a></td>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-1)</td>
<td>12/24/19</td>
<td>Establish a clear definition of DNS Abuse. The DNS has already produced consensus definitions of &quot;abuse&quot; and &quot;malicious use of domain name&quot; that are more expansive. According to that definition, &quot;abuse&quot; is an action that: 1) Causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm; and 2) Is illegal or legitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose. Such a definition is not limited to: 1) spam, 2) malware distribution, 3) online child sexual exploitation and imagery abuse, 4) phishing, 5) botnet command and control. ICANN should clarify the purpose and applications of &quot;abuse&quot; 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.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-3)</td>
<td>2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)</td>
<td>2020. ICANN sent this understanding to the ALAC for review on 27 January 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC: DNS Abuse (R-5)</td>
<td>2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 11 April 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

**RSSAC004**

**Meeting Date:** October 1 to 3, 2019

**Summary:** The RSSAC held its eighth workshop from October 1 to 3, 2019, at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, hosted by Verisign, Inc. and supported by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). The workshop focused on several key areas:

1. **Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System (RSS) and how the ICANN Board could respond if threats to the RSS materialized.**
2. **Certification of root server operators (RSOs) and the role of the RSSAC in this process.**
3. **Threats to the DNS and the role of the RSSAC in defending against such threats.**
4. **Candidate algorithms and their implications for the DNS.**

**Recommendations:**

- **Recommendation 1:** The RSSAC recommends to the ICANN Board and the RSSAC to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with ICANN's charter, experience and capabilities.
- **Recommendation 2:** The RSSAC recommends to the ICANN Board and the RSSAC to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with ICANN's charter, experience and capabilities.
- **Recommendation 3:** The RSSAC recommends to the ICANN Board and the RSSAC to participate in an advisory capacity, consistent with ICANN's charter, experience and capabilities.

**Follow-up:**

- The ICANN organization understands that this is the RSSAC's Statement on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. The RSSAC would like to formally endorse the work of the RSOs on Threat Mitigation for the Root Server System. Additionally, the RSSAC regards the ICANN Board's request for input fulfilled. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 16 Dec 2019. This item is considered complete as of the RSSAC's confirmation of understanding on 18 Dec 2019.

**Other Activities:**

- The RSSAC also considered a request from ICANN for feedback on its post-quantum cryptography second-round candidate algorithms. The RSSAC did not provide any feedback, as it was not required by ICANN.
<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 (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC105</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/sac-105-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC105: SSAC Comments on Enforcing the Governance of the Root Server System (R-4)</td>
<td>8/8/19</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 (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC106</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/sac-106-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC106: SSAC Comments on Enforcing the Governance of the Root Server System (R-5)</td>
<td>8/8/19</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that decisions of the GNS be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC042</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/rssac-042-04jun19.pdf">https://www.icann.org/policy/files/files/rssac-042-04jun19.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC042: RSAC Statement on Root Server Operator Independence</td>
<td>7/17/19</td>
<td>Principle 10 of RSSAC037 states, &quot;RSSAC must be autonomous and independent,&quot; and this must be preserved in future RSS governance models. RSSAC must remain independent from each other as well as from any overarching organization, government, or community. This serves to prevent capture of the RSS by an entity that may diverge from the guiding principles of the RSS as set forth in RSSAC037. This document illustrates important aspects of root Server Operator (RSO) independence: organizational independence, financial independence, architectural and engineering design, and network operations and administration. RSO independence is a vital quality of the RSS that must be preserved for the purposes recognized in this publication and to ensure the stability, security, and resilience of the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>CANN401</td>
<td><a href="http://epi%E5%A9%B7%E5%A9%B7.org/advocacy/efforts/c401-alac-statement-13255">http://epi婷婷.org/advocacy/efforts/c401-alac-statement-13255</a></td>
<td>CANN401: SAC – ALAC Statement on EPDP</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
<td>The ALAC and the SAC take this opportunity to congratulate the EPDP team and the GNSO Council on the development and approval of the Phase 1 report. The Phase 1 report provides a baseline for ensuring GDPR compliance as it pertains to the processing of Registration Data. The views of the SAC and the ALAC are aligned overall as it pertains to our outstanding concerns, as articulated in our respective statements to the report. The SAC and the ALAC would like to underline the importance of complying with the GDPR, which protects the privacy of natural persons and allows for the processing of and access data for legitimate purposes. The EPDP Final Report of Phase 1 provides sufficient basis for the work to progress to the subsequent Phase 2.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1B)

23/11/18

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

The ICANN Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/fouquart-to-botterman-29jan21-en.pdf). On 23 April 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a policy that reports on ICANN org’s and the community’s progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf). On 27 January 2019 the Board addressed this advice in their Barcelona Scorecard (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+21+January+2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

SSAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-1C)

23/11/18

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

Phase 4 | Deferred

On 23 June 2018 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a report on the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP). The ICANN Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf). On 27 January 2019 the Board addressed this advice in their Barcelona Scorecard (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+21+January+2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

SSAC104: SSAC Comment on Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)

21/12/18

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

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

Phase 4 | Implement

On 23 June 2018 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and accepted Recommendation 1 and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to create a policy that reports on ICANN org’s and the community’s progress toward the four objectives identified in the advice (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “In accepting advice item one, the Board further notes that the creation of an “accredited RDDS access program,” is a topic under discussion in the EPDP Phase 2. The Board cannot dictate outcomes of PDPs. Once the EPDP delivers its final Phase 2 report, the Board will consider the policy recommendations.” This item continues to be deferred. It is also subject of correspondence (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-hilyard-06feb19-en.pdf). On 27 January 2019 the Board addressed this advice in their Barcelona Scorecard (https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+21+January+2021) passed by the GNSO Council. The topic will be parsed and placed in Phase 4 | Deferred.

Phase 5.

Implement RDAP no later than 26 August 2019.” Accordingly, this item will also be parsed and placed in Phase 5.
<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/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-19)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must act long deferred problems regarding domain name registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board overwalk the creation and execution of a plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. The 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>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-19)</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board and EPDP policy-makers should ensure that security practitioners and law enforcement authorities have access to domain name contact data, via RDDS, to the full extent allowed by applicable law.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Committee (SSAC)**

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

**As of 31 October 2021**

**ICANN Board Status Advice Report**

**Advice Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC101v2: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data (R-4)</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>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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advice**

- **On 23 June 2019** the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item two suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.” The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-03-25-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf) to direct ICANN org to conduct the Operational Design Phase (ODP) for the SAID on 25 March 2021.

- **On 25 June 2019** the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item six suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.” The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-03-25-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf) to direct ICANN org to conduct the ODP for the SAID on 25 March 2021.

- **On 23 June 2019** the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-06-23-en#1.c). In its rationale the Board states “Advice item seven suggests that the ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work to ensure that all methods of access to RDDS data provide an equivalent response to the same query. As this is a policy matter and the topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs.” The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. Pending Board consideration, this item will remain in a deferred status. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. ICANN org notes the Public Comment period regarding Phase 2 Priority 2 Topics closed on 22 January 2021 and a staff report was issued on 5 February 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf). ICANN org also notes as the Public Comment regarding Phase 2 closed on 30 March 2021 (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/epdp-2-policy-recs-board-2021-03-25-en). Additionally, the Board resolved (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-policy-recommendations-epdp-phase-2-05feb21-en.pdf) to direct ICANN org to conduct the ODP for the SAID on 25 March 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference</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>SAC103v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-1)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101v2</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-101-v2-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC041: RSSAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-3)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should, with sufficient detail, define an ICANN organizational review. This definition should be documented and available to the community. Details should be crisp and tight in order to ensure complete clarity of scope.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SASA041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSAC101: RASAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-2)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should document the intent of the organizational review, what information it hopes to obtain, and how that information will be used.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SASA041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSAC101: RASAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>The ICANN organization should continue to use the IRIS process to select the IR. The process should be modified to ensure that the IRs are experts in assessment frameworks and methodologies and that they are not from the ICANN community.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SASA041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSAC101: RASAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-4)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>When an organizational review begins, the ICANN organization should ensure there are actionable checkpoints in place to ensure the organizational review is meeting contractual obligations. Depending on the outcome of each review, the ICANN organization should take appropriate action to ensure contractual compliance.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>SASA041</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sasa-041-05oct18-0-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSAC101: RASAC Advisory on Organizational Reviews (R-5)</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>At the conclusion of any organizational review, the ICANN organization should report on how the process functioned. If there are any lessons learned from the organizational review, the ICANN organization should demonstrate how the process will be modified.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC103</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/files/files/sac-103-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC103: SAC Advisory on the gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report</td>
<td>10/3/18</td>
<td>This is an advisory to the ICANN Board, the ICANN Organization staff, the ICANN community, and, more broadly, the Internet community from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) about the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. This report is organized by subject matter and includes regular references to the specific questions and preliminary recommendations given in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group Initial Report. Each section begins with a listing of relevant questions and preliminary recommendations from the Initial Report, then follows with the SSAC’s comment. In this report the SSAC limits its advice to its scope and role.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICANN Board Status Advice Report

Advisory Status
As of 31 October 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory 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>Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC102</td>
<td>SAC-102: SAC Comment on the Updated Plan for Continu(</td>
<td>8/20/18</td>
<td>13 May 2018, the ICANN Board requested the SSAC to provide advice to the ICANN Board on the <strong>Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover</strong>*. This comment represents the SSAC’s response to that request.</td>
<td>No action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.</td>
<td>SAC102 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC019</td>
<td>RSSAC-019: RSSAC Statement Regarding ICANN's Updated KSK Rollover Plan</td>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1:</strong> Root Server Operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization data that comes from multiple operators, particularly the DTI data. That decision needs to include consideration of the advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of the RSOs, of the users of the RDS, and of researchers looking at the anonymized data. Harmonization using mixing full addresses or bit by bit will help the research community correlate sources of DNS queries across datasets that are collected from different RDSs. However, full harmonization inherently on sharing a secret key that will enable the anonymization if it is later revealed. Even if the RSKs decide not to harmonize with the help of secret values, harmonizing the method used can help RSOs choose an anonymization strategy, and simplify understanding the properties of the data for those who use data from multiple RDSs.**</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC019 Recommendation 1 for the Root Server Operators to consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization of anonymization for DTI data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC confirmed this understanding on 17 September 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC040</td>
<td>RSSAC-040: Recommendations on Anonymization of Address Submission for Future Analysis</td>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2:</strong> Each RSO should consider the anonymization procedures in this document individually. Any of the proposals given in Section 4 of this document can be used as the anonymization specification for IP addresses, depending on the policy of the party doing the anonymizing.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 2 for each RSO to consider anonymization procedures in RSSAC040 individually. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC040</td>
<td>RSSAC-040: Recommendations on Anonymization of Address Submission for Future Analysis</td>
<td>8/7/18</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3:</strong> Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data (if the original AS is sufficiently general that it does not unnecessarily expose that data should have been anonymized). First, it would provide an operator to publish a machine-readable table that maps the anonymized addresses to the original address. Such a table should have a timestamp for when the mapping was made due to AS values changing over time.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC040 Recommendation 3 for Autonomous System (AS) numbers of original addresses should be made available with the anonymized data. There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 7 September 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Zone Resolution Review Committee (RZERC)</td>
<td>RZERC001</td>
<td>RZERC-001: Feedback on the Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Signing Key Rollover</td>
<td>7/18/18</td>
<td><strong>The Root Zone Resolution Review Committee (RZERC) is pleased to respond to the Board’s request for advice in ICANN’s “Updated Plan for Continuing the Root KSK Rollover” per its resolution 2018.05.30.09. The ICANN RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by RSSAC, SSAC, the root zone management partners, and ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (CTO). At this time, the RZERC does not have significant additional advice to add to what these activities have already provided. Additionally, the RZERC is not aware of any reason for not resuming the updated plan for continuing the root KSK rollover.</strong></td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RZERC001 is the RZERC’s response to ICANN Board Resolution 2018.05.30.09. The ICANN org understands the RZERC has confidence in the assessments made by RSSAC, SSAC, the root zone management partners, and ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (CTO). The RZERC does not have significant additional advice, and 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 RSSAC on 7 September 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC056</td>
<td>RSSAC-056: Statement on the Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC</td>
<td>8/14/18</td>
<td>The Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) appreciates the opportunity to participate in this public comment proceeding on the draft final report as part of its ongoing organizational review. This response builds on RSSAC031 and the feedback on the draft recommendations from the RSSAC Review-Work-Party (RWP) to the independent examiner.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this statement is RSSAC056: Statement on the Final Report of the Second Organizational Review of the RSSAC. As this item will be considered as the Public Comment process, there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RAP on 19 July 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC077-38</td>
<td>RSSAC-077: A Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root System</td>
<td>8/14/18</td>
<td>The ICANN’s Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) presents RSSAC077: A Proposed Governance Model for the Domain Name System (DNS) Root System (RSS) and its Root Server Operators (RSOs). The model presented in this publication is the result of three years of extensive deliberations by the RSSAC to address issues of accountability, financial stability, and sustainability of the DNS.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this is a detailed proposal of a governance model for the DNS Root System. The ICANN org understands the proposal document itself does not contain any recommendations for the ICANN Board. There is no action for the ICANN Board for RSSAC077. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC on 17 July 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</td>
<td>SAC-101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2</td>
<td>8/14/18</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1:</strong> The ICANN Board, ICANN Organization, and ICANN community must solve long-standing problems regarding domain registration data and access to it. SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board override the creation of an access control plan that accomplishes the following interconnected tasks in a coordinated fashion, with timely deadlines. The creation and execution of this plan should be a top priority of the Board and the ICANN Organization. A ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purpose for the collection and publication of the data. B. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not contract for parties to migrate from using the WHOIS protocol to using the WHOIS protocol. C. The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should require the remaining WHOIS registrars to move to status the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08. D. The ICANN Board should support the creation of an accredited RRO access program, with the ICANN Organization ensuring the creation, support, and oversight of the supporting technical access mechanism. E. The ICANN Board should ensure updates to the registration agreement and registry contracts as necessary to ensure compliance with A through D above.</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands that this recommendation is part of Version 1 of SAC101. ICANN closed recommendations under Version 1 on 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 authoritative.”</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>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</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>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to incorporate the following principle into its contracts with gTLD root server service providers: Legitimate users must be able to gain operational access to the registration data that policy says they are authorized to access, and must not be at risk if the user does not理会.(1) This recommendation is also made to policy makers participating in the EPDP.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands SAC101 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</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>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-3</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to amend the policy on RDDS data in an as input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.(2) These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 4 Engage</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands SAC101 Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RDDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP). ICANN sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</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>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-4</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: The ICANN Board and the ICANN Organization should not allow a fee to be imposed for RDDS access unless such a decision is made via a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).</td>
<td>Phase 4 Engage</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands SAC101 Recommendation 5: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to amend the policy on RDDS data in an as input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.(2) These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the DNS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC101</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>SAC101: SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data R-5</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to amend the policy on RDDS data in an as input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.(2) These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the DNS.</td>
<td>Phase 4 Engage</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands SAC101 Recommendation 6: The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to amend the policy on RDDS data in an as input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.(2) These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the DNS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSA037-18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSA037: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-3</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board and community implement the final version of the Model based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity.</td>
<td>Phase 3 Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 3 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. The ICANN org sent the ICANN Board this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSA037-18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSA037: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-2</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board refer to RSSAC037, section 5.5.3 to estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than 6 months.</td>
<td>Phase 4 Engage</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. The ICANN org sent the ICANN Board this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSA037-18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSA037: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-1</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board initiate a process to produce a final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037.</td>
<td>Phase 5 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 sent this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSA037-18</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssa-037-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSA037: RSSAC Advisory on a Proposed Governance Model for the DNS Root Server System R-0</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
<td>The RSSAC recommends that the ICANN Board estimate the costs of the RSS and developing the Model. Initial efforts should focus on developing a timeline for costing these. The RSSAC estimates the suggested costing effort should not take more than 6 months.</td>
<td>Phase 4 Engage</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands RSSAC038 Recommendation 2 is for the ICANN Board and community to implement the final version of the Model for implementation based on RSSAC037 based upon the principles of accountability, transparency, sustainability, and service integrity. The ICANN org sent the ICANN Board this understanding to the RSSAC for review on 24 July 2018. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 17 August 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSSAC Advisory Committee: As of 31 October 2021
### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC034</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-String-1-2018-04-10-en">https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-String-1-2018-04-10-en</a></td>
<td>RSSAC034: Report from the RSSAC Mtg 2018 Workshop</td>
<td>4/18/2018</td>
<td>The RSSAC stated that the April 18, 2018, workshop was to finalize the proposed governance model (the Model) for the DNS Root System (RSS). At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high level summary of the outcomes from the six RSSAC workshops held hosted by Verisign in early May.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC033</td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-String-1-2018-04-10-en">https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large-Advice-String-1-2018-04-10-en</a></td>
<td>RSSAC033: RSSAC Statement on the Distinction Between RSSAC and Root-Ops</td>
<td>4/2/2018</td>
<td>The RSSAC and Root-Ops are two separate committees that relate to the Internet’s DNS Root System. They have different missions and scopes. RSSAC provides this document to help explain the differences between these two functional bodies, as confusion between the two has been noted.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-0423-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (c). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $15 million in total, in line with principle (c). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $16 million, corresponding to the total amount of withheld fees from the Reserve Fund to date. A contribution of US $17 million (US $16 million plus US $136 above) could possibly be one of the following: not to provide an additional contribution from the proposed Governance Model (the Model) for the DNS Root System. At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high level summary of the outcomes from the six RSSAC workshops held hosted by Verisign in early May.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-0423-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Draft Project Plan for the Proposed Name Collision Analyses Project (NPC)(G)</td>
<td>4/18/2018</td>
<td>The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (c). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $15 million in total, in line with principle (c). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $16 million, corresponding to the total amount of withheld fees from the Reserve Fund to date. A contribution of US $17 million (US $16 million plus US $136 above) could possibly be one of the following: not to provide an additional contribution from the proposed Governance Model (the Model) for the DNS Root System. At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high level summary of the outcomes from the six RSSAC workshops held hosted by Verisign in early May.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-0423-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation</td>
<td>4/6/2018</td>
<td>The ALAC has noted that the following Program has not adequately integrated a sexual orientation / gender identity (SOGI) action plan to address the ICANN community. The ALAC believes that SOGI action plans need to be more effective in raising issues to be active in larger administrative activities and outreach.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-0423-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation</td>
<td>4/6/2018</td>
<td>The ALAC has noted that the following Program has not adequately integrated a sexual orientation / gender identity (SOGI) action plan to address the ICANN community. The ALAC believes that SOGI action plans need to be more effective in raising issues to be active in larger administrative activities and outreach.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC-0423-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on ICANN Fellowship Program Community Consultation</td>
<td>4/6/2018</td>
<td>The ALAC has noted that the following Program has not adequately integrated a sexual orientation / gender identity (SOGI) action plan to address the ICANN community. The ALAC believes that SOGI action plans need to be more effective in raising issues to be active in larger administrative activities and outreach.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSSAC032</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-EN/statement/11363</a></td>
<td>RSSAC032: Feedback on the Independent Review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation</td>
<td>3/28/2018</td>
<td>The ICANN org understands this is the RSSAC’s feedback on the independent review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Assessment Report for Public Consultation. The RSSAC requests that the independent examiner reviews their stated concerns and applies them in the formulation of their recommendations. There is no action for the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALAC Statement on ICANN Reserve Fund: Proposed Replenishment Strategy

- The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed reserve fund replenishment strategy. As presented, the strategy is: The replenishment period should not exceed 5 years, in line with principle (c). Over the 5-year period, the ICANN Org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of US $15 million in total, in line with principle (c). A contribution from the Auction Proceeds should be considered. The amount under consideration would be US $16 million, corresponding to the total amount of withheld fees from the Reserve Fund to date. A contribution of US $17 million (US $16 million plus US $136 above) could possibly be one of the following: not to provide an additional contribution from the proposed Governance Model (the Model) for the DNS Root System. At the workshop the RSSAC reviewed the Model, discussed scenarios and implementation, and planned next steps. The document provides a high level summary of the outcomes from the six RSSAC workshops held hosted by Verisign in early May. | Phase 1 |
Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC030: Advice to the ICANN Board on Root DNS Stability Analysis

- The ICANN Board understands that this is the RSSAC statement on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy. This was submitted as part of a public comment:

  https://www.icann.org/en/comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

RSSAC031: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures request for input on root scaling.

- The ICANN Board understands that this is the RSSAC response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the new generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures request for input on root scaling. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-0118-04-01-EN

- The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC's comment on Recommendations to Improve ICANN Staff Accountability: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/accountability-2017-11-13-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

AL-ALAC-ST-0118-01-EN


AL-ALAC-0118-04-01-EN

- The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC's comment on ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/budget-2018-01-19-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

AL-ALAC-0118-01-EN

- The ICANN org understands that this is the ALAC's comment on Proposed Incremental Changes to the ICANN Meetings Strategy: https://www.icann.org/en/comments/proposed-change-meetings-strategy-2017-12-14-en. There is no action for the ICANN Board.

ICANN Board Status Advice Report

As of 31 October 2021

RSSAC030

- This is the RSSAC statement on Entries in 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.

The ICANN org understands that this is the RSSAC 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 1 January 2018.
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Phase 4 | Implement
The Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team reviewed new Announcements and Blog pages on Feedback.icann.org on 4 October 2017. The new oversight and content model in the document management system has begun and several content types have been completed. Since the launch of ITI in January 2018, the ITI team has published eight blogs on icann.org and conducted several public sessions to provide the community with updates and input into the progress of this project. On 30 October 2019, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new search experience for Board Meeting content for community input via the feedback site. The improved searchability, which is done to ITI (includes: filters to narrow search by document type (Resolutions, Minutes, Agenda), Board Committees (current and former), and Board Meeting types; auto range filter; an expandable and collapsible table structure, jump to links for upcoming Board Meetings, Year, and Month/Year; and keyword/search within Board Meeting content with results available by relevance (number of instances of the keyword(s)) or newest (search results ordered by publish date). Also, the ITI team is developing an improved Public Comment feature based on invaluable input from members of ICANN’s Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. This new feature will be available for testing in late January 2020. ITI is aiming for an April 2020 soft launch of the new site. In September 2019 and October 2019, blogs were published to https://icann.org, which provided the community with an update on the project’s status. On 7 February 2020, the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) team released the proposed new Public Comment feature for community input via the ITI feedback site. The improvements include: Closed Proceedings will be visible via filters (status, dates and or keyword). Submissions will be included in search results, the most recent published Submissions and Reports will be more easily accessible, a count of the number of Public Comment Submissions will be displayed, the Submission process will include a guided form to help with the efficiency of the submission process. Alternative processes like bypassing the form and uploading a Submission as a document or emailing Submissions to the ITI will also be available. During the development phase of this feature, the ITI convened a small group of community participants who aided in providing requirements, recommendations, and feedback. Additionally, we conducted demos to this same group of community stakeholders from 10-27 February. Their feedback on the implementation of the new Public Comment feature has been very positive. The ITI team is running an April 22 soft launch of the new site.

On 29 October 2018, the ICANN Board sent a letter to Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC, regarding this joint ALAC-GAC advice. Please see the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-greenberg-09feb18-en.pdf. In August 2019, ICANN organized an update meeting that was facilitated at ICANN66 with the ALAC, GAC, and NGOS to discuss the needs of all groups regarding simple language documentation and capacity building activities. Additionally, the co-chairs of the ICANN-LAC (LAC) Consolidated Policy WG prepared a draft for public comment which ALAC has agreed to prepare a statement. During ICANN66, representatives of the ALAC and NPOIC with input from GAC support staff held an informative session on current communication procedures and tools within their respective groups. They received useful comments from Sally Costerton and Sally Newell-Cohen. Next steps will include the ALAC reaching out to the GAC and NPOIC leadership on organizing an open-ended call early in 2020 to discuss follow up from their successful session. The ALAC will propose a joint position for discussion at ICANN67 in Cancun.


Resiliency of the DNS Review (SSR2)
SAC098: The Security, Stability and Operational Procedures document how the RSSAC will carry out its work, with the rationale for processes where it makes reference to the process it belongs to and explains the acronyms used in the document; and

Joint Statement by ALAC and GAC (SSR2 Review)
**Recommendation 1: Study reducing the priming response size.** When considering the priming response size under DNSSEC, the scheme explained in Section 5.6 generated the smallest possible size, as expected. However, some implementations would become brittle if this naming scheme was adopted. Future work in this area could include modeling and proposing protocol changes to support this configuration, noting that the total cost 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 CH bit set; ● Backward-compatible protocol enhancements using DNS to support a naming-specific signature over the entire priming set (IE, A, AAAA, DNSKEY); ● Further, more speculative studies about how to reduce the response size might include: ● Using different cryptographic algorithms; ● Advertising what is expected in the Additional section (this would require modifying the DNS protocol); ● Varying a single piece of the root zone instead of the current KSE + ZKSE scheme; ● Effects of leaving the Additional section in priming responses empty.

Upon further review of our original understanding, the org would like to re-examine. Because this recommendation is listed as speculative, the org believes there is no action for the ICANN Board to take and this item should be closed. ICANN sent this understanding to the RRSA on 15 September 2020. ICANN received confirmation of the understanding on 23 September 2020.

**Recommendation 2: Conduct a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors.**

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 2 to mean that studies on current behaviors of DNS software and DNS resolvers should be conducted to understand different elements of root server responses to queries, both individually and in combination; for initial priming and standard responses; and for how well specific implementations, such as the DO bit, are interpreted by root servers and the DNS software. ICANN received confirmation of understanding from the RSSAC on 1/17/18. On 25 March 2021 the ICANN Board considered 2021.03.25.02 and the Board accepts Recommendation 2, relating to conducting a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or designee(s), to commence such study.

**Recommendation 3: Conduct a study to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks.**

The ICANN org understands RSSAC028 Recommendation 3 to mean that a study should be conducted to understand how the current infrastructure is susceptible to various cache poisoning attack scenarios, specifically node re-delegation attacks, and that proof of concept code testing these scenarios should be made available to others in the 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.

**Recommendation 4: Study reducing the priming response size.**

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

**Recommendation 5: Conduct a study to understand the current behavior of DNS resolvers and how each naming scheme discussed in this document would affect these behaviors.**

The ICANN organization understands that RSSAC028 Recommendation 5 to mean that the RSSAC should conduct a study regarding the priming response size with a goal of reducing the priming response. This would include modeling different scenarios and options, and providing an analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of different models against the current priming response size scenario, and against each other. If the study determines that the cost-benefit ratio yields a positive benefit, then proposed protocol changes to support the new scenarios should be developed. The ICANN organization understands there is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 1/17/18.
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At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-57

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights

8/23/17

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. This statement will be included in the report of public comments, which will be published on 16 August 2017 (https://www.icann.org/psub/comments/follr-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC037

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

Implement

Phase 4

- Implement
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC097</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-097-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC097: SSAC Advisory Regarding the Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) and Registry Operator Monthly Activity Reports, R.4</td>
<td>6/32/17</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board suggest to ICANN staff to ensure that zone file access and Web-based WHOIS query statistics are accurately and publicly reported, according to well-defined standards that can be uniformly complied with by all gTLD registry operators. The Zone File Access (ZFA) metric should be clarified as soon as practicable.</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-05</td>
<td>17-08-01-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>This is the ALAC Statement on the Recommendations to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The ALAC supports the general direction of the recommendations, but does not follow the specific comments. 1. The “best practice”, one by one, each make sense. However, together the ALAC has concerns about the impact on groups recommending that these are all volunteers with often relatively minimal staff support. Accountability is important, but a clearly accountable group does nothing other than be accountable by virtue of being within ICANN. 2. The ALAC supported the original position of the SSAC Accountability Working Group to not pursue the accountability routable. That was overruled by the CCWG. As currently proposed there is a high likelihood that it will become a meaningless exercise taking up valuable time at ICANN meetings with little benefit. That notwithstanding, if the decision is made which it should be kept, further thought needs to be given to exactly what it will do and what its aims are. 3. The ALAC does not support the explicit incorporation of AC/SO best practices into the ARTT scope. The periodic organizational reviews are a more appropriate opportunity to do such reviews. If a future ARTT chooses to do such a review, it is already wholly within its scope and prerogative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-05-05</td>
<td>17-07-00-EN</td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposed Renewal of .NET Registry Agreement</td>
<td>5/30/17</td>
<td>The ALAC does not have any comment to make on the changes to the contract overall as we believe that much of it has been predetermined by agreement. However, the increasing cost of .NET domains is a concern as it would make them unaffordable and thus an accessibility issue for end users, especially for those in already underserved regions. The proposed $10 increase is also out of scope of an ICANN Registry Agreement. A query was made as to whether or how.NET funds are returned to serve the Internet community in line with the redistribution of .org funds into the community by the Internet Society, to support Internet development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC098</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-098-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC098: SSAC Comment on the CCWG- Accountability WG2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights</td>
<td>7/30/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG- Accountability WG2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC wishes to thank the Human Rights Sub-Group for its enormous effort over a significant period of time and for this excellent report. The SSAC provided previous input to the Human Rights Sub-Group in SAC093: SSAC input to the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Workstream 2, Human Rights and thanks the CCWG for this opportunity to provide further input. Since there are not associated security and stability aspects, the SSAC is pleased to offer its support for the draft framework of interpretation for Human Rights. The SSAC notes that, as Chartering Organization of the CCWG- Accountability, formal SSAC approval of the final version of the framework of interpretation for Human Rights will be required in due course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ICANN organization understands that this is the ALAC Statement on the Proposals to Improve SO/AC Accountability. The respective public comment period closed on 26 May 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 July 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/soc-accountability-2017-04-14-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

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/system/files/files/report-comments-net-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.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG- Accountability WG2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ho-hv-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.

The ICANN organization understands that this is the SSAC’s comment on the CCWG- Accountability WG2 Draft Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights. The respective public comment period closed on 16 June 2017. A Report of Public Comments will be published on 14 August 2017 and this comment will be included in that consideration (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ho-hv-2017-05-05-en). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the SSAC on 22 June 2017.
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>SAC031</td>
<td>5/21/17</td>
<td>Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to IDNA or IDNS (or both), this SSAC Advisory recommends that the ICANN Board reject any TLD (root zone label) that includes emoji.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC032</td>
<td>5/21/17</td>
<td>Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to IDNA or IDNS (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrars of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>ALAC-51-ST-0317-04-01-EN</td>
<td>2/17/17</td>
<td>An ALAC Statement on the GNSO Community Comment 2 (CC2) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Proc. was released and provided its statement on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the DNS-Ops Policy Development Working Group that is evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing gTLD policy recommendations. The statement is organized by Work Track 1 - 4. ALAC sees many benefits to furthering the new gTLD expansion. In addition, there may be some benefits to an RFC programme. The support for new gTLD-round contingent on improved Applicant Support Programme. Guidebook should be improved from lessons learned. Work Track 3 Brief: ALAC largely supports proposals of Track 1. Support for Registry Agreement for level playing field and understanding of requirements for all gTLDs. Support for inclusion of commitments made by applicants to be enforceable via Registry Agreement. Guidebook should include all restrictions on names and of string. Work Track 3 Brief: ALAC notes string confusion, singular/plural, community applications and objections and independent objection need to be reviewed. Support for preferential pricing. CPE is a reasonable process for implemented Work Track 4 Brief: Support for single character IDN TLDs but consideration of additional safeguards. Universal Acceptance is important to promotion of equal and consistent domain name acceptance. Active outreach to the ccTLDs to inform them of the risks of registering emoji domains. Outreach has been done to ccTLDs since the advice, and materials were produced, distributed and presented at multiple forums. This item was requested to be closed.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>SAC031</td>
<td>5/21/17</td>
<td>This is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDF) Working Group Community Comment 2. On 22 March 2017, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) opened a public comment forum to obtain input on the Community Comment 2 (CC2) questionnaire developed by the DNS-Ops Policy Development Process Working Group that is evaluating what changes or additions need to be made to existing gTLD policy recommendations. This is the SSAC’s response to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDF) working group community comment 2.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SSAC Advisory on the Use of Non-ASCII Labels in Domain Names (RIPE NCC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>SAC031</td>
<td>5/21/17</td>
<td>This is the ALAC Statement on the Deliberations of Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. The ALAC supports the ccNSO request to defer their review. ICANN is overwhelmed with reviews of all kinds at the moment. If the ccNSO believes that a deferral will be beneficial to their use of volunteer resources and will result in a better outcome of the review when it is performed, this is a win-win situation.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Close Request</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0417-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9953">link</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report on Recommendations for New gTLDs</td>
<td>4/25/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SSAC-093</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9965">link</a></td>
<td>ALAC Chair Statement on the ICANN’s Draft FY18 Operating Plan and Budget, and Five-Year Operating Plan Update</td>
<td>5/17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0417-02-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/9959">link</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Interim Paper Cross Community Working Group on Use of Names of Countries and Territories as Top Level Domains</td>
<td>4/25/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: This paper sets out the ALAC's response to various recommendations proposed by the IFRS Review of the At-Large Community. These recommendations include steps IFRS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).]

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response on the independent Review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-iat-review-at-large-04april17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and therefore, this item is now closed.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC026: RSSAC Lexicon

[Public Comment Statement: The precise technical language often found in RFCs, while often providing consistency and clarity to technical communities, can sometimes be incomprehensible or misleading when used in a non-technical setting. The purpose of this document is to increase the understanding of terms used commonly when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community. It is not to redefine or provide guidance to any technical communities on the correct use of these terms. This document and its terms should be useful to anyone discussing the DNS root server system. This includes RSSAC members, RSSAC staff, and the larger ICANN community. It will be updated by RSSAC as the vocabulary used to discuss the root server system evolves.]

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC026 is RSSAC's documentation of the terms commonly used when discussing the root server system to the broader ICANN community, and there is no actionable advice for the ICANN Board. The ICANN org received confirmation of this understanding on 2/20/17.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SSAC091: SSAC Comment on Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition

[Public Comment Statement: ALAC wishes to ensure the presentation on Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) and provides this response to the Call for Public Comments on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers.]

The ICANN organization understands SSAC091 is SSAC's comment on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) and its response to a Call for Public Comments "on the description of five diseases that could affect the health of the name part of the system of unique Internet identifiers."

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: The ALAC appreciates that details have been carefully addressed to avoid any misleading situations between the IFRS Supplementary Procedures being updated and those proposed as new IFRS Supplementary Procedures. 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-0117-02-01-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed IRP Supplementary Procedures for Independent Review Process (IRP). The respective public comment period closed on 1 February 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments is due on 29 March 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-irp-supplementary-procedures-2016-11-26-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 ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: The ALAC appreciates that details have been carefully addressed to avoid any misleading situations between the IFRS Supplementary Procedures being updated and those proposed as new IFRS Supplementary Procedures. 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 ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 12 January 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 26 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-anti-harassment-policy-26jan17-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: This paper sets out the ALAC's response to various recommendations proposed by the IFRS Review of the At-Large Community. These recommendations include steps IFRS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).]

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response on the independent Review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-iat-review-at-large-04april17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and therefore, this item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: This paper sets out the ALAC's response to various recommendations proposed by the IFRS Review of the At-Large Community. These recommendations include steps IFRS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).]

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response on the independent Review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-iat-review-at-large-04april17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and therefore, this item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

[Public Comment Statement: This paper sets out the ALAC's response to various recommendations proposed by the IFRS Review of the At-Large Community. These recommendations include steps IFRS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).]

The ICANN organization understands this is the ALAC's response on the independent Review of the ICANN ALAC Draft Report for Public Comment. The respective public comment period closed on 24 March 2017, and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was published on 30 April 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-iat-review-at-large-04april17-en.pdf). There is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 12 April 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and therefore, this item is now closed.
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)  
AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-EN  
https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/1116-01-01-EN  
ALAC Statement on the Draft PTI FY18 Operating Plan and Budget  
12/22/2016  
[Public Comment Statement] The overall budget estimates are reasonable increments from the FY17 budget, and there are no major changes compared to the FY17 budget. Although the overall travel and meetings budget line items have increased by 42.3% from $0.4 million to $0.7 million, we think that the sub-item ‘community engagement?’ which is proposed as $0.1 million could be increased to ensure PTI can engage with its customers and non-customers stakeholders constructively. Some examples of such community engagement could be the participation in major internet and IC & regional forums and the publication of PTI material in multiple languages (e.g. Arabic). It would be useful in the future to provide a detailed breakdown of the ICANN support functions provided to the PTI. For example, it will be useful to know the figures allocated for PTI’s Communications activities which are conducted by ICANN support functions. The final proposed figure for ICANN provided administrative services to PTI is $0.3 million. We think ICANN communications could provide more support to PTI on its outreach and awareness efforts which are required.  
Recommendation 4: The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to implement the IETF.  
Phase 1  
Close Request  
The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1116-01-01-EN is ALAC’s Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-pti-fy18-op-plan-budget-2017-01-23-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC090  
ALAC Statement on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-2  
12/22/2016  
The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) the Applicant Guideline for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications; 2) ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that cannot be applied for new gTLD names, such as the “reserved list” in Section 2.2.1.2, the “ineligibility strings” listed in Section 2.2.1.3.5, the two character ISO 1366 codes prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3 Part II, and the geographic names prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special Use Domain Names Registry. 21 As described in RFC 7171, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be published in a defined “special use” way that is different from the normal process of IDN resolution. Should ICANN inform policy the status of the names on these lists if so? How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN’s direct influence? 22 How should ICANN respond to a change that is recognized to have occurred during a round of new gTLD applications? 23 The IETF is an example of a group outside of ICANN that maintains a list of “special use” names. What should ICANN’s response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called “private use” names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN maintain the status of “private use” names if so? How should ICANN deal with private use names such as corp., home, and mail that are already to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? 24 How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?  
Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.  
Phase 1  
Close Request  
On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).  

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC090  
ALAC Statement on the Stability of the Domain Namespace, R-1  
12/22/2016  
The SSAC recommends the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) the Applicant Guideline for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications; 20 ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that cannot be applied for new gTLD names, such as the “reserved list” in Section 2.2.1.2, the “ineligibility strings” listed in Section 2.2.1.3.5, the two character ISO 1366 codes prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3 Part II, and the geographic names prescribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special Use Domain Names Registry.  
Recommendation 1: The SSAC recommends that ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.  
Phase 1  
Close Request  
On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and will ask the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2018-06-23-en#1.g).  

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC089  
ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-pti-fy18-op-plan-budget-2017-01-23-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC089  
ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-pti-fy18-op-plan-budget-2017-01-23-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)  
SAC089  
ALAC Statement on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries 2016-2019 Strategy. The respective public comment period closed on 23 January 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-pti-fy18-op-plan-budget-2017-01-23-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
<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 (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/states/9917">https://atlarge.icann.org/states/9917</a></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>10/19/16</td>
<td>The ATLAS II Recommendations Implementation Report</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands this ATLAS II Report is ALAC's Implementation Report. The report was provided to the ICANN Board on 7 November 2016, at ICANN57 (<a href="https://icann57.2016.icann.org/en/system/board-meetings">https://icann57.2016.icann.org/en/system/board-meetings</a>). There is no further action required of the 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>SAC083</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-086-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC083: SSAC Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>SAC083 is the SSAC’s Response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084.</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is the SSAC’s response to the ccNSO evaluation of SAC084 and is not directed at the Board. The SSAC states it will continue to study the ccNSO document and provide complete feedback within four weeks. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC023</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-03oct16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-022-response-03oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC023: History of the Root Server System</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>A report to the Internet community from the RSSAC. The RSSAC views an overview of the organizational history of the root server system.</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC023 is RSSAC's report to the community on the organization of the root server system and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC024</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC024: Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>A advisory to the ICANN Board of Directors and the Internet community. In this Advisory, the RSSAC identifies key technical elements of potential DNS root server operators. RSSAC024 and RFC 7725 are considered as starting points; alone, they are insufficient to evaluate potential operators. The RSSAC believes non-technical aspects (trustworthiness, ethos, etc.) to be important and part of an overall evaluation but are not addressed herein. The proposed recommendations only consider technical aspects as well as current understanding of the key technical elements a potential root server operator should meet.</td>
<td>11/4/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC024 is RSSAC's input into the descriptions of key technical elements for new root server operators and is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC025</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-025-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC025: RSSAC October 2016 Workshop Report</td>
<td>11/14/16</td>
<td>Overview of RSSAC third workshop (11-13, 2016). The RSSAC took the feedback collected during the previous two workshops and broke it into affinity groupings of subject matter. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted under each grouping.</td>
<td>11/14/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC025 is RSSAC's report on its third workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and evolution of the root server system, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC085</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-084-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC085: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>SAC085 Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs)</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC085 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC086</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-087-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-087-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC086: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures – Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>SAC086 Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures – Seeking Community Comments</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC086 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC087</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-088-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC087: SSAC Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services / Second Outreach</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>SAC087 Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services / Second Outreach</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC087 is the SSAC’s response to the GNSO PDP WG on Next Generation Registration Directory Services request for input and invites the WG to review SSAC publications, several of which address TLDs. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC022</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-023-04nov16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Next Generation Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>RSSAC022: Response to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on the Next Generation Top Level Domains (gTLDs) Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC022 is RSSAC's response to the PDP Working Group on the Next Generation Top Level Domains (gTLDs) 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. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</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-0101-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/685">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/685</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta)</td>
<td>6/28/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC welcomes the publication of this first set of gTLD Marketplace Health Index. This is a natural progression based on the work of ICANN Community into Community, Consumer Trust and Consumer Confidence in new gTLDs. The ALAC proposes a number of additions/improvements. Competition: All in all, consumers (registrants) are the factors that move the market. The one who pays? No? we should find more insight on their needs and behaviors. This should break into an account for future developments. Market stability: The metric presented are very useful. However, as an ex in the &quot;Competition&quot; section, it is not just how many new players do have (registrars and registrants) but the market share of each one, for different TLDs or families of TLDs. And symmetrically, the count of the number of TLDs should include their market share. In addition, statistics per country region would be welcome in Figure 10. True/accuracy of WHOIS Records: Rather than a pie chart, over a bar graph showing the ongoing accuracy on a quarterly basis would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per top domain basis. An in-line graph, rather than a pie chart, over a bar graph should be more helpful for the percentage of UDP and URS decisions against gTLD registrants. Furthermore, it would be interesting to now where registrars are, voluntarily or involuntarily, deaccredited. Was that due to high ICANN fees, non-compliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc? The ALAC absolutely supports the further proposals of metrics on page 14 and 15 of the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0101-01-01-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 27 September 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-2016-09-27-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-marketplace-health-index-2016-09-27-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-POLICY-0101-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6895">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6895</a></td>
<td>ALAC Policy Issue Report: why end users should care</td>
<td>6/28/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The ALAC strongly supports the Working Group’s proposed observations on the process around confusing similarity in gTLDs. Specifically, the ALAC is in agreement with the Working Group’s suggested way forward. The ALAC congratulates the PPRWG Working Group for making significant, positive impact on the overall ICANN policy for the selection of gTLDs TLD strings. The ALAC believes that the proposed guidelines will help promote linguistic diversity, mitigate the risk of user confusion, and preserve and enhance the security, stability, and interoperability of the DNS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-POLICY-0101-01-00-EN is ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Guidelines for the Second String Similarity Review Process. The respective public comment period closed on 25 April 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 5 June 2016 ([<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicy/AL-ALAC-POLICY-0101-01-00-EN">https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicy/AL-ALAC-POLICY-0101-01-00-EN</a>] ) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC021</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9867">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9867</a></td>
<td>Issue Report: Reliability of Root DNS Data</td>
<td>6/28/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] This is the ALAC’s statement on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 25 June 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 July 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-base-new-gtld-registry-agreement-2016-07-20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-base-new-gtld-registry-agreement-2016-07-20-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC021 is RSSAC’s statement regarding the question of whether the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root system. It is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC083</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9869">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/9869</a></td>
<td>SSAC083: SSAC Comment on Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. The respective public comment period closed on 20 July 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 20 July 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-base-new-gtld-registry-agreement-2016-07-20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-proposed-amendments-base-new-gtld-registry-agreement-2016-07-20-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC on 5 May 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>6/28/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] This is the SSAC’s statement on the Proposed Amendments to Base New gTLD Registry Agreement. Specifically, Section 2 of Exhibit A (Approved Services) introduces new text relating to the potential provision of non-dotted (dotless) domain names. The ICANN organization understands SAC083 provides SSAC’s comments on draft proposed amendments to the Base New gTLD Registry Agreement (as of 20 July 2016) and the ICANN Board of Directors. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SSAC on 5 May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands SAC083 is SSAC’s statement regarding the question of whether or not the loss of any single root server will impact the resiliency, stability or reliability of the root system. It is informational only. There are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of ICANN’s second workshop (May 11-12, 2016), the RSSAC continued upon its previous workshops and deliberations themes, including accountability, continuity, operational and organizational evolution. The work was framed around Architecture, Evolution and Reinventing RSSAC. This provides a high-level outline of the work conducted during the two-day effort.

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC019 is RSSAC’s report on its second workshop in which it discussed accountability, continuity, and organizational evolution, and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the RSSAC for review on 16 February 2017.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) (ALAC-ALAC-ST-0616-01-00-EN)
ALAC Statement on the Request for Input-Next Generation RDS to replace WHOIS PDP
ALAC requested input in form of representative input from the organizations, we suggest that the Working Group focus on more critical documents, including: - The latest WHOD Policy Review Team Final Report 2012 - SAC Reports 054, 055 and 056 - 2013 AAA and 2014 New gTLD Registry Agreement - Related FAQs - The latest decisions from the ICANN data protection, particularly the latest Directive/Regulation. The EWG Final Report, together with additional statements by EWG members The WC input, at a minimum by and Full Consensus, address the following questions: - Should the domain name ecosystem capture, collect and curate personal data elements for availability domain name registration transaction? - Should ICANN compel the capture, collection and the curation of certain specific personal data elements of the domain name registration transaction? Specifically, the Working Group should identify all data that ICANN requires to be collected. This data, together with other data, can potentially be of concern to individual users. With the increasing use of data analytics, a great deal of information about people can be gained by analyzing data from a variety of sources in combination with other data.

The ICANN organization understands SAC082 is SACCC’s response to the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures request for input on building a catalog of existing Advice or Statements for Working Group consideration during its deliberations. There is no action for the ICANN Board. ICANN confirmed this understanding with the SAC on 5 May 2017 and closed the case.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) (ALAC-ALAC-ST-0616-03-01-EN)
ALAC Statement on the Draft New ICANN Bylaws
ALAC requested revision of the Bylaw proposal. We receive the Bylaw proposal and the draft Bylaws. This is included in the consideration. A Report of Public Comments was issued 25 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-new-bylaws-25may16-en.pdf), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) (ALAC-ALAC-ST-0616-04-01-EN)
ALAC statement on the draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update
ALAC requested revision of the Bylaw proposal. This is included in the consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 6 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-06jun16-en.pdf), and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) (ALAC-ALAC-ST-0616-02-00-EN)
ALAC requested revision of the Bylaw proposal. This is included in the consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 13 May 2016 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-op-budget-fy17-five-year-05jun16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.
Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAAC079


SAAC Advisory on the Changing Nature of IPv4 Address Semantics

2/17/16

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

SAAC079 is primarily informative and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operators should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv6 continues to improve, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well, or better, than they currently support IPv4.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC018


RSSAC018: RSSAC Statement on the Transmission of the IGP and CGWS- Accountability Proposals

3/10/16

The RSSAC congratulates the Internet stakeholder community for the transmission of the proposals, from the ICANN Stewardship Coordination Committee and the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, to the United States Department of Departmental Telecommunications and Information Administration via the ICANN Board of Directors.

The RSSAC is pleased to announce the closing of the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) ? Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance ? Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs ? Joint SO-AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (APASG) ? Joint DNS Security and Stability Working Group (DSSA- WG) ? Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance ? Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability. Having reached a Chartering Organization of several of these Cross Community Working Groups, the ICANN Board is now aware of the diverse requirements and the current lack of unity regarding the chartering of Cross Community Working Groups, as proposed by the ICANN community, is therefore welcomed to increase efficiency in the process of chartering these working groups and to reduce the potential for ambiguity and timeliness in finding a consensus on internal processes. The ICANN Board must however call attention to a number of important points that warrant further discussions.

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

RSSAC017


RSSAC017: RSSAC Statement of Work and Scope for ICANN003 4

2/16/16

The RSSAC recently updated the RSSAC002 document with a number of minor clarifications. RSSAC002 was published on 16 January 2016. While working on the ICANN004 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 publish RSSAC002. It requestsounce Weekes to lead a cross-working group to produce version 3 of RSSAC020 RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the normal public comment process. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN

AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN


AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN

3/10/16

This comments are provided by ALAC as part of the normal public comment period on the root name server (RNS) Agreement. ASO-RSAC-0007 was published on 30 November 2015 and is scheduled to close on 21 December 2015, specifically on those matters that are related either to security and stability or to the manner in which SAAC functions as an Advisory Committee of ICANN.

The RSSAC advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

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

AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow Up.

AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs Follow Up.

SSAC Statement on the Changing Nature of IPv4 Address Semantics

2/17/16

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

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

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

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

The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0116-00-EN is ALAC's Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Group. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAAC077


SSAC Comment on the Global Domain Name Space

1/24/16

A Disclosure Policy as informed by industry best practices for vulnerability disclosure (e.g. CERT / CC Forum) and CA/B Forum, which passed Ballot 96. Finally, the disclosure policy can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/news/blog/icann-coordinated-disclosure-guidelines.

SSAC077 is primarily informative and that the recommendations contained therein, specifically: Framework operators should accelerate plans to deploy IPv6, and consider the consequences of deploying IPv6 continues to improve, such as NAT, prior to deployment. Device manufacturers, and application developers, should accelerate plans to support IPv6 as well, or better, than they currently support IPv4.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.

This work was undertaken by ICANN staff including the Security Team. ICANN has coordinated mitigation efforts with the CA/Browser forum. Specifically, 1. ICANN worked with the Certificate Authority Browser forum (CA/B Forum) to produce version 3 of ICANN030 ICANN Advisories on Measurements of the Root Server System, with adherence to RSSAC sacus procedures.
<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 Item Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/2756">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/2756</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars</td>
<td>2/13/16</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] The RSSAC in its 2015 report on Domain Name Whois Terminology and Procedures (ALAC 15) recommends that the implementation of a framework that would provide a uniform and standard framework for accessing Domain Name Registration Data (DNRD). That framework would facilitate implementation verification methods, credential services and access control capabilities. The ALAC recommends that the Expert Working Group (EWG) on DNS Directory Services (DNS/DG) be given implementation recommendations. In its final Report, the EWG recommended a paradigm shift whereby gTLD registration data is collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only, with some data elements being accessible only to authorized registrants that are then held accountable for appropriate use. Therefore, while existing ICANN policies do not now require differentiated access to DNRED, it is clear from Board decisions and EWG recommendations that future ICANN policies will likely have that requirement. The Operational Profile of RDAP, therefore, should include an obligation on all gTLD registrars and registrant to support an authentication and authorization framework. Specifically, the framework to allow differentiated access must be required now, as a part of this protocol. Even if this stage all access seekers will be in one class - the public. In that way, when differentiation access requirements are imposed, protocol features will already be deployed to provide such access.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1215-01-00-EN to be the ALAC's Statement on the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars. The respective public comment period closed on 18 March 2016 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 25 April 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-draft-proposal-25apr16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-gtld-draft-proposal-25apr16-en.pdf</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC015</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The RSSAC has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC's understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The RSSAC has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC's understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The RSSAC has reviewed the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements and that there are no actionable comments-draft-ccwg-accountability-proposal-08jan16-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. The RSSAC's understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>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>N0274</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/ssac-0274-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/ssac-0274-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SSAC Comments to ICANN on Establishing New Certification Authorities</td>
<td>2/24/15</td>
<td>Ant-1: SSAC welcomes the clarification of DNS and DNS-based services, and the role of the ICANN in ensuring their security and stability. The ICANN organization understands that this advice is not directed at the ICANN Board, but that it is the ICANN's response to the 11 September 2015 statement from ICANN.</td>
<td>3/21/15</td>
<td>This comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 3 November 2015 and there is no action for the ICANN Board.</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-1015-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/078">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/078</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains</td>
<td>10/25/15</td>
<td>This is an input request from the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, they have chartered a Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains (ccNSO-GNSO-CWG-UCTN). Arguments for and against the re-naming of -let to ccLDs with the potential for creating much confusion amongst the user community, there was very strong alignment among the AL-Large respondents that there is a need for a moratorium where full evaluation should be made of the potential impacts of the current expansion of the existing ccLD programs. It has also be recommended, in order to increase user confidence in navigating the enlarged domain space, that along with a time-framed moratorium, promotional and educational resources and activities related to the introduction of the new ccLDs be developed in areas: geographical, political, social, economic, etc. that weren't served well in the first run.</td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Joint. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/078">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/078</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Arabic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules</td>
<td>7/17/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC preference was to have less “enforceability” and a lighter-weight proposal than preferred by some other groups in ICANN, we believe that the overall direction now being taken is acceptable. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-arabic-lgr-13oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-arabic-lgr-13oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Joint. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-04-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/079">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/079</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability 2nd Draft Report (Work Stream 1)</td>
<td>7/17/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: The ALAC is generally supportive of the overall proposal. Although the ALAC preference was to have less “enforceability” and a lighter-weight proposal than preferred by some other groups in ICANN, we believe that the overall direction now being taken is acceptable. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-13oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-accountability-13oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Joint. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-05-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/080">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/080</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: We recommend that the drafting team is made up of at least 2 persons per chartering SOG/AC and with representation from all SOG/ACs that indicate an interest. - Any charter reported broadly: 1) reflects the principles of openness and transparency; 2) embraces the concept that the use be in tune with the ICANN Strategic Plan; and 3) must reflect the broad global public interest in concrete ways and endowing the Affirmation of Commitments Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gold-auction-proceeds-07june15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gold-auction-proceeds-07june15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Joint. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-05-02-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/081">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/081</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making</td>
<td>7/9/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: ALAC provides community input into the Initial Report from the GNSO Working Group with regards to possible recommendations for the use of Data and Metrics for Policy Making. The ALAC supports the position noted to employ an independent third party in order to address any concerns relating to the collection, anonymization and aggregation of data. - The ALAC supports the introduction of a &quot;pilot&quot; where working groups will be able to submit proposals or ideas 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 making process rather than as cost against budget. - The ALAC supports the revision of the templates for the Issue Report, Charter and Final Report to update earlier WG guidelines and also the development of a decision tree of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-data-metrics-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Resolved (2021.05.12.16), the Board finds that ICANN org acted upon all Recommendations from SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012, as evidenced by the successful first RSK Joint. The Board considers SAC063, SAC073, and SAC012 to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-1015-05-03-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/082">atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/082</a></td>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal</td>
<td>7/9/15</td>
<td>Public Comment Statement: ALAC response to IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. Answers questions stemming the Proposal as a Whole, the RTRA Criteria, and the ICG Report and Executive Summary List of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iaa-transition-proposal-iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-policy-making-08oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iaa-transition-proposal-iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-policy-making-08oct15-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. ICANN confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-1015-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains. This statement is in response to an input request from the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, they have chartered a Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains (ccNSO-GNSO-CWG-UCTN). The progress of the CWG-UCTN can be followed in its Community Wiki (<a href="https://community.icann.org/wiki/CWG-UNCTOutput-and-Draft-Document">https://community.icann.org/wiki/CWG-UNCTOutput-and-Draft-Document</a>) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ICANN confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>ALAC Motion</td>
<td>Advisory Item</td>
<td>Date</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-ALAC-ST-0815-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-root-servers-statements/9689">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-root-servers-statements/9689</a></td>
<td>RSSAC014</td>
<td>Comment to &quot;Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...&quot;</td>
<td>9/25/15</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC014 is RSSAC's comment detailing support for the &quot;Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions...&quot; and that there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN understanding of the request was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advisory Status
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Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.

Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

SAC070

R-8 Advisory on the Use of Static TLD / Suffix Lists

6/28/15

Recommendation 6: ICANN should explicitly include use and actions related to a PSL in a part of the work related to universal acceptance.

Resolved (2021.05.12.10), the Board finds that the actions called for by the recommendations from SAC070 advising action for ICANN org, specifically Recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6, have been completed by ICANN org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAC 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>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6501">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6501</a></td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement]</td>
<td>0515-02-00-AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - As noted within the General Comments: The ALAC is generally supportive of the 2nd Draft Proposal. The ALAC notes that the inclusion of the six scripts added in MSR-2 is expected to benefit several million end-users of the Internet, particularly from Developing Countries. The ALAC also notes that while some of the GPs are seated and active, others have been less active or inactive. - It is important that the IPR program is harmonized in terms of parameters such as technology dissemination, capacity building and outreach) with the IAO. The ALAC also recommends that the IAO be utilized to ensure better community participation for the IPR program. - MSR-2 is based on Unicode 7, but is limited to the Unicode 6.3 subset. Given the fact that Unicode 8.0 is scheduled for release in 2015, there may be questions about staffing levels. The budget indicates that 16 new staff hires are expected for FY16, yet, none of the hires seem to be in Policy Support. The ALAC forecasts a number of new PDPs, review processes, as well as a potential next round of GIDs which will only serve to increase the demand on already busy Staff. Its Community of At-Large Structures will soon reach the 200 mark - translating to a need for increased support of this increased activity. The ALAC is concerned that this need to increase PDPs supporting Policy both in the GND and in the ALAC is not currently reflected in the budget and may lead to Staff burnout, Community alienation, and a reduction in Community involvement that risks making long-term evolution of the Multistakeholder model unsustainable. Report of Public Comments: <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></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-02-00-EN is 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-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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC Statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximail Starting Repertoire Version 2</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0515-03-00-EN</td>
<td><a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511">https://atlarge.icann.org/advice-statements/6511</a></td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement]</td>
<td>0515-03-00-AL-ALAC-ST-0515-03-00-EN</td>
<td>[Public Comment Statement] - General Comments: ALAC generally supports the proposal. [Policy &amp; Implementation Definitions (Section 3): No Comment - Policy &amp; Implementation Principle (Section 4): Note concern when new or additional policy issues are introduced in the implementation process. Public interest issues should issues should be referred back to Chartering Organization. When policy issues involve public interest issues, involve all impacted stakeholder all impacted stakeholders. - Proposed Additional New GNDO Processes (Section 5): Generally supports the introduction of new processes that may be able to deal with some matters in a more appropriate way. Suggest testing to understand impact of changes and changes should be reviewed within reasonably short periods to ensure they achieved goal. Report of Public Comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pag-14apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pag-14apr15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands AL-ALAC-ST-0515-03-00-EN is ALAC's statement on the IDN TLDs - LGR Procedure Implementation - Maximail Starting Repertoire Version 2. The respective public comment period closed on 17 Mar 2015 and this comment was included in that consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 15 Apr 2015 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pag-14apr15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-pag-14apr15-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>
At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

12/10/14

Policy Comment Statement: The elimination of DNS programs should adhere to the following principles. Registrars and users rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNS penetration; education at all levels is key in increasing demand and local supply; requirements placed on registrants should 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 gTLD program should give preference, if possible, to applicants from underserved regions, with adequate outreach efforts. In response to the questions posed in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrar rights must be secured through the GGL insurance or 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 "best practice," registrars using registrants do not follow the practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) The GGL requirement is maintained, the $500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrars can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) ICANN decides to eliminate the GGL requirement, it should be applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrants and user rights. The elimination of the GGL 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: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf

12/17/14

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. 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. RSSAC011: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

1/12/15

In its regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (P16-201): In the regular meeting on 20 November 2014, the RSSAC approved the following statement regarding the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (P16-201): “Root Zone TTLs” Requirement to Registrar Accreditation Insurance - Include in an assessment of the possible impact that the IANA leadership transition may have in ICANN’s operations. - Change the wording to reflect the idea that stakeholder engagement is to be encouraged by the wider ICANN community, not just by staff. - Include SMART implementation metrics in strategic objectives or goals wherever feasible. - Encourage underserved stakeholder groups to engage with ICANN at local, regional, and international levels and to establish metrics that reflect the scope of action. - Change the wording from “reflect” to “reflected” in the sentence “Comprehensive regional engagement plans and strategies covering most ICANN regions Report of Public Comments: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf

1/30/15

Change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Requirement. The respective public comment period closed on 04 January 2015 and this comment was included in this consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 30 January 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed. The ICANN organization understands ALAC-ST-1515-01-01-EN in ALAC’s statement on the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan (P16-201): The respective public comment period closed on 04 January 2015 and this comment was included in this consideration. A Report of Public Comments was released on 30 January 2015 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-transliteration-contact-initial-19feb15-en.pdf) and there is no action for the ICANN Board. This understanding was sent to the ALAC for review on 27 February 2017. ALAC confirmed this understanding on 7 December 2017, and the item is now closed.

2/12/15

Registrant and user rights and expectations must not be lowered in order to increase DNS penetration; education at all levels is key in increasing demand and local supply; requirements placed on registrants should 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 gTLD program should give preference, if possible, to applicants from underserved regions, with adequate outreach efforts. In response to the questions posed in the current Public Comment: 1) Registrar rights must be secured through the GGL insurance or 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 “best practice,” registrars using registrants do not follow the practice must NOT be disadvantaged; 4) The GGL requirement is maintained, the $500,000 limit should be lowered to an amount that the registrars can demonstrate that it would still provide registrants reasonable compensation to cover potential losses; 5) ICANN decides to eliminate the GGL requirement, it should be applied to all registrars and another mechanism should be put in place to protect registrants and user rights. The elimination of the GGL 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: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-draft-five-year-ops-06feb15-en.pdf

2/19/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

2/12/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

3/12/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

3/30/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

4/12/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

4/17/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

4/27/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

5/12/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

6/12/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC002: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

6/17/15

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC001: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC010: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC009: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC008: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC005: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC004: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC003: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC002: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

The ICANN organization understands RSSAC001: IAB liaison to the RSSAC

Action(s) Taken

- RSSAC011

- RSSAC010

- RSSAC009

- RSSAC008

- RSSAC007

- RSSAC006

- RSSAC005

- RSSAC004

- RSSAC003

- RSSAC002

- RSSAC001

- ALAC-ST-1515-01-01-EN
<p>| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC059 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 2: Each of the communities should review and (if necessary) enhance its policy development processes to ensure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA Functions Operator are clear and implementable. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC059 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 5: Effective arrangements should be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the root zone management process post-transition, including inter-organisation coordination of the post-transition RZM process involving more than one root zone manager partner. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC059 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 7: NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer after transition. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC059 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 8: As part of the transition process, each of the affected communities should 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 NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC069 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 5: Noting the stability and efficiency of existing structures, processes, and mechanisms for the management of the root zone, the SSAC recommends that any proposal to replace NTIA/RINN funding requires formal authorization of root zone changes with an alternative be at least as reliable, resilient, and efficient as the current process. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC069 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 2a: Each of the affected communities should consider whether or not existing mechanisms for the management of the root zone might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC069 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 4: As part of the transition process, each of the affected communities should 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 NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) | SAC069 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 7: NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer after transition. | In March 2015, the NTIA requested ICANN and Verisign to work together to develop a proposal for transitioning the NTIA's administrative role with root zone management. A proposal was submitted in August 2015, and Root Zone Maintainer Agreement was published for public comment on 29 June 2016 (see announcement here: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.c</a>). |  |
| Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) | RSSAC001 | 2012/10/24 | Recommendation 1: Development of standards for the operation of root servers. | The ICANN Board of Directors, in its 12th meeting, has stated that it is committed to achieving a more stable and resilient Internet through the improvement of root server operations. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-001</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-12sep14-en.htm">RSSAC-002-scope-10jul14-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum</td>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on &quot;Measurements of the Root Server System&quot; and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td>Considerable work has been completed on the ICANN Bylaws related to the ICANN Stewardship Transition. This work and progress can be tracked here: [<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/ProjectRoadmapSupportingtheDomainNameIndustryinUnderservedRegions">https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/ProjectRoadmapSupportingtheDomainNameIndustryinUnderservedRegions</a>]. In addition, implementation work is underway on the ATRT2 recommendations. General information and information on progress of the implementation efforts can be found here: [<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/ATRT2ImplementationProgram">https://community.icann.org/display/prjctgdduro/ATRT2ImplementationProgram</a>].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC006</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-stewardship-correspondence-31jul14-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC006: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the IPA without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of ENI programs should adhere to the following principles: 5) the second new gTLD round should give preference to applicants from developing economies and undertake an outreach program to ensure a better understanding of the demands placed on registrars and governments.</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: [<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments?sort=date-descendent&amp;sort-by=item_id&amp;comments=all">https://www.icann.org/public-comments?sort=date-descendent&amp;sort-by=item_id&amp;comments=all</a>]. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC006 provides RSSAC’s ‘Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum’ and there are no actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)</td>
<td>RSSAC007</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/correspondence-31jul14-en.htm">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-stewardship-correspondence-31jul14-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>RSSAC007: RSSAC Statement at the ICANN Accountability Town Hall Internet Governance Forum</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
<td>The ALAC strongly supports the concept of supporting the DNI in underserved regions but notes that simply increasing the IPA without corresponding increases in demand will not be helpful. The evolution of ENI programs should adhere to the following principles: 4) the demands placed on registrars and governments should not be lowered.</td>
<td>This statement was submitted and considered as part of a public comment: [<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments?sort=date-descendent&amp;sort-by=item_id&amp;comments=all">https://www.icann.org/public-comments?sort=date-descendent&amp;sort-by=item_id&amp;comments=all</a>]. The ICANN organization understands RSSAC007 describes RSSAC's scope for developing a recommendation on &quot;Measurements of the Root Server System&quot; and there are actionable items for the ICANN Board. ICANN's understanding of the request/item was reviewed and later confirmed by the RSSAC in May 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advice Item

Issued Date

Advice Document Recommendation

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-51)

9/26/14

R-8: ICANN should ensure that its Beginner Guides are easily accessible.

The Board is 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 work is ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-30)

8/26/14

R-10: The next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of the wording for all meetings and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes and make translation available in a timely manner.

The Board is 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 ICANN is continually working to update the guides. For more information, see the ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation10

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-30)

8/26/14

R-11: ICANN must implement range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender, cultural diversity) and user needs (disabilities, etc).

The Board is 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 ICANN should implement a policy management process system that is workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SO/ACs, in order to: enhance the ability of the community to participate in the development of policy, provide policy development metrics, facilitate multi-lingual engagement, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)

8/26/14

R-12: In collaboration with At-Large structures, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend education programmes across underrepresented regions.

The Board is 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/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation12

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)

8/26/14

R-13: ICANN must review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and relevance.

The Board is 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/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation13

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-11)

8/26/14

R-14: ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.

The Board is 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 work is ongoing work and commitment to continued improvement of policy management processes.

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-14)

8/26/14

R-15: ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure into a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.

The Board is 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 covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG Accountability home: https://community.icann.org/display/WA/WS2+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-15)

8/26/14

R-16: ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zone.

The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of time zones. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation16

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – The Globalization of ICANN (R-16)

8/26/14

R-17: ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.

The Board is 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 day-to-day work of ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Several ICANN offices have been opened over the past years, most recently the Engagement office in Nairobi. See ALAC workspace for updates: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation17

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-36)

8/26/14

R-18: Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SO/ACs, in order to: enhance knowledge management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activity, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multilingual engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.

The Board is 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 CCWG Work Stream 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG Accountability home: https://community.icann.org/display/WA/WS2+Enhancing+ICANN+Accountability+Home

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

DCL-01-01-EN


The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-27)

8/26/14

R-19: The Board must implement ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.

The Board is in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e This specific advice item is being addressed through rotation of time zones in some working groups with rotation of time zones. See ALAC Workspace: https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ALACReference#Recommendation19
<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>AC-AL-ATLAS-02-D19-01-04</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-33.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-33.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-33)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-33. For each Public Comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Completion letter sent to Board on 25 May 2018 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/alac-to-chalybe-25may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-05/alac-to-chalybe-25may18-en.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AC-AL-ATLAS-02-D19-01-04</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-34.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-34.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-34)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-34. The ALAC should arrange more At-Large capacity building Webinars.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. No action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which begin on 3 Jun 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. See the monthly Leadership Connect call minutes here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+34">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+34</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AC-AL-ATLAS-02-D19-01-04</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-36.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-36.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-36)</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.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new At-Large website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: thinkeric.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See the ALAC Workspace for more information: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+36">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+36</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AC-AL-ATLAS-02-D19-01-04</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-37.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-37.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-37)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-37. Additional logistical support from ICANN should be made available to the At-Large leadership to facilitate their participation in public meetings.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This specific advice item is within the remit of ALAC. No action for the Board. However, there are monthly Leadership Connect calls, which begin on 3 Jun 2014, which members of the ICANN Board have attended. See the monthly Leadership Connect call minutes here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+37">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+37</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AC-AL-ATLAS-02-D19-01-04</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-38.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/atlas/documentuploads/2014/10/ATLAS-II-Recommendation-38.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-38)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-38. ICANN should encourage open data: best practices that foster reuse of the information by any third party.</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a> This recommendation was partially met by the roll out of the new At-Large website on 24 February 2016. See the new website here: thinkeric.icann.org. This topic continues to be addressed by the Technology Task Force. See the ALAC Workspace for more information: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+38</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s) Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-4.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-4.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-9)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-44. ICANN should offer prizes 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>. ICANN offered a request for comments (R-44) on an annual basis, the CROPP program is reviewed and adjustments are made based on community input. Annual community special budget request process is also used to address these types of requests. This recommendation has led to greater collaboration between ALAC leadership and ICANN staff/regional engagement teams. See the CROPP Page here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=4191006093">https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=4191006093</a>. See ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations41">https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations41</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-41.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-41.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN (R-41)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-41. The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.</td>
<td>The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-09-09-en#3.e</a>. The ALAC submitted a public comment on the FY17 budget [<a href="https://forum.icann.org/en/boards/gray-op-budget#t-300016">https://forum.icann.org/en/boards/gray-op-budget#t-300016</a>], which was considered in the finalization of the budget. ICANN staff and members of the ICANN Board Finance Committee have met with ALAC leadership to discuss the subject of funding, and will continue to work with the ALAC on this topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-42.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-42.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS 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. The 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-43.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-43.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-2)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-43. RALOs should encourage their reactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.</td>
<td>There are no actionable items for ICANN. This specific advice item is complete par ALAC workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations43">https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations43</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-44.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-44.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-3)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-44. ICANN should continue to 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 networking staff offers a venue for future meetings, outreach has been conducted at universities, and some funding was provided to students to attend ICANN55. The Meeting team and Global Stakeholder Engagement have also contributed funding to broader groups. See below: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations44">https://community.icann.org/display/AtLarge/Recommendations44</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-45.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-45.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-45. ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to 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. The 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-46.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-46.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>R-46. ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model reaching not only board members but all parts of the ICANN community, in order to develop a more transparent and 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>. The Proposal for Multi-Year Planning of At-Large RALO Face-to-Face Meetings has been submitted to the ICANN public comment on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan &amp; Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update. The Fellowship Program will expand by another 10 slots in FY17, up to 60 total for Meeting A and C, 30 for Meeting B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) | AL-ATLAS-02-D10-01-01-EN | http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/At-Large-Advisory-Committee-At-Large-Summit-II-Recommendation-47.pdf | The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration – Future of Multi-Stakeholder Models (R-8) | 6/26/14 | R-47. ICANN should study the possibility of achieving and maintaining the level of inclusiveness balance in its different Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations [AC/SOs] to do away with the "Alas! culturally fall背后的!

### Notes
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   - **ICANN Board Status Advice Report**
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   - DCL-01-01-EN

3. **Action(s) Taken**
   - Reference to actions taken by ICANN or subsequent advisories.
## ICANN Board Status Advice Report

**Advisory Status**

As of 31 October 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>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>F-25. To enhance ICANN’s community effort on building a culture of Transparency and Accountability, as called for in the recommendations of KNT2, oversight of the Board’s decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective scrutiny.</td>
<td>Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: <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> Much has been accomplished on this specific advice item and part of day-to-day operations at ICANN. For example, there is a new ALAC website, there have been public comment improvements, expanded working group onboarding program, capacity building initiative, as well as RAUL webinars. See ALAC Workspace: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/RAUL+in+ICANN+management#alac:RAUL+in+ICANN+management-22">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/RAUL+in+ICANN+management#alac:RAUL+in+ICANN+management-22</a>. The Board in its 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledged the Final ATLAS II Declaration: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19">https://community.icann.org/display/als2/ATLAS+II+Recommendation+19</a>. Regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: <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> Implementation is covered by work related to CCWG Work Streams 1 and 2. The ICANN Board provided the Work Stream 1 proposal to the NTIA on 10 March 2016. Development of Work Stream 2 is still in progress. For updates regarding Work Stream 2, see the CCWG-Accountability wiki page: <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 was discussed by the Board’s GNSO Committee (GNSO), which subsequently added the item to the GNSO workplan: “Holistic Assessment of ICANN structure”. The GNSO agreed that the work underway on the current cycle of 11 reviews and the recommendations of RSAC- Accountability should progress further, before the topic of “holistic assessment of ICANN structure” be to addressed. Updates on GNSO progress on this work item can be found in the Semi-Annual Committee Report (most recent published report – page 8; <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/oeic-activities-15jan18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/oeic-activities-15jan18-en.pdf</a>). For further information on GNSO’s consideration of this topic, see: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2017-10-27-en</a>; and latest OEC meeting minutes: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-oec-2018-06-24-en</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B-3. 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 specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action to fo ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B-20. Support the input of the 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 specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action to fo ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B-22. Enable members of the general public to be able to participate in ICANN in an ongoing basis. Information on the ICANN website should be in clear and non-technical language.</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 specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action to fo ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B-23. The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.</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 specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action to fo ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AT-LAUS-02 - D01-01-00</td>
<td><a href="http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf">http://atlas.icann.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ATLAS-II-Declaration-with-appendix-R-25.pdf</a></td>
<td>The 2nd At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) Final Declaration — Global Internet: The User Perspective (R-25)</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>B-24(a). The complaint handling process and the Ombudsman should be designed to handle and address the relevant decisions 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 specific advice item is being addressed internally by the ALAC. No action to fo ICANN. See ALAC Workspace for updates: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17">https://community.icann.org/display/alac/Alac+in+ICANN+management#alac:Alac+in+ICANN+management-17</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advisory Item

Issue Date

Advice Document Recommendation

R-24(b).
Both the areas of domain Obfuscation and) (2) Contractual Compliance should report regularly on the complaints they received, resolved, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.

Standing Committee (SSAC)

Reference Number

SSAC065

The Board is in 9 September 2014 resolution acknowledges the final ATS1Sti Declaration:

http://www.icann.org/resources/board-mat

102 01-00-

48 of 57

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

187

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

296

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

447

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

667

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

87

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

247

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

348

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

550

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

73

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

137

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

263

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

323

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

482

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

642

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

792

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

952

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1112

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1272

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1432

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1592

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1752

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1912

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2072

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2232

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2392

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2552

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2712

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

2872

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3032

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3192

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3352

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3512

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3672

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3832

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

3992

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4152

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4312

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4472

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4632

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4792

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

4952

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5112

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5272

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5432

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5592

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5752

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

5912

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6072

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6232

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6392

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6552

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6712

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

6872

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7032

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7192

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7352

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7512

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7672

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7832

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

7992

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8152

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8312

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8472

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8632

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8792

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

8952

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9112

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9272

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9432

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9592

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9752

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

9912

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

10072

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1023

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1039

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1055

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1071

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1087

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1103

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1119

https://www.icann.org/en/syste

1135

https://www.icann.org/en/syste
Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (R-1)

The SSAC recommends ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the IETF to encourage the standardization of search list processing behavior. B. Communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-5.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-6

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: a. 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.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.

SSAC Advisory on DNS Infrastructure - R-5

The ICANN organization understands that SAC064 R-3 means that the SSAC recommends that in the context of mitigating name collisions, ICANN should consider the following steps to address search list processing behavior: b. ICANN should communicate to system administrators that search list behaviors currently implemented in some operating systems will cause collision with names provisioned under the newly implemented DNS infrastructure - R-4.
<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>SAC061</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-061-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-061-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC061: SSAC Advisory on gTLD Directory Services - Item 1</td>
<td>9/16/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 3: ICANN should explicitly consider under what circumstances un-delegation of a TLD is appropriate for security or stability reasons. In the case where a TLD has an established name space, 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 stable and in-name space from the DNS. Finally, ICANN should work in consultation with the community, in particular the root zone manager partners, to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for rapid removal of the delegation of a TLD.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-062-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-062-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what strategy has been made and why as part of its decision as to whether to delegate any TLD on a trial basis: • Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? • Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it? • Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency roll back decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and how the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? • Termination of trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)?</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC062</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Recommendation 2: ICANN should explicitly consider the following questions regarding trial delegation and clearly articulate what strategy has been made and why as part of its decision as to whether to delegate any TLD on a trial basis: • Purpose of the trial: What type of trial is to be conducted? What data are to be collected? • Operation of the trial: Should ICANN (or a designated agent) operate the trial or should the applicant operate it? • Emergency Rollback: What are the emergency roll back decision and execution procedures for any delegation in the root, and how the root zone partners exercised these capabilities? • Termination of trial: What are the criteria for terminating the trial (both normal and emergency criteria)?</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 4</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>SSAC 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>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC063</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-063-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC Advisory on DNSSEC Key Rollover in the Root Zone - Item 5</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>SSAC 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>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00</td>
<td><a href="http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html">http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html</a></td>
<td>P-1. ALAC Statement on Concurrency Similarities</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to resist the issue of new TLD strings that are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are virtually certain to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00</td>
<td><a href="http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html">http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html</a></td>
<td>P-1. ALAC Statement on Concurrency Similarities</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to resist the issue of new TLD strings that are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are virtually certain to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)</td>
<td>AL-ALAC-ST-0913-04-00</td>
<td><a href="http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html">http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/input-to-ewg/2013/thread-11313-en.html</a></td>
<td>P-1. ALAC Statement on Concurrency Similarities</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>The ALAC advises the Board to resist the issue of new TLD strings that are singular and plural versions of the same word, and ensure that ICANN does not delegate strings that are virtually certain to create confusion among Internet users and therefore result in loss of faith in the DNS.</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>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 (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>Initially recommend to the ICANN Board to ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SAC060: R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on TLD Directory Services

**As of 31 October 2021**

Advice Item Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Advice Provider</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Action/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN Board Status Advice Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advice Item 5 (R-2)**

**Guidance:**

The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. The subsequent advice discusses the details of the security risk assessment.

**Phase:**

Phase 5

**Provisional Phase:**

No provisional phase

**Effective Date:**

As of 31 October 2021

**Advice Item:**

**Revised:**

2 June 2018

**Action(s) Taken:**

The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**Implementation:**

The ICANN Board has taken the following actions to implement the advice:

- **Action:** The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**References:**

- [Link to Advice Document](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- [Link to ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)

**Guidance Details:**

The advice is based on the SSAC's understanding of the potential security risks associated with the registration data policy and the need for a formal risk assessment to ensure that the policy is robust against security threats.

**Action:** The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**References:**


**Guidance Details:**

The advice is based on the SSAC's understanding of the potential security risks associated with the registration data policy and the need for a formal risk assessment to ensure that the policy is robust against security threats.

- **ICANN Policy Development Process:**
  - [R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- **Implementation:**
- **Current Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on TLD Directory Services:**

**Guidance:**

The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. The subsequent advice discusses the details of the security risk assessment.

**Phase:**

Phase 5

**Provisional Phase:**

No provisional phase

**Effective Date:**

As of 31 October 2021

**Advice Item:**

**Revised:**

2 June 2018

**Action(s) Taken:**

The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**Implementation:**

The ICANN Board has taken the following actions to implement the advice:

- **Action:** The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**References:**

- [Link to Advice Document](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- [Link to ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)

**Guidance Details:**

The advice is based on the SSAC's understanding of the potential security risks associated with the registration data policy and the need for a formal risk assessment to ensure that the policy is robust against security threats.

- **ICANN Policy Development Process:**
  - [R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- **Implementation:**
- **Current Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on TLD Directory Services:**

**Guidance:**

The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. The subsequent advice discusses the details of the security risk assessment.

**Phase:**

Phase 5

**Provisional Phase:**

No provisional phase

**Effective Date:**

As of 31 October 2021

**Advice Item:**

**Revised:**

2 June 2018

**Action(s) Taken:**

The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**Implementation:**

The ICANN Board has taken the following actions to implement the advice:

- **Action:** The ICANN Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed.

**References:**

- [Link to Advice Document](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- [Link to ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)

**Guidance Details:**

The advice is based on the SSAC's understanding of the potential security risks associated with the registration data policy and the need for a formal risk assessment to ensure that the policy is robust against security threats.

- **ICANN Policy Development Process:**
  - [R-2 SSAC Comment on ICANN's Initial Report](https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-060-en.pdf)
- **Implementation:**
- **Current Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on Security Risk Assessment:**
- **Guidance on TLD Directory Services:**
<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/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (14 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agrees 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 SAC050 Recommendation 5, the IDN 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://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (5 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The IDN LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program</a> and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (7 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The IDN LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program</a> and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (3 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The IDN LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program</a> and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC060</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssa/documents/sac-060-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC060: Active Variant TLDs (1 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible.</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>ICANN agrees with this recommendation and the IDN LGR procedure is designed to follow a conservative and minimalist approach to maintain the security and stability of the root zone. The IDN LGR procedure including guidelines has been put in place <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">Project 2.1 of the IDN Variant TLD Program</a> and is being improved by integration panel. General information on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1">https://community.icann.org/display/WP2.1</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The advice items and their recommendations are aligned with the ICANN Board Status Advice Report. The reports and links to specific sections are detailed in the advice items to provide further context and information for each recommendation.
<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-activities/active/sac-058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC058: Active Variant TLDs (6 of 14)</td>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>CANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: Updating the DNS Implementation Guidelines; Standardizing and publishing a central repository of rules for second-level domain labels (LDUs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and Conducting specific training and outreach sessions</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC059</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>1/18/13</td>
<td>The SSAC recommends three issues that previous public comment periods have suggested were inadequately explored as well as issues related to cross-functional interactions of the changes brought about by root zone growth should be examined.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC059</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>4/18/13</td>
<td>The Org (ICANN) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: Scoping the Root System on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone; <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-05aug10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-05aug10-en.pdf</a> - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling; Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf</a> - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment); [<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en</a> ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC059</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-059-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC059: R-2 Interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications from expanding the root zone</td>
<td>4/18/13</td>
<td>The Org (ICANN) understands SSAC to be requesting that the study described in SAC059 related to the expansion of the root zone be performed. More specifically, the study should focus on areas that have not already been explored in other studies related to scaling the root or on areas within completed studies that the community felt were inadequately addressed, as evidenced by responses provided during those studies' public comment period. The study should also explore potential interactions among the areas of inquiry suggested in SAC059. The study should be undertaken by representatives from communities that may not have been fully consulted or engaged during previous investigations into the impacts of the new gTLD program. These communities are listed in SAC059. ICANN sent this understanding to the SSAC for review on 30 June 2020. ICANN received confirmation of understanding on 13 July 2020. Issues related to the expansion of the root zone have been/are being considered through other means, including Name Collision and DNSSEC roll over. Other reports on the expansion of the root zone include: Scoping the Root System on the Impact on the DNS Root System of Increasing the Size and Volatility of the Root Zone; <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-05aug10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/root-scaling-study-report-05aug10-en.pdf</a> - Summary of the Impact of Root Zone Scaling; Impact on Root Server Operations and Provisioning Due to New gTLDs: <a href="http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf">http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/historical-documentation/root-scaling-27jun12-en.pdf</a> - Continuous Data Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Study Plan (Public Comment); [<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dar-study-plan-2015-12-02-en</a> ICANN continues to work to address the issues identified in SAC059.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC058</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-058-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/sac-058-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>R 2 SAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>As the ICANN community discusses validating contact information, the SSAC recommends that the following meta-questions regarding the costs and benefits of registration data validation should be answered</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Close Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- The SSAC was requested to provide additional RZ-LGR proposals in the future. With the new IDN table review process now implemented, this item can now be closed.
- The IDN Guidelines were updated to version 4 in May 2018 ([https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/idn-4-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/idn-4-en.pdf)). However, these Guidelines are currently being held for review of GNOSIG following the request from GNSIG to the SSAC Board. In March 2020, the Guidelines for Developing Reference Label Generation Rules (LGRs) for the Second Level Version 2 were published for public comment, and the public comment staff report was issued in May 2020. The IDNA Repository of IDN tables is also now being updated to address any gaps. ICANN has been developing reference LGRs for the second level in consultation with the community. A new list of the ICANN active LGR topics is now available at the [https://www.icann.org/lgr](https://www.icann.org/lgr) website. The IDN WG has included a recommendation for RIOs to utilize reference LGRs when they design their IDN tables. This, along with the updated IDN table review process now utilizing reference LGRs, therefore, this recommendation is now largely addressed. Additional reference LGRs will be developed against the additional R2-LGR proposals received in the future. With the new IDN table review process now implemented, this item can now be closed.
- The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should consider adopting the terminology outlined in this report in documents and discussions.
- The SSAC was requested to provide additional RZ-LGR proposals in the future. With the new IDN table review process now implemented, this item can now be closed.

- Many of these questions were addressed in the Expert Working Group’s work and are not part of the policy questions posed within a Future PDF by the GNSIG. The EWSI delivered its Final Report: [https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/final-report-dj0614-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/final-report-dj0614-en.pdf). Information on the public comment process are also be found here: [https://www.icann.org/public-comments/dbs-prefinal-issue-2015-12-13-en. The GNSIG PDF process information can be found here: [https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds](https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds).
The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that insert the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.

The Board should pass a resolution clearly stating the criticality of the development of a registration data policy defining the purpose of domain name registration data. This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en in November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a

The Board should explicitly defer any other activity (within ICANN’s remit) directed at finding a “solution” to the WHOIS problem until the registration data policy identified in (1) and (2) has been developed and accepted by the community. This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en in November 2012, the Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2012-11-08-en#1.a

International Domain Name: Internationalization RIDO be supported by default, not called out separately. The focus should be on Recommendation 2 from the RID WG final report. This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2012-05-11-en in November 2012, the ICANN Board provided a resolution on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Report recommendations: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2011-12-08-en. In response to recommendation 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group’s (IRD WG’s) final report, a RID Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and transliteration of contact data, which addresses the submission of international data. Board resolution 2016.03.10.07 requests GNO to review policy implications of RID Final Report and directs staff to incorporate RID recommendations into Translation & Transliteration policy implementation as consistent with policy (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#1.e).

An accuracy policy should define each dataelement and require that it be examined and indicated for each element a method for determining the level of accuracy of the data. This statement was considered as part of a public comment period: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/whois-rt-final-report-2011-12-08-en. In response to recommendation 2 of the International Registration Data Working Group’s (IRD WG’s) final report, a RID Policy Development Process has been started on the translation and transliteration of contact data, which addresses the submission of international data. Board resolution 2016.03.10.07 requests GNO to review policy implications of RID Final Report and directs staff to incorporate RID recommendations into Translation & Transliteration policy implementation as consistent with policy (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-03-10-en#1.e).

The ICANN organization understands SAC058 Recommendation 3 to mean that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that insert the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.

This specific advice 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 GNSO (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en).
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (3 of 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SAC052           | 2/9/12 Recommendation (1): Given the potential for user confusion and the currently unfinished work on string similarity and IDN variants, the SSAC recommends: 1. Delegation of all single character IDN TLDs if all scripts should be disallowed by default. 2. Exceptions may be made for some scripts, but only after careful consideration of substrings/character similarity both within and across scripts. Such consideration should ignore comments from the technical and linguistic community, and from ICANN staff advisory committees. Single-character TLD applications in an exceptionally allowed script should be accepted only when there is clear evidence that there is no risk of user confusion. Each applied-for single character TLD label must be explicitly examined across scripts to ensure that there is absolutely no possibility of user confusion within an across scripts. 4. ICANN should consult with the technical and linguistic community to determine which scripts, if any, should be restricted with respect to the delegation of single character TLDs, and how any such restrictions should be defined, and how such restrictions may be lifted if appropriate. 5. ICANN should take into consideration the outcome of the IETF work on the creation of a concise specification of the TLD label syntax based on existing syntax documentation, extended minimally to accommodate IDNs. 6. ICANN should consider adopting the following guidelines regarding its consideration of which scripts and code points could be accepted as exceptions: a) The code point must be non-ASCII according to IANA’s code point dictionary. b) The code point must be from one of the following Unicode categories: lower case letter (Ll), upper case letter (Lu), and other letter (Lo) as defined by the Unicode Standard. c) Some single character IDN TLDs are composed of multiple Unicode code points, which may include non-ASCII code points. These should be subjected to a more stringent technical and confusability analysis, whose criteria should be well defined and made public. If the script in which an exception is made and a single character IDN TLD is allowed should not have characters that are intrinsically confusable with characters of another script (for example, Latin/Dingbats, Latin/Thai, etc.). d) The existing and extended rules of confusability must be met. Single-character code points must explicitly be examined across scripts. Delegation of a single character TLD application does not imply acceptance of the script. If a script is allowed, a distinct and explicit specification of which subset of the script is allowed must be provided.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>SSAC Advisory on the Delegation of Single-Character Internationalized Domain Name Top-Level Domains (2 of 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SAC053           | 2/9/12 Blocking or allowing responses to Domain Name System (DNS) queries is increasingly prominent. Domain names or Internet Protocol (IP) address filtering (or otherwise preventing access to web content as a matter of security policy) may be used by some organizations as a natural extension of historical telephony controls that block these names within organizations from incurring toll charges. Technical approaches to DNS blocking are intended to affect users within a given administrative domain, such as a private or publicly operated network. Preventing resolution of the domain name into an IP address will prevent immediate connection to the named host, although circumvention techniques may enable connectivity to the intended system anyway (this includes simply accessing the site via IP address rather than via a Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN)). A DNS resolver or network operator could also rewrite a DNS response to contain an IP address mapping the operator chooses, whether rewriting a Non-Existing Domain (NXDOMAIN) response or rewriting the DNS response for an existing FQDN, with potentially harmful effects on DNS Security Extension (DNSSEC) supporting name servers and their users. A particularly coarse-grained approach is for an operator to simply discard DNS responses, although this results in non-deterministic behavior and may be problematic. Regardless of the mechanism used, organizations that implement blocking should apply these principles: 1. The organization imposes a policy on a network and its users over which it exercises administrative control (i.e., it is the administrator of a policy domain). 2. The organization determines that the policy’s benefits to its objectives and/or the interests of its users. 3. The organization implements the policy using a technique that is least disruptive to its network operations and users, unless laws or regulations specify certain techniques. 4. The organization makes a concerted effort to do no harm to networks or users outside its policy domain as a consequence of implementing the policy. The ICANN Board adopted this conservative approach and did not change the New gTLD Applicant Operations Disclosure to allow for the delegation of single character TLDs.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>SSAC Report on WHOIS Technology and Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SAC054           | 9/14/11 Recommendation (1): The ICANN community should adopt the terminology outlined in this report in its documents and discussions, in particular: Domain Name Registration Data (DNS). The data that domain name registrants provide when registering a domain name or that registrants collect - Domain Name Registration Data Access Protocol (DNDAP). The components of a standard communications exchange - queries and responses that specify the access to DNDAP - Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (DNDSD). The services offered by domain name registries and registrars to implement the DNDAP and to provide access to DNDSD. Additional terminology includes: TLDWHOIS Policy; WHOIS-D Policy; WHOIS-C Policy; WHOIS-M Policy; and WHOIS-X Policy. The terms TLDWHOIS should only be used when referring to the protocol as currently specified in RFC 1035.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>SSAC Report on WHOIS Technology and Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SAC055           | 10/14/11 Recommendation (1): The ICANN community should develop a uniform and standard framework for accessing DNDAP that would provide mechanisms to define and implement a range of request methods, credential verification, and access control capabilities.  

**Summary:**
- The SSAC made recommendations on IDN TLD delegation and DNS blocking.
- They discussed the importance of string similarity and the need for careful consideration across scripts.
- The ICANN Board took these recommendations into account.
- Further work on DNS blocking and WHOIS standards is ongoing.

---

**Note:**
- The provided summary is a condensed version of the document's content.
- Full details can be accessed through the linked resources.
### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC047: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 5/12/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

**ICANN Board Status Advisory Report**

**Advisor Status**

As of 31 October 2021

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC048: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (3 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 5/12/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC049: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Comment on the Dictionary Zone Advisor and Management (2 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 6/3/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC051: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Report on DNS Zone Risk Assessment Terminology and Structure (R-2)

**Issued Date:** 5/12/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC050: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Report on DNS Zone Advisor and Management (1 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 6/3/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC048: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Comment on the Orphan Glue Records in the Draft Applicant Guidebook (2 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 5/12/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.

---

### Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

#### SAC047: Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Advice Item:** SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model (2 of 3)

**Issued Date:** 4/15/11


**Phase:** 5

**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.


Based on this rationale, this item is closed as of 7 July 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Link to Advice Document</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Issued Date</th>
<th>Advice Document Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td><a href="http://ssacdocuments.org/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf">http://ssacdocuments.org/ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>SAC045 - Report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee on Root Scoping (1 of 5)</td>
<td>12/9/10</td>
<td>Recommendation (2): ICANN should publish estimates of expected and maximum growth rates of TLDs, including TLDs and their variants, and solicit public feedback on these estimates, with the end goal of being as transparent as possible about the justification for these estimates.</td>
<td>Recommendation to the CEO to direct staff to publish current estimates of the expected growth rates of TLDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice Provider</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Link to Advice Document</td>
<td>Advice Item</td>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Advice Document Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/</a> ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf](<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/</a> ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf)</td>
<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. 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)</td>
<td>SAC045</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/</a> ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf](<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/</a> ssac/documents/sac-045-en.pdf)</td>
<td>SAC045: Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the Domain Name System (R-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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>