From: David Olive
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2023
To: Rod Rasmussen
Cc: James Galvin, Marika Konings, Danielle Rutherford, Steve Sheng
Subject: Closing Certain SSAC Advice

Dear Rod,

Thank you for our recent conversations regarding the new Advice process. ICANN org and the ICANN Board have reviewed items currently in "Phase 5 - Close Request" as part of our efforts to improve the Advice process. We wish to start with a clean slate for the coming process change and are formally closing out items that are currently in Phase 5.

You will find an overview of the SSAC Advice items in the annex to this letter. These items' status should be familiar as they have been communicated previously. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Best regards,

David Olive

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Comment on the ICANN gTLD Registry Transition Processes Model SAC047: Rec 2	The SSAC recommends that ICANN preserve operational data about ex-registries. ICANN should define a framework to share such data with the community. Availability of such data will ensure that the registration transition process can be studied and if needed, improved.	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and directed implementation. In July 2019, ICANN org completed implementation of a system that preserves the data available on performance monitoring of TLDs in general, as recommended by the SSAC Advice. As a result, implementation of Advice is considered complete.

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Report on WHOIS Terminology and Structure SAC051: Rec 2	The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of Internationalized DNRD as well as addressing the relevant recommendations in SAC003, SAC027 and SAC033.	**Closed**	The ICANN Board adopted during its meeting on 30 April 2023 the proposed RDAP Global Amendments to the Base gTLD Registry Agreement, the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and Specification 13 to the Base gTLD Registry Agreement which incorporate robust requirements for RDAP and define a smooth transition from WHOIS to RDAP including a sunset of the obligations for the WHOIS service. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation SAC058: Rec 3	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN community should seek to identify validation techniques that can be automated and to develop policies that incent the development and deployment of those techniques. The use of automated techniques may necessitate an initial investment but the long-term improvement in the quality and accuracy of registration data will be substantial.	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation had already been completed. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
Active Variant TLDs SAC060: Rec 4	ICANN should coordinate and encourage adoption of these rules at the second and higher levels as a starting point by: - Updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines; - Maintaining and publishing a central repository of rules for second- level domain labels (2LDs) for all Top Level Domains (TLDs); and - Conducting specific training and outreach sessions	**Closed**	ICANN org has been developing reference LGRs for the second level in consultation with the community and in-line with the RZ-LGRs. SubPro WG has included a recommendation for ROs to utilize reference LGRs when they design their IDN tables and reference LGRs have also been incorporated in the updated IDN Guidelines 4.1 now approved by the ICANN Board for implementation. Also, the updated IDN table review process now utilizes the reference LGRs along with the online LGR tool. Additional reference LGRs will be developed against the additional RZ-LGR proposals received in the future. ICANN has also communicated these changes through public comment, announcements and direct communication to the registry operators, as well as conducted webinars on how to use the tool and the reference LGRs to review IDN tables. With the new IDN table review process now operational, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
Comment on ICANN's Initial Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services SAC061: Rec 2	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	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and noted that implementation has been completed . Subsequently, on 2 August 2018, the SSAC contacted the ICANN org to oppose this determination and requested the ICANN org change SAC061 Recommendation 2's status from 'Closed' to 'Open." Upon review of SAC061 and SAC101v2, the ICANN org has returned SAC061 to Phase 2 | Understand. SAC061 Recommendation 2 was considered in conjunction with SAC101v2. On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and three through seven in SAC101 version 2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work . In its rationale the Board states "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the Advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council." As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace SAC090: Rec 1	The SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors take appropriate steps to establish definitive and unambiguous criteria for determining whether or not a syntactically valid domain name label could be a top-level domain name in the global DNS.	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and asked the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work . The PDP issued the on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures on 18 January 2021, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 18 February 2021 and was provided to the Board for consideration. The Working Group reviewed the SSAC's advice in SAC090 and the PDP Final Report references SAC090 in Topic 21: Reserved Names and Topic 29: Name Collisions. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace SAC090: Rec 2	The SSAC recommends that the scope of the work presented in Recommendation 1 include at least the following issues and questions: 1) In the Applicant Guidebook for the most recent round of new generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) applications,20 ICANN cited or created several lists of strings that could not be applied-for new gTLD names, such as the "reserved names" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.1, the "ineligible strings" listed in Section 2.2.1.2.3, the two-character ISO 3166 codes proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.3.2 Part III, and the geographic names proscribed by reference in Section 2.2.1.4. More recently, the IETF has placed a small number of potential gTLD strings into a Special-Use Domain Names Registry. 21 As described in RFC 676122, a string that is placed into this registry is expected to be processed in a defined "special" way that is different from the normal process of DNS resolution. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of the names on these lists? If so: i) How should ICANN respond to changes that other parties may make to lists that are recognized by ICANN but are outside the scope of ICANN's direct influence? ii) How should ICANN respond to a change in a recognized list that occurs during a round of new gTLD applications? 2) The IETF is an example of a group	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and asked the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
	outside of ICANN that maintains a list of "special use" names. What should ICANN's response be to groups outside of ICANN that assert standing for their list of special names? 3) Some names that are not on any formal list are regularly presented to the global DNS for resolution as TLDs. These so-called "private use" names are independently selected by individuals and organizations that intend for them to be resolved only within a defined private context. As such they are harmlessly discarded by the global DNS—until they collide with a delegated use of the same name as a new ICANN-recognized gTLD. Should ICANN formalize in policy the status of "private use" names? If so: i) How should ICANN deal with private use names such as .corp, .home, and .mail that already are known to collide on a large scale with formal applications for the same names as new ICANN-recognized gTLDs? ii) How should ICANN discover and respond to future collisions between private use names and proposed new ICANN-recognized gTLDs?		

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace SAC090: Rec 3	Pursuant to its finding that lack of adequate coordination among the activities of different groups contributes to domain namespace instability, the SSAC recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors establish effective means of collaboration on these issues with relevant groups outside of ICANN, including the IETF.	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and asked the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work . The PDP issued the on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures on 18 January 2021, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 18 February 2021 and was provided to the Board for consideration. The Working Group reviewed the SSAC's advice in SAC090 and the PDP Final Report references SAC090 in Topic 21: Reserved Names and Topic 29: Name Collisions. As a result, the implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace SAC090: Rec 4	The SSAC recommends that ICANN complete this work before making any decision to add new TLD names to the global DNS.	**Closed**	On 23 June 2018, the Board accepted this advice and asked the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP to include this recommendation in its work . The PDP issued the on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures on 18 January 2021, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 18 February 2021 and was provided to the Board for consideration. The Working Group reviewed the SSAC's advice in SAC090 and the PDP Final Report references SAC090 in Topic 21: Reserved Names and Topic 29: Name Collisions. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names SAC095: Rec 2	Because the risks identified in this Advisory cannot be adequately mitigated without significant changes to Unicode or IDNA (or both), the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may not function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.	**Closed**	On 2 Nov 2017, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN org to engage with gTLD and ccTLD communities on the findings and recommendations in SAC095 in addition to requesting that the ccNSO and GNSO integrate conformance with IDNA2008 and its successor into their relevant policies so as to safeguard security, stability, resiliency and interoperability of domain names. Registrations under gTLDs are limited to IDNA2008 under the new gTLDs program. So registrations for such gTLDs do not permit emojis. The same restrictions are also extended for contracts for other gTLDs. There has been an active outreach to the ccTLDs for following the same practice, and not register emojis, by ICANN org's GSE team and the IDN program team. ICANN org notes that the SSAC has stated this item can be considered complete and for ICANN org to provide a link to the training materials. ICANN org notes that a flyer on Emojis based on SSAC's SAC095 report is published and ICANN org has been distributing and presenting it at various forums globally through its GSE team. The flyer is available in six languages on the IDN program page. The GSE team has also reached out to the few ccTLDs which offer emojis and has conveyed the security concerns. In some cases these have been taken up by the ccTLD community as well. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data SAC101v2: Rec 1A	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,	**Closed**	In June 2019, the ICANN Board accepted Recommendation 1 and tasked ICANN org to track progress on the advised objectives. The Board acknowledged ongoing discussions about an 'accredited RDDS access program' in the EPDP Phase 2 and clarified that the Board cannot dictate PDP outcomes and would review policy recommendations after the EPDP Phase 2 Team submits its Final Report. The EPDP issued the Phase 2 Final Report on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 31 July 2020, and was subsequently adopted by the GNSO council on 24 September 2020 and was provided to the Board for consideration. The EPDP Phase 2 Report contains recommendations regarding:

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
	ICANN Organization, and ICANN community. A. ICANN policy-making should result in a domain registration data policy, including statements of purposes for the collection and publication of the data.		Accreditation of SSAD requestors, Required criteria and content of SSAD requests, Response requirements, Required Service Level Agreements (SLAs), Automation of SSAD processing, Terms and conditions of SSAD, Logging, auditing, and reporting requirements, Implementation of a GNSO Standing Committee. As a result, implementation of this Advice is considered complete.
SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data SAC101v2: Rec 2A	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN Organization to work with the ICANN Community to: A) develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements	**Closed**	On 23 June 2019 the ICANN Board considered SAC101v2 and noted advice items 2A and 3-7 in SAC101v2 and referred them to the GNSO Council for consideration for inclusion in the EPDP Phase 2 work . In its rationale the Board stated "Advice item 2A suggests that the Board direct ICANN org to work with the community to 'develop policy with clearly defined uniform purposes for RDDS rate-limiting and corresponding service level agreement requirements.' As policy is developed by the community and this topic is in the work plan for the EPDP Phase 2, the Board notes this advice and refers to the GNSO Council as the manager of PDPs. In taking this action, the Board also notes that in the Annex to the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, the Board asked that the topic of rate limit be discussed and resolved by the community as quickly as possible." As a result, implementation of this Advice was not directed and this item is now closed. .

Subject	Advice Recommendation	Status	Rationale
SSAC Advisory Regarding Access to Domain Name Registration Data SAC101v2: Rec 5	The SSAC reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061: "The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy." These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.	**Closed**	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 . In its rationale the Board states "Advice item five reiterates Recommendation 2 from SAC061 and suggests that 'The ICANN Board should ensure that a formal security risk assessment of the registration data policy be conducted as an input into the Policy Development Process. A separate security risk assessment should also be conducted regarding the implementation of the policy.' The advice further suggests that 'These assessments should be incorporated in PDP plans at the GNSO.' As the advice suggests that the assessments be incorporated into PDP plans and the GNSO is the manager of PDPs, the Board notes and refers this advice to the GNSO Council." As a result, implementation of this Advice was not directed and this item is now closed.
SSAC Comments on Evolving the Governance of the Root Server System SAC106: Rec 3	The SSAC recommends that decisions of the RSS GWG be made on the basis of consensus, and that votes only be taken when formality is required or consensus is not achievable.	**Closed**	The Root Server System Governance Working Group operates transparently and makes decisions by consensus (see https://community.icann.org/x/35EzBw). As a result, no further implementation of this Advice item is required and the item is now closed.