Pre-Singapore Policy Update Webinar
13 March 2014
Second session: 19:00 UTC

David Olive: Welcome. My name is David Olive. I'm Vice President of Policy Development Support. And I have the pleasure of conducting this Webinar with members of my Policy team who will provide you with an update on various policy activities to take place in Singapore at our ICANN 49 meeting.

We are very pleased to return to the Asia Pacific region and to Singapore in particular and so we welcome those who may be joining us in person or remotely in Singapore for the various activities and events and policy discussions that will be taking place.

Let me briefly go through some of the themes for ICANN 49. Obviously the community will be very deeply engaged in looking at next steps for the ATRT 2 recommendations; a discussion on the initiatives to globalize ICANN; comments on the budget and operational plan for the fiscal year 2015; as well as inputs for the strategic planning for 2020 now that our four strategy panels have completed their work and that will be put into the strategic plan process.

In addition, of course, the Meeting Strategy Working Group will be reviewing and discussing its recommendations for the next generation, if you will, of ICANN meetings and the structure of those ICANN meetings looking at three strategies and potential options. And I encourage you to also look at that and comment upon that. The Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations are online at ICANN.org.

In terms of the Singapore outlook I would like to point out that we'll have the Root Server Security Advisory Committee providing its updates on its activities on Mondays. The strategic panels and the Cross Community Working Groups on Internet governance will also have sessions on Monday.

The gala is Monday evening on the first day. Also on Tuesday is Community Day where various members of the stakeholders and constituency groups will be meeting with our Board of directors to exchange ideas and comment on various topics.

There will be a DNSSEC workshop on Wednesday. And of course because we're in the Asia Pacific there will be a showcase of the APROLO on Wednesday evening with a public forum and Board meeting on Thursday.

In addition, of course, there'll be Tech Day within the country code group, the ccNSO, and of course new gTLDs updates as well throughout the conference. But today we're going to focus on the policy development activities in Singapore and the policy development process in general.

As we know, a primary role of ICANN is to coordinate policy development related to the global Internet systems of unique identifiers. We have an open and transparent policy development mechanism to promote well-informed decisions based on the advice from a diverse group and views of our stakeholders.

The ICANN community works to improve and streamline these mechanisms so many global stakeholders as possible can participate and have their voices heard.

This bottom-up, multistakeholder consensus-approach results, I think, in recommendations for the Domain Name System that are fair, effective and carefully considered, thus preserving and enhancing the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet.

I always like to show this infographic that kind of describes the various functions and participation of various groups including our policy development activities within the ICANN community.

The goals of this Webinar will be to update you on current policy developments, encourage your inputs and participation, review those main topics that will be discussed and raised by the various stakeholder groups and stakeholder organizations; brief you on upcoming initiatives like the SO and AC engagement activities; answer any questions you may have; and of course please provide any comments on the Webinar hashtag shown here on the screen.

The lines are muted at the moment and we will unmute those at the end of the call for questions but please put questions in the Chat and we'll try to answer them as soon as we can so that we can make sure that your questions are raised, drawn attention to and answered.

The topics covered in this session will be from the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the following listed here on the slide. Also we'll hear from the Country Code Supporting Organization issues, the Address Supporting Organization topics, activities of the Root Server System Advisory Committee, our Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Government Advisory Committee and of course the At Large Advisory Committee as well. My colleagues will be presenting individual topics for each.

And with that I'll turn it over to Marika Konings to talk about the GNSO policy issues, and other members will follow. Marika, the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. Welcome, everyone. My name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO based in the ICANN office in Brussels.

And in this section of the presentation we'll be covering some of the projects that are currently under discussion in the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization.

So currently we have 11 policy development processes, or also referred to as PDPs, in active and in various stages of the PDP cycle. And some of them we'll be covering today such as the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy and Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation as well as the Translation and Transliteration of Registration Data.

In addition to that there are seven other non-PDP projects, as we refer them, that are also being reviewed and discussed within the GNSO and some of those are also being - an update is being provided during this presentation, such as the Data and Metrics for Policymaking as well as Policy and Implementation.

So in discussing - in addition to discussing and reviewing the status of these projects the GNSO will also meet with several other organizations within ICANN during the Singapore meeting such as the ICANN Board, the Country Code and Name Supporting Organization as well as the Governmental Advisory Committee, also known as the GAC, to discuss topics of common interest and ways in which they can enhance and facilitate collaboration.

And in that context it may be helpful to mention that the GAC and GNSO have recently formed a GAC GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement to facilitate and encourage early input from the GAC on policy development activities.

But as said, the focus of today is providing you with an update on the policy activities of the GNSO and as such I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Lars Hoffman, who will be talking to you about the Inter Registrar Policy Transfer Part D PDP Working Group.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Marika. And hello everybody. As you can see on the slide I'm going to give you a brief update of the Inter Registrars Transfer Policy PDP Working Group.

And I will start off with a spoiler alert, the group has just published its initial report which is out for public comment and will also be presented to the community in Singapore.

The Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, IRTP for short, is a 2004 consensus policy and provides a straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars.

And issues related to IRTP, including its Transfer Dispute Policy, the TDRP, are still the Number 1 area of customer complaints to ICANN Compliance. That's actually a quite important policy despite its low profile.

The policy has been under review for a while, to put it mildly, and this Part D is the fourth and final of those reviews. At least that's what we're hoping for. And Michele said earlier D will stand for - I forgot what he said - the last one. That's not what it stands for but that's what he meant.

The working group was chartered with six questions. And as said before it has published its initial report which it's out for public comment, throughout the ICANN meeting in Singapore. And in fact up until the 3rd of April is when the comment period will close.

In the interest of time I will go through all the - will not go through all the charter questions - recommendations but talk to you just briefly through the highlighted ones.

In total there are 12 recommendations the initial report - in the initial report. And these include, among others, a more detailed reporting requirement for dispute providers to be incorporated into the TDRP. The recommendation

that a domain name be returned to the original registrar of record if the TDRP procedure finds that a noncompliance transfer has occurred even if this was followed by one or more compliance transfers, in fact.

The group is also considering to recommend to extend the statute of limitations to launch a TDRP from currently 6 to 12 months. Further recommendations include that if a request for enforcement is initiated the relevant domain name should be locked against future transfers under the TDRP until said enforcement proceedings have concluded.

The working group, incidentally, did not decide to recommend that the TDRP can be initiated by registrars. This is a very - it's a very contentious or a very longly debated issue in the working group but this is the way it has come down and the initial report goes into detail why that is the case.

The working group is also considering to recommend that the TDRP's first level of dispute resolution, the registry level, be eliminated. And the working group also recommends the dispute options for registrants are made more visible and accessible.

You might have noticed that I mentioned twice that the working group is considering to recommend and this is because the group members want to make sure that this is the best way forward and so the group states in the report explicitly that it seeks community input on these issues before it finalizes these recommendations. You will find that these issues are clearly marked and highlighted in the initial report.

Community input, as I said, is short on these methods and they can be submitted through the public comment forum and of course during the group's face to face meeting in Singapore where the group is meeting on Wednesday the 26th of March at 10:30 am.

And finally, you can see here a few abbreviated URLs that you can go to and find out more information. And on that note I'll pass on to Julie I believe. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Lars. This is Julie Hedlund. I'm going to speak to you briefly on the policy development process concerning translation and transliteration of contact information.

And why is this important? Well, as I'm sure you all know, the Domain Name System is continuing to be internationalized. And so we do need to allow for standardized query of international registration data and to assure its functionality.

There are ongoing reforms of gTLD directory services such as the Expert Working Group. And that makes us have a need to establish GNSO policy on translation and transliteration of contact information.

The recent developments, we have a working group that has started in December of 2013 to look at the PDP issues. This working group sent a request to the supporting organizations and the stakeholder groups and constituencies and the advisory committees for input on questions relating to the PDP issues. And that deadline has been extended to 31st of March.

ICANN also has commissioned a feasibility study on the translation and transliteration of contact information that will inform the working group's recommendations. And the working group also will consider the outcome of the EWG and other relevant efforts.

And how can you get involved? Well, as I noted the working group is starting to receive community feedback and will be working on draft recommendations. And if you are interested in this topic you are welcome to join. New members are always welcome. And you also are very much welcome and encouraged to join the working group's face to face public

meeting in Singapore on Monday the 24th at 7:30 in the Sophia Room, and that's 7:30 am.

Just a bit of background information, the two principle questions being considered by the PDP working group are, first, whether it's desirable to translate contact information into a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

And, secondly, who should decide who should bear the burden of translating and transliterating contact information into a single common script? And for your reference, there are several links here to the working group charter, the Wiki page and the to the PDP issue report.

And now I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Mary Wong, who will talk to you about privacy and proxy services accreditation issues in the policy development process.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Julie. Hello everybody. My name is Mary Wong and I'm a Senior Policy Director in the Policy Team supporting primarily the GNSO. I work out of the US primarily but I am from Singapore. And in fact I'm speaking to you from Singapore and I'm looking forward, as we all are, to welcoming you to Singapore either face to face or remotely for the ICANN meeting that starts in just over a week's time.

So I'm privileged to speak to you today about a couple of PDPs and working groups that are ongoing in the GNSO starting with, as Julie said, privacy and proxy services and the accreditation.

Why is this important? Many of you who are on the call will be familiar with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, almost known as the RAA, and know that the latest newest form of the RAA was approved by the ICANN Board sometime last year.

In negotiating the RAA, that's between ICANN and the registrars, the community was involved in identifying a certain number of high and medium priority topics. And most of these were addressed in the negotiations and are in the RAA as approved by the Board in one form, shape or another. The single issue, however, that was identified as a fairly high priority and that wasn't addressed by the negotiations was that of the accreditation and the usage of privacy and proxy services.

Now many of you know, but just in case I'm just going to go quickly over what those mean. Essentially privacy and proxy services allow the masking, if you like, of either some or all of the contact details of a domain name holder in the globally accessible Whois database, which again as most of you know, is the gTLD domain name registration data directory that can be searched so that a user can find who is behind a domain name. And, as I mentioned, privacy and proxy services to different extents and using different means, cloak some of that information.

As part of the lead-up to this PDP the ICANN Board and staff committed to creating an accreditation program for providers of such services. And in the 2013 RAA you see a temporary specification that deals with some aspects of privacy and proxy registrations.

This temporary specification has the duration of either up to the 1st of January 2017 or when ICANN launches a accreditation program, whichever occurs earlier. So this working group is really working to a particular timeline. And so in October 2013 the GNSO Council chartered a working group to launch a PDP to address the policy issues concerning accreditation.

And if you look at the charter, which we'll link to in the next slide or two, you'll see a number of fairly specific substantive issues that the GNSO Council has asked this working group to address. And as you see in the slide, the working group has begun discussing these substantive issues.

And what might be interesting for folks who are not members of this working group is that firstly, like all other working groups, membership is open and participation is always welcome even if the working group has already begun its task.

But secondly, in Singapore the working group plans to conduct a face to face meeting. And in that respect I should mention that recently the working group did some outreach to other supporting organizations and advisory committees as well as the GNSO's own constituencies and stakeholder groups to seek input and feedback as well as suggestions on all of the substantive issues that are outlined in the charter.

And while feedback is coming in the working group will obviously welcome and face to face or remote feedback and input as well as discussion that you may care to provide during this meeting in Singapore.

As I mentioned, the current specification in the RAA is only a temporary one and the working group's work plan right now has the objective of producing initial report for public comment by early 2015.

One of the themes that you'll hear throughout the Webinar today and throughout the ICANN community and specifically in the PDP is that community input and feedback is extremely important to the work of these groups and to ICANN's multistakeholder model and besides participation in a working group that captures your interest the public comments that are open for reports, documents and so forth, are another important piece of this.

And I know one of my colleagues, Rob Hogarth, will speak more directly to this later on in this Webinar.

So with respect to this particular PDP working group on privacy and proxy accreditation, as I mentioned, a face to face meeting is planned and that is

currently scheduled for Thursday, the 27th of March in local time 9:00 am to 10:30 am.

I should note here that for this as well as all of the scheduled meetings please do check the latest schedule on the ICANN Singapore Meetings web site as meeting times and venues do change. There's also some further background information that might be helpful to some of you to familiarize yourself with both the background as well as the provisions of the RAA.

And, finally, the workspace for the working group has a copy of the charter as well as updates on the current issues being tackled by this working group.

The second project that I've been asked to speak on today relates to an outcome of a working group that completed its work fairly recently. And I'll explain what that means in a minute.

The specific issue at hand here is with regard to the access by international government organizations, or IGOs, as well as international nongovernmental organizations, or INGOs, to what are called curative rights protection mechanisms, which many in the community will know as the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, the UDRP, or the new Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure. And I do have a slide that highlights those.

The issue here really is at IGOs and INGOs currently cannot fully utilize either of these policies. Both of these policies were developed to address domain name disputes at the second level in both legacy as well as new gTLDs delegated under the new gTLD program in the case of the UDRP or in the case of the URS for the new gTLDs that are being delegated.

And there are a couple of reasons why it's difficult for IGOs and INGOs to use either or both of these processes. These reasons range from the jurisdictional problem for IGOs because of certain requirements in these policies that they believe might prejudice their sovereign immunity status.

And of course, as many people know, both these policies were developed with trademark protections in mind and while IGOs and INGOs may own trademark in their names and/or in their acronyms that isn't always the case. So, in other words, these two policies are not a great fit for these two types of organizations.

I mentioned earlier that there was a PDP relating to IGOs and INGOs that completed its work in late 2013. They came up with a number of consensus recommendations as to protections for IGOs and INGOs in top level domains, specifically in gTLDs.

One of those consensus recommendations related to the issue that I have just highlighted. And I should say at this point that in order for policy issues to be explored and recommendations developed for possible adoption a required proceeding step to these types of PDPs is an issue report that scopes out the issues and highlights certain background information as well as certain questions that could be tackled in a PDP. And this was requested by the GNSO Council on the recommendation of the IGO INGO Working Group that I mentioned a while ago.

Recent developments in this regard, the most important is that the preliminary issue report was published for public comment just earlier this week. And the comment period will remain open until at least the 14th of April. As I mentioned earlier, public comments is an important part of the multistakeholder model and process.

And so any public comments that are submitted will be taken into account in the preparation of the final issue report which will then be delivered to the GNSO Council who will then vote on whether or not to initiate a PDP on this particular issue. And that is expected probably some time around June perhaps around the time of the next ICANN meeting in London.

Here are some bullet points that list some further information. And, again, most importantly, a copy of the preliminary issue report you can get that at the link that's highlighted here in the first bullet point. And we look forward to your comments and feedback on this issue.

The final issue that I've been asked to speak on today is not about a PDP or actually even a working group. And I should explain at the outset, for those who are not familiar or not that familiar with GNSO working processes and procedures is that we've spoken to you about working groups being chartered by the GNSO Council.

More often than not, a drafting team consisting of community members, and they may or may not be just GNSO community members. In many cases they are community members from different parts of the ICANN community. They get together and form a drafting team to draft that charter for the working group and that charter is submitted to the GNSO Council, in this case, for its approval prior to the working group starting its work.

In this particular case the issue of importance is that, as many in the community will agree, there has been an increasingly well-recognized need for a coherent framework of operating principles to be adopted to enable the effective collaboration across the various ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The difficulty here, of course, is that each SO and AC has its own mission, scope and remit. And as some of you also know, operating procedures may defer, in some cases, fairly significantly across different SOs and ACs. This is not to say that there haven't been cross community working groups in the past. Some have been very successful.

I've just listed on this slide a couple here of the more recent ones that some of you may have been involved with. But the point here is that we don't

currently have an operating framework to govern either the formation or the operation or even the termination of these cross community working groups.

So in 2012 the GNSO took the initiative and created an initial draft framework and solicited feedback from other SOs and ACs. In 2013 a set of very detailed comments was received from the ccNSO that suggested clarifications in certain parts as well as additions and additional issues that may need to be considered in developing a final framework.

As a result, a drafting team co chaired by both the ccNSO and the GNSO was formed shortly after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. And this slide says that drafting team is working on a charter for a new working group.

I am happy to report that the drafting team had a meeting earlier today and is prepared to submit to both the ccNSO and GNSO councils a charter for that new working group to take forward both the initial GNSO work on this issue as well as the feedback provided by the ccNSO. So we look forward to the work of that working group and the development of the final general framework.

We therefore also look forward to your participation in this working group when it is formed. And so for further information, both on the background and how to get involved, here are some links to some information. The important part here is that there is also a meeting planned in Singapore that is probably going to be more of a community-led, community-based discussion on how that final framework could be crafted. And you're all very welcome to join and to spread the word to your respective communities.

So on that note I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Berry Cobb, who will speak on a different working group regarding data and metrics for policymaking. Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Mary. This is Berry Cobb. And I assist the policy team with mostly operational-type projects but on occasion such as this I do help manage the working groups as well.

Today I'll be talking to you about the Data and Metrics Reporting Working Group that has just started. This effort was originally titled the Uniformity of Reporting and it stems from a recommendation made from a previous non-PDP Working Group that was dealing with registration abuse policies and activities from that involved subsequent interactions with ICANN contractual compliance as well.

During that time, which was around 2009 and 2010, that working group recognized that there was a lack of available data that would have been useful in their deliberations and hence their recommendations.

This is important because it does allow the community to explore standard methods in data and metrics gathering that may better inform fact-based policy development and decision making within working groups.

It'll also allow for a review in how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and other service providers in the sharing of metrics and data that may also complement the policy development process.

Additionally, the working group deliberations and research within the working group is hoped to identify critical success factors and key performance indicators of recommendations produced by the working groups in their efforts to help better measure consensus policy implementation once adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

And note, again, that this effort is a non-PDP and as such changes to existing policy will not be recommended - or will not be recommendations from this group.

In terms of recent developments, as you can see by the green flags in the pictures that - with the slide, basically presented to signal start to this effort. The GNSO Council approved the working group's charter at their meeting in January of 2014. And since then the working group has conducted two meetings after a couple of calls for volunteers.

The important fact about the call of volunteers was that we had a very large influx of new volunteers and our participation is well over 25 members; most of them which reside outside of the US so we're very excited about that as well many of these members being new to the working group process and the policy development process.

And what we uncovered in terms of our introductions in kicking off the working group is - it was revealed that many of our members do have a strong background and experience with data and metrics so we're really looking forward to moving this issue forward and deliberation.

Some of the tasks that the working group will perform, this is not an exhaustive list but these are some of the primary tasks; first and foremost, the working group will try to baseline current practices and capabilities of reports - reporting and metrics that are available and for use within working group efforts.

Then we'll also evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced that particular process. We'll also - pardon me - we'll also look at reviewing and suggesting possible modifications to existing work product templates which provide inputs and produce outputs of working group efforts. Such templates would be charters that start a working group, issue reports that kick off whether a working group is started or not as well as initial and final report.

Additionally, research of external data sources that may also benefit the policy process such as abuse statistics of DNS industry-related data and

define a possible framework and how that may be accessed and/or requested.

In terms of next steps, like many of the other groups previous to this we will be meeting our first time face to face in Singapore. That's scheduled - that session is scheduled for Thursday the 27th at 0800 hours local time. I suspect that that schedule will probably remain intact and we look forward to your participation there.

And then of course after the Singapore meeting the working group will resume its regularly scheduled meetings. We usually meet on a weekly basis. From there we'll reach out to SOs and ACs for their input based on a series of questions that are derived from our charter and some of the working group research at which we'll look to create an initial report and submit that for public comments out to the community for feedback as we move through the working group process.

And lastly, you can find a little bit of information about the working group effort on the GNSO web site. From there I'm going to turn it over to Marika and she'll continue to brief you on other projects ongoing. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Berry. So this is Marika again. I think that the previous update should have given you a good overview of some of the projects and topics that the GNSO will review and discuss during its meeting in Singapore.

And I'll just briefly take you through some of the projects that you may have wondered about why they weren't covered in the previous section. But due to time limitations, unfortunately we can't cover everything the GNSO is working on so I'll just briefly touch upon some of the other projects that are still ongoing or have reached a stage where, you know, they're moving on into other directions, you know, within the GNSO's remit.

So the first project I wanted to briefly mention is the Whois study. Basically a couple - or a number of Whois studies were commissioned by the GNSO Council dating back to 2010 and 2011. We actually now reached a stage that, you know, we're about to publish the final two reports of - for those studies which basically means that, you know, this project has completed.

So now the moment has arrived for the GNSO to actually review, you know, what has come out of these studies and what, if any, steps need to be taken next.

It's probably worth mentioning as well that several of these studies are already actively informing some of the ongoing efforts, you know, both in the GNSO as well as outside of the GNSO such as the, you know, Proxy and Privacy Service Accreditation Issues Working Group that Mary spoke about before. So this will also be covered during the GNSO weekend session, for example.

So another initiative that's ongoing is focusing on policy and implementation. This has been a hot topic I think across the ICANN community for a while now and the GNSO basically has taken it on to look at this issue from the perspective of GNSO policy development and is addressing some specific issues dealing with, you know, what its policy?

Where does implementation start? How do you deal with questions that may arise as part of the implementation process that are deemed to be policy? What is the role of implementation review teams and how should these work? So the working group is already - has started awhile back in August of last year and has spent a lot of time developing working definitions and working principles that they're now in the process of completing which are expected to underpin their deliberations.

And they are looking forward to engaging with the community on those and receiving feedback on those at the face to face meeting that they have

scheduled in Singapore on Wednesday the 26th of March. So if you're interested in that topic please feel free to come along.

Then briefly mentioning as well, two projects that have actually recently, you know, completed at least from a GNSO perspective by the adoption of the recommendations by the GNSO Council, now as well the ICANN Board.

The first one being the Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings. That work completed a little while back and basically has developed recommendations that are intended to clarify and standardize the process that needs to be used when a domain name is subject to UDRP proceedings. So that project is currently in implementation phase. An implementation review team has been formed and is working actively with staff on reviewing the proposed implementation language for that.

The second project that has been recently - or the recommendations of which have recently been adopted by the ICANN Board is thick Whois. Basically the Board adopted the recommendations that all gTLD registries should under a thick Whois model in which, you know, both sets of data, those related to the domain name and registrants, are managed by or held by the registry provider.

So the Board adopted those recommendations in February of this year. And, again, here an implementation review team has been formed that will be working with the staff on developing and reviewing the implementation plan.

Work has already actively started on a legal review which was one of the recommendations of the PDP working group that should look into whether there are any implications that haven't been foreseen at this stage in relation to the transition from a thin to a thick Whois model.

And then last but not least just to mention, because I know there's a lot of interest in this topic, the purpose of gTLD registration data. And as many of

you may know this is closely linked, as well, to the work of the Expert Working Group that was created at the same time as the Board requested an issue report on this topic.

So but basically this is a policy development process that's currently in the holding dock and awaiting the finalization of the recommendations by the Expert Working Group on this topic. So once that happens, as far as I'm aware, I think the expected date for that is by the ICANN meeting at London which is in June of this year. Then this PDP will continue and look at this topic and see what, you know, recommendations should be made in this regard.

There are several discussions in Singapore focusing on this topic so if you're interested in this topic, you know, have a look at the ICANN schedule and you should be able to find those meetings relatively easily.

Just basically concluding on this section, just to mention as well, and I think as others already done as well, all GNSO working groups are typically open for anyone interested to participate so if you're interested to join any of these efforts come either to one of the face to face meetings in Singapore or look at the working group's wiki to obtain further information about, you know, what they're focusing on and how you're able to join.

So with that I'll hand it over to Bart. And if there are any questions please feel free to post those in the Chat and we'll do our best to answer those or you can ask them at the end of the call and they'll open all the lines. Over to you, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. So I'll change the tone of the Webinar I'll go into some of the details of the meeting of the ccNSO in Singapore. I will touch upon some of the issues that are being discussed in the ccNSO or so by the ccTLD community and particularly those that will have a connection with other SOs and ACs as well. So I will touch upon - a little bit on the framework for the use

of country names. This will be a new cross community working group and the other SOs and ACs have been invited to participate in that one.

A little bit on the universal acceptance panel discussion, which is organized by ICANN staff but sponsored by the joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group and then the discussions within the ccNSO on Internet governance and touch upon, finally, on other topics.

So the first topic is the framework for the use of country and territory names. The At Large GNSO and Governmental Advisory Committee have been invited to participate in a cross community working group to develop a framework on the use of country and territory names across different policies.

So what is such a framework and what is it background? Before this working group the ccNSO had created a study - a study group with participation, again, from - and observers from other SOs and ACs. The recommendations of this study group that were based on that work and it's included a review of the status of country and territory names and how they're used in the different policies so the GNSO and ccNSO polices.

Based on that result the study group advised the Council to undertake more work to advise and develop on a harmonized definitional framework. The study group noted that across the different policies country and territory names are defined differently.

So as said it's the implementation of recommendations of the study group and it's an invite to other SOs and ACs and hopefully by the Singapore meeting there will be a full discussion on the charter and on participation.

A second recommendation of the study group and which will be requested by the ccNSO Council once the new working group has been established is to extend the current rule in the Applicant Guidebook on the use of country and

territory names as new gTLDs until this new working group provides its final report.

The second topic I want to touch upon was universal acceptance. As some of you will know, the joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group has produced a final report with some recommendations on universal acceptance. And the ccNSO and GNSO Council have submitted this report to the ICANN Board of Directors.

At the same time ICANN has re launched its universal acceptance project and as a result there will be a panel discussion in Singapore on Monday afternoon from quarter past 3 until quarter to 5 on issues pertaining to universal acceptance of new TLDs so both new gTLDs, IDN gTLDs and ASCII TLDs and IDN ccTLDs.

The panel will include representatives from TLDs, both with ccTLD and gTLD, a representative from the user community and two industry - at least two industry representatives. And the focus of the panel is in fact to define and develop a plan for the role of ICANN and in order to enhance the collaboration and coordination of communities.

And note, communities in this context doesn't mean the ICANN - across the community but across the ICANN application development community so the technical community outside of ICANN.

The third topic I want to touch upon briefly was the input of the ccNSO on Internet governance and what the ccNSO has done and some of the sessions regarding Internet governance at the ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday.

The first thing is that the ccNSO Council has created an ad hoc group to provide a comprehensive overview of all the issues and discussions to the ccTLD community on Internet governance across the different fora. As said,

across the different fora, that includes 1net, NETmundial, iSTAR community and all the ICANN strategy panels and the high level panel.

At the Buenos Aires meeting the Council already recognized the need to keep track of these developments in the various Internet governance tracks and to inform the ccTLD community.

And the reason was that as some of you will have seen as well, there is a high variety of these panels, and secondly - and this is particularly for the ccTLD community, some of the ccTLD community, including ccNSO members, do not have the capacity to follow what's going on in these Internet governance fora. And so this was perceived as a service for those ccTLDs and ccNSO members.

If you look at the ccNSO sessions in Singapore the ccNSO will have three sessions on Internet governance. One is focused on the Internet governance in the Asia Pacific region both locally, so that means in countries and territories and regionally so the Asian Pacific region as well. So this is just to share the information and what's going on in the Asian Pacific region with members and ccTLD operators from other regions.

The second topic on the agenda will be updates on ICANN's role in Internet governance. And, again, this is to provide an overview to the ccTLD community present of the interconnectedness and the remit of all these different ICANN panels and the President Globalization advisory groups.

And finally, there will be the traditional panel discussion on Wednesday afternoon focusing on an area that's of particular interest to the ccTLD community and that is the globalization of the IANA function. For this panel the ccNSO has invited representative of other main users of the IANA function so an RAR representative of the RARs and of the IETF and IAB and there will be other panelists as well at that meeting.

Some other topics that will be discussed in Singapore is the progress to date of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. Again, this is related to the IANA function. The working group is now focusing on a glossary in order to harmonize the terminology used with regard to the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs and hope to complete its work in Singapore and inform the ccTLD community present where they are.

And secondly is a report from the Incident Response Working Group. This is a working group focusing on creating a context details repository in case of incident that affect the stability and security of the DNS at a global level.

This working group had sent out a survey just after the Buenos Aires meeting and they will present the results of the survey. And one interesting aspect there, again, is that the ccTLD who responded recognize the added value but there may be some issues around funding so that needs to be resolved and discussed by the community present.

Finally, some further information which you can find here. And I now want to hand over to my colleague, Barbara.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you, Bart. I'm going to give a brief introduction to some ASO policy issues and the Root Server System Advisory Committee. The ASO Address Council has completely formed for 2014. The way that this works is they have three people from each region and one person out of those three is selected by the RAR directors; the other two are selected by the membership of the RAR in that region.

The ASO will not be meeting formally at ICANN 49 but several of the ASO AC members will be there. Additionally, many of the NRO Executive Committee members will be in Singapore. And they have scheduled to have their face to face, their annual face to face meeting, at ICANN 50 in London and we look forward to hosting them there.

Their activities in Singapore are going to be fairly standard. They're going to meet with the ICANN Board. They're going to have other meetings during the week including a meeting with the At Large Committee.

Some news that's happened since the last presentation of the policy Webinar is that the NRO announced this 2-byte autonomous system number pool nearing depletion. This is a very fairly technical issue. And all of the RARs have already addressed this by adopting a 4-byte AS number pool and have mechanisms for allowing people to transfer over.

The RSAC, Root Server System Advisory Committee, will in fact be meeting in Singapore. They are in the middle of their restructure and they're expected to approve the new operational procedures during the upcoming meeting. This includes formation of what is called the Caucus, which will be a much larger group of participants than the current RSAC Executive Committee.

This is the first time that the RSAC is convening at an ICANN meeting since the very first ICANN meeting which was also held in Singapore. And they're planning on doing a public session on Monday that will be about 45 minutes long and will just include an update on their activities and perhaps some discussions of issues that are of importance at the root server level of the DNS.

They have meetings with the Board, with several of the other advisory committees and are open to having other meetings throughout the week as well.

Steve, I'd like to hand it over to you now.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Barb. My colleague Julie and I would like to provide you an update of the SSAC activities since Buenos Aires. The SSAC has recently released two reports, SAC 64 and 65, for community consideration. And these reports will be discussed in the Singapore meeting. I will provide a

quick overview of these reports and invite you to participate in those discussions in Singapore.

Now the SAC 64 called SSAC Advisory on DNS Search List Processing. Search list is a feature that allows the user to enter a partial or shortened domain name in application with the operating system expanding the name through entries in the list. We call it the Search List.

So for example, if a operating system set a search list called, you know, with some domain, 1.com and some domain 2.com and the user types system in her browser's address box the operating system, you know, will try system.somedomain1.com, system.somedomain2.com and system in some order.

This is widely implemented in pretty much every application of every operating system and in many applications. So the issue here it was - it is first - it is loosely specified in RFCs 1034, 1035 and 1535. However, as the Internet grow the application, for example, the browsers and mail clients, and the DNS resolve library's process search lists differently.

In some of these cases it leads to security and stability concerns. For example, some of these behaviors, you know, presents privacy issues for end systems in terms of queries unintended query leakage to the, you know, open DNS.

It can leads to performance problems for the Internet. Some of this is documented in SAC 45. And finally, and more importantly, it might cause collisions with names provisioned under the newly delegated top level domains.

So with this as a background in SAC 64 the SSAC examines how current operating systems and applications process search lists. There is an empirical test done by the SSAC on this.

It also highlights the security and stability implications with some of these behaviors. And finally, propose a straw man for the community to consider to improve search list processing and bring more standardization in this area. This report is available on line and will be discussed in the Singapore meeting. Invite you to participate in those discussions.

The second advisory the SSAC issued is an advisory on the distributed denial service attacks leveraging the DNS infrastructure. The background here is contemporary feed off attacks use DNS reflection and implication techniques to achieve an attack data bit rate (reportingly) exceeding 300 gigabytes per second; in many of these cases well exceeding the victim's network capability.

Underlying many of these attacks is a technique called "packet level source address forgery" or spoofing which essentially works the following way. An attacker generates and transmits UTP packets purporting to be from the victim's IP address. So in other sense the attacker spoofed the IP address.

And it uses a query and response protocol, for example, the DNS, to reflect and amplify responses to achieve the attack. And DNS is especially suitable for such an attack because it's UTP based and also the query size is relatively small but the response size is large so it's suitable for such attacks.

This is an important issue because the SSAC wrote an advisory back in the early 2000s, SAC 04, on this topic. Over 10 years not much progress has been made in this area. Essentially critically basic controls for network access and DNS security have not been as widely implemented as it is necessary to maintain and grow a resilient Internet.

And coupled with that lack of adoption of basic controls with an increasingly higher speed Internet connections. For example, we have files, we have, you know, cable, with increasing higher speed combined with the growing power

of individuals end user devices. This is, as a result, is an extraordinary capacity for conducting extremely large scale denial service attacks using the unsecured DNS infrastructure.

So in SAC 65 the SSAC explored these issues and recommends ICANN and operators of the Internet infrastructure and also manufacturers take specific actions to address this issue. These two reports will be - is available online and will be discussed in Singapore. We invite you to read these reports and participate in the discussion.

Next, I'll hand over to my colleague, Julie, to talk about some of the SSAC activities. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve. This is Julie Hedlund. And just a little bit on some of the SSAC works in progress. We have work party on identifier abuse metrics; one on public suffix lists; we have a work party that is conducting outreach to law enforcement representatives and they'll be meeting with those representatives in Singapore. And we have a work party that is coordinating the SSAC workshop at the 2014 Internet Governance Forum. And here is a link where you can find the SSAC reports.

And then a little bit of information on the SSAC and related events in Singapore. There is an SSAC public meeting on Thursday the 27th from 8:00 to 9:00 local time. There is a DNSSEC session for everybody, a beginner's guide, that is on Monday the 24th at 5:00 pm to 6:30. And the DNSSEC workshop on Wednesday the 26th from 8:30 am to 2:45 pm.

And now I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Olof Nordling. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Julie. And hello everybody. My name is Olof Nordling and I support the Governmental Advisory Committee, commonly known as the GAC.

And a few words of introduction, first of all, the committee already has 131 governments as members and 30 IGOs, intergovernmental organizations, as observers. These numbers are increasing so we expect a few more to be announced in Singapore.

The GAC usually meets face to face at - only at ICANN meetings but they perform work intercessionally with remote means, telephone conferences and email and in working groups.

And the role of the GAC is to provide advice to the ICANN Board on public policy matters or rather public policy aspects on any matter which may occur. So what are they up to in Singapore? Well in recent years much of the bandwidth of GAC has been absorbed by advice regarding the new gTLD program.

And there are still a few matters to conclude on in that regard notably assessment of the Board's responses to the most recent advice provided by the GAC in Buenos Aires and also a few other detailed matters like the protection of national names of the Red Cross Red Crescent organization.

But we're looking forward to becoming more proactive and concentrate on producing advice for future rounds. And there's already work underway regarding such advice on geographical names and the handling of those for future rounds. But there is a lot more to say, of course, and a lot more of - for them to address.

In particular, like Bart has mentioned, the Framework of the Interpretation Working Group outcomes and discussions, matters related to the Whois including privacy and proxy aspects and the Expert Working Group which also have been mentioned by other colleagues.

And one of the big themes - one of the themes for the meeting is the ATRT 2 recommendations of which quite a few address the GAC. And that calls for a little more work of introspective nature within the GAC because there is also, in parallel, a working group on working methods.

And as Marika mentioned, there is a joint consultation group with the GNSO to improve cooperation between GNSO and the GAC and early engagement of GAC in the policy development processes.

And also there are important matters to prepare for the upcoming London meeting including a high level meeting to take place there under the auspices of the UK government.

So just briefings and discussions on the big themes for Singapore like strategy and Internet governance so they really have a very full agenda in Singapore from Saturday afternoon until Thursday mid day.

And most sessions, really most sessions with the exception of two, are open so you're very welcome to join and enjoy the debates within the GAC or during the open sessions and enjoy them in the six UN languages plus Portuguese.

The meeting room is Collyer and with that you are warmly welcome to join in and listen to. And with that I'd hand over to Heidi Ulrich for - to tell the story about the ALAC. Heidi, the floor is yours.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much, Olof. Hi, everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich and I'm the Senior Director for At Large. And just continuing on the theme of enjoyment I'm going to be walking you through some of the policy and process highlights or hot topics for the ALAC and the At Large community as well as activities in Singapore.

So to begin with the policy highlights, in terms of policy advice development the ALAC produced 16 policy device statements between the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires in early March and two of those statements that I'd like to highlight.

The first is the ALAC statement on ICANN's draft revision mission and focus areas for a five-year strategic plan. And here the ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated in the report and strongly supports the process.

However, the ALAC stated that it prefers the issues of trust and security be stressed in all focus area of the report. And the ALAC also suggested that to reach the required level of trust and to make the internationalization of ICANN meaningful the ALAC believes that the IANA function should be internationalized as well.

The second statement I'd like to highlight is the ALAC statement on the ATRT 2. And, again, the ALAC supports the recommendations within the report and urge the Board to adopt the recommended strategic priorities. However they also advise the ICANN Board to place equal emphasis on the recommendations and observations within the report as well as for future reviews to ensure that the - there's efficient time for a thorough and effective assessment.

And the second policy hot area is that the ALAC will shortly be issuing a public comment on the concept of public advisory boards or PABs. And here' the ALAC joins other members of the ICANN community in supporting that the PAB model as an effective implementable and necessary solution to many of the trust issues that have been raised related to the new gTLDs.

And the ALAC is of the view that PABs are able to address what are perceived to be substantial public interest efficiencies in the current implementation of ICANN's gTLD expansion.

Then moving on to three hot topics that they would like to be discussing during the Singapore meeting, the first is the gTLD expansion and public interest and the ALAC will be focusing on whether the rollout of new...

David Olive: I'm sorry, we lost Heidi. She's calling right back. One moment please. We will now turn to Rob Hogarth as we try to reconnect Heidi. Rob, would you please go forward?

Rob Hogarth: Sure, thanks a lot, David. I appreciate it. Hi, everybody. Good day. My name is Rob Hogarth. And I'm ICANN's Senior Director of Policy and Community Engagement. I hope you all can hear me okay. I'm using an ICANN VoIP bridge so I always cross my fingers when that happens.

I'm usually located in Washington DC in our office there but today I'm speaking to you from ICANN's hub office here in Los Angeles, California. I hope during today's Webinar so far my policy colleagues have reinforced for you the collective commitment that we all have to supporting your work at ICANN and each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

There's a reason that our team is called Policy Development Support, and there's quite a lot going on, as you can see. As I reported to many of you back at the time of the Buenos Aires meeting, the staff has been working to develop a new team to coordinate efforts across the entire ICANN staff to improve collaboration and to maximize the collective work of all the SOs and ACs.

And so the purpose of my brief remarks here at the end of today's webinar is really to offer you an update about that initiative. The magic word in the job description of the three members of our new team is, quote, community engagement unquote.

But Carlos, Benedetta and I have already found ourselves substituting the words "effectiveness" or "enablement" when we talk with fellow staff or some of you community members.

And that's because the goal of our team is really to identify opportunities to maximize the effectiveness and the efficiency of our most important community assets and that's you. It's our community members and the time and the commitment you all bring to ICANN's work and to ICANN's mission.

So what I'd like to do today is tell you a little bit about our initial efforts. Essentially what we've been doing is focusing on identifying those areas where, one, we can have the quickest impact; two, where we've been told that there are major problem areas; or, three, where there's been specific formal direction or advise to make changes or improvements.

And so as you see on the slide before you we've got six major efforts that we've begun some initial work on and we hope through collaboration with all of you we'll be able to add others.

The first one on the list is to manage the public comment forums. And this is a duty we took on about six weeks ago where we're basically running the public comment forum space on the ICANN.org web page on a daily basis and looking longer-term at what improvements we can make either based on the ATRT 2 implementation recommendations or other feedback that we're getting from all of you as you use the public comment forums. And so that's going to be a major area that we're going to continue to focus resources on.

A related piece to that is the recognition that a number of us have that public comment forums are just one channel of community input or advice to ICANN.

And one of the things that we're going to be embarking on after the meeting in Singapore is to really look comprehensively at all those various channels

whether those be, you know, the public meetings themselves, feedback through chats and Webinars, actual sessions at ICANN public meetings, surveys that the community working groups or that staff circulate to the rest of the community.

It can also include advice to the Board formally from SOs and ACs. You get the picture there are many different channels. And up to now we've really not looked at that area in a truly comprehensive way. And so that's going to be an area of focus that we're really going to be looking to many of you for input and perspective on.

Another area that folks have identified for us and that we've observed is that many people do a lot of tremendous work at no cost to ICANN but at tremendous personal costs; lost sleep, travel, missing time with families. And we're looking to really expand and do a better job in a programmatic way to manage our volunteer recognition efforts.

And, you know, this includes some of the concepts that you've heard recently from Steve Crocker and Fadi Chehade with respect to like the leadership award, the recent public comment opportunity that was out about the multistakeholder ethos award; recognizing people who really go above and beyond the call of duty but at the same time also finding ways to really support the continued and ongoing really selfless work that many of our community participants and leaders engage in, another area that we'll be looking to all of you for input, feedback, nominations and other information about.

Something that a number of us observed too is that it's really important for us to focus on a comprehensive look at what the in kind administrative support or secretariat support that's offered across the various SOs and ACs, different people have different understandings or perceptions.

There are occasions where people say, "Gee, that group is getting this amount of support. That group's getting that amount of support. It doesn't seem equal. It doesn't seem fair. It doesn't seem to be consistent."

And this is a really important area for us to look at particularly as we're seeing increased activity almost across the board in all the different groups, in particular areas where we're seeing many, many more people coming into the ICANN arena, into the ICANN community. And it's very important for us to be able to scale the great support that our secretariats and admin teams already provide and not only to be able to maintain that but to increase that where we can.

A part of that is the fifth bullet on our list there which is to help coordinate the assessment of the FY '15 community budget request. We received 46 separate requests from various communities, the various SOs and ACs asking for additional support either that they have not had before or to continue or consider additional pilot efforts and programs. So we're doing what we can to coordinate with the Finance team, the Global Stakeholder Engagement team in those areas.

And then finally, in some operational areas existing right now we're working with the GSE team to help manage some of the newer activities that have been introduced. For example, the community regional outreach pilot program; something that was a collaborative effort that a number of different people both on staff and the community contributed to and something that we hope will have much longer legs and much more benefits for the community long-term.

So that's just a brief overview. I look forward to the opportunity to see many of you in Singapore. Been chatting with some of you in the Adobe Connect room and I'm excited that you're going to be there.

I hope that over the course of the next year we'll really have many opportunities to continue to improve on the support that we currently offer and really work hard to fill in a lot of the gaps that many of you have identified for us.

So please, whether it's in Singapore or on the telephone or just reaching out individually to me, to Carlos, to Benedetta, we really look forward to collaborating with you on new and better ways to get your work done. So now I think, David, I'll pass the baton back to Heidi to let her finish her description of activities in Singapore for the At Large community. Thanks a lot.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, Rob. And this is Heidi Ulrich again and many apologies for my line having dropped midway through my presentation. So just a very brief recap. The ALAC produced 16 policy advice statements between the Buenos Aires meeting and Singapore. And the ALAC will be issuing a public comment on the concept of public advisory boards shortly. In terms of...

END