TRANSCRIPT

Pre-Beijing Policy Update Webinar

Thursday 21 March 2013 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Pre-Beijing Policy Update Webinar call on the Thursday 21 Match 2013 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-update-webinar-1200-20130321-en.mp3

on page:

http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar

And presentation:

http://www.icann.org/en/resources/policy/presentations

David Olive: e'll begin very shortly. Again let me welcome everyone to our policy update Webinar. My name is David Olive.

I'm Vice President for Policy Development Support. And we're here with the policy team members to provide an update on the policy development issues before us at the ICANN meeting in Beijing.

But I would like to turn the floor over to my colleague, Dr. Steve Sheng, who will provide a greeting to those Chinese language speakers on the call and who will be looking at this recording in the next few days. Dr. Sheng.

Steve Sheng: Thank you David. ((Chinese Spoken 00:00:56-0:01:54)). David back to you.

David Olive: Thank you very much Steve and thank you to our friends and soon hosts of the Beijing meeting who will be listening to our Webinar in the Chinese language.

We thank you very much. As Steve pointed out in his introduction we will be muting the lines and unmuting them to allow questions. We will change the format somewhat by having questions at the end of each section dealing with the various Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees so that you, the participants, can ask questions at that time.

And also you can put questions in the chat area and we will answer them as soon as we can with the many team members on this call. So again I thank you and welcome.

I wanted to show this one graphic that we have on our ICANN Web site talking about the various communities who participate in the ICANN activities and policy development activities in particular.

And that's what we'll focus on today: the activities of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as they make recommendations on policies for the DNS to our Board of Directors.

And in that regard policy recommendations are formed and refined by the ICANN community through the Supporting Organizations and influenced by Advisory Committees.

All the Working Groups and activities are comprised of volunteers from many, many countries in a bottom up and open and transparent process. Each Supporting Organization, the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ASO in this regard have their own process for conducting policy development and these are found in our ICANN Bylaws.

There are of course other advice given to the Board from these Advisory Committees listed here: At-Large, Security and Stability, the Root Server System Advisors and the Government Advisory Committee.

And they also provide information, comments and advice to our Board of Directors. Of course our ICANN stakeholders include companies that offer domain names to the public, companies that operate top-level domain registries, Internet service providers, intellectual property interests, business users, non-commercial users, academics, non-governmental organizations, nonprofits and consumer advocates and individual Internet users as well as governments.

All these are part of our ICANN community. The goals for this session are to update you on work in policy development, to review the issues that will be discussed at our Beijing meeting, to inform you of how to participate or provide input into these processes and to answer any questions you may have.

Topics covered are here in the Generic Names Supporting Organization for the Country Code Supporting Organization, some of their activities, the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Address Supporting Organization to name a few.

And I'll now quickly turn it over to our policy experts to talk about the current issues being discussed in the GNSO. These are among them. I now turn it over to Marika Konings, our Senior Policy Director, to continue the Webinar. Marika?

Marika Konings: Thank you very much David. Hello everyone. And so as David said my name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director and a Team Leader for the GNSO.

So in this first set of topics we're looking at some of the policy initiatives that are currently being worked on in the Generic Names Supporting Organization, or also known as the GNSO.

We currently have over 15 projects underway but unfortunately we don't have time to go into detail into all of these. So what we've done is actually focused on those projects that are either considered a high priority by the community, and where there is an immediate opportunity to provide input on proposed recommendations or reports.

So in addition at the end of this section we'll provide you with a short overview of some of the other projects for which there will be an opportunity to either participate in a session in Beijing if you're interested to learn more or get involved, or where you can expect possible next steps to be initiated.

So now let's first look at policy development process, or also known as a PDP, that addresses the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

So following the issue report on the current state of the UDRP, which was published a while back, the GNSO Council decided to initiate a policy development process on this specific topic only, as a more extensive review of the UDRP is scheduled to take place at a later point in time.

Currently there is no requirement to actually lock a domain name in the period between the filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of proceedings.

The UDRP itself only refers to maintaining status quo, but it actually does not define what this means or at what point in time status quo should be maintained.

So this has resulted in different interpretations and practices by Registrars, which has resulted in confusion, lack of clarity for Registrars, UDRP providers as well as complainants and Registrants.

So in order to help its - and to help inform deliberations, and this is also one of the tasks assigned to the Working Group as part of its charter, the Working Group went out to obtain additional information on this subject.

So they started off by conducting a survey in which they asked Registrars as well as UDRP providers about their existing practices as well as experiences. The feedback that was received clearly indicated that currently there is no standard approach in relation to the locking of a domain name by none of the parties involved.

So in addition to that the Working Group also reached out to the different ICANN stakeholders as well as the broader ICANN community to obtain further input and the charter questions that it had been asked to address through means of our public comment forum and requesting direct input from the different SOs, the Supporting Organizations, and Advisory Committees as well as the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and constituencies.

So as a result now of all that feedback received, the review of that information and continued Working Group discussions, the Working Group has now published its initial report for public comments.

So the initial report itself is in addition to information on the background of the issue, the input that has been received, information on the Working Group deliberations and considerations, the Working Group - the report itself contains 11 preliminary recommendations, which the Working Group expects would hopefully clarify as well as standardize the process that is to be followed in the case of a UDRP proceeding with regard to locking.

So first of all it actually includes a proposed definition of locking, a term that is currently not defined or even mentioned in the UDRP or the UDRP rules. So in this context it's proposed by the Working Group that locking should mean the preventing of any changes of Registrar and Registrant without impairing the resolution of the domain name.

And just a short note there - the last part of this sentence actually - something the Working Group is considering and looking for input on whether to actually maintain that or not, and they will further consider that in the second part of the deliberations.

So in addition the Working Group proposes that a Registrar is required to prevent any changes of Registrar and Registrant within two business days of receiving a verification request from the UDRP provider.

And one of the few proposed changes to the UDRP rules - it may be worth pointing out that most of the other recommendations are actually clarification of the existing rules and policy or clarifications of existing practices.

So the one change that is suggested to the UDRP rules is to remove the existing requirement for the complainant to send a copy of the complaint to the respondent at the time of filing, as this is associated with an increased risk of cyber flight.

So all the recommendations together aim to provide a step-by-step process on what needs to happen when a UDRP complaint has been filed, and what the responsibilities are of the different parties involved.

So in addition the Working Group proposes that if and - or when these recommendations are adopted, accompanying educational materials are developed to ensure that all affected parties are aware and appreciate what the new requirements are that would need to be met.

So as I said before this report has now been published for public comment and comments can be submitted until the 26th of April, followed by a reply period.

You see here on the screen the link where you can find further information, including the public comments forum itself as well as the report. The Working Group is also organizing a session in Beijing on Thursday the 11th of April from 9:00 to 10:30 Local Time, during which there will be an opportunity to ask questions or provide further input to the Working Group so that can be taken into consideration as the Working Group continues its deliberations.

So once the public comments forum closes the Working Group will resume its deliberations and review the input received and develop its final report for submission to the GNSO Council.

So another policy development process that has recently kicked off deals with the purpose of gTLD registration data, which is currently also referred to as WHOIS.

So as many of you probably know WHOIS was created in the early 1980s as a mechanism to contact those responsible for operating a network resource on the Internet.

However since then WHOIS has been used for many additional reasons and we've also seen in the meantime introduction of other scripts on the Internet. A few changes have actually been made to the underlying protocol or the services using this protocol.

Of course it not necessarily the result of not trying, because I think many of you know or have been involved in the many efforts that have been undertaken in addressing some of these challenges.

But as a result of the many aspects and different perspectives involved in this conversation, no agreement has been reached to date on how to deal with issues such as data accuracy, reliability, accessibility, privacy and readability.

So recognizing the importance of addressing these issues also inspired by the recommendations of the WHOIS Review Team, the ICANN Board requested an issue report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data.

And so requesting an issue report is the first step of a GNSO policy development process. In parallel to this request for the issue report the Board also directed the creation of an expert Working Group to look into these issues.

The recommendations of this expert Working Group are expected to feed into the final issue report and help inform the PDP deliberations that will follow. And so the expert Working Group has already been formed and has started deliberations, and at the same time we've now also published the preliminary issue report for public comments.

So the preliminary issue report itself provides an overview of the background on this topic as well as the many previews as well as recent initiatives that have been undertaken in relation to this issue, and which we expect will help inform the PDP deliberations.

And the report also includes a Staff recommendation, which confirms that this topic is considered to be within scope of ICANN and the GNSO Policy Development Process, and recommends taking into account the importance of this topic that the PDP proceeds.

So public comments can be submitted until the 19th of April followed by a reply period. And as mentioned before the final issue report is expected to be published following the finalization of the expert Working Group recommendations so that these can be included in the final issue report and be considered as part of the PDP as it moves forward.

And so with that I would like to hand it over to my colleague Avri if she's on the line, or Brian are you covering these slides?

Steve Sheng: Marika I can cover this - these slides.

Marika Konings: Oh sorry. Steve. So we go back to Steve Sheng. Thank you very much. Steve over to you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you. I'll give a brief update on the WHOIS studies. As you will recall these studies are requested by the GNSO Council in 2009 to provide more fact to guide the policy making.

And I'm here to update three studies. So the first study focused on the misuse of the registration data. It examines the extent to which the public WHOIS data in gTLD domains are misused for example, you know, by phishing, by spam.

It's currently done by the Carnegie Mellon University in its last stage with the final draft report due to be published in April 2013. The next study is also looking at abuse but with particular focus on the privacy and proxy services.

So the hypothesis or the rationale is to examine the extent to which these gTLD domain names used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via privacy or proxy services.

And so the assumption is that this miscreant use privacy and proxy service to obscure their identity, making it harder to find. The National Physical Laboratory in the UK is performing this study and the result is expected in mid-2003.

The next study is called the WHOIS Registrant Identification Study. This - the purpose of this study is to classify entities that register a gTLD domains and compare the data with Internet content for the registered domain names.

So the underlying difference here is today you can register a domain name as a legal person or as a natural person, and depending whether you're a legal person or a natural person, you know, the privacy and the access rights might be different.

So the goal is to find out how many of those. This study is conducted by the National Opinion Research Council at the University of Chicago. They have released a report.

So according to a report the key finding is 39% appear to be registered by legal persons, 33% appear to be registered by natural persons, 20% were registered using a privacy or proxy service so those are the rough breakdowns: 39%, 33% and 20%.

There are 8% unable to classify. The other finding is roughly 45% to 57%, you know, within the competence interval of all those sample domains were perceived to have potential commercial activity.

You know, that also depends on, you know, whether pay per click sites were included because a lot of the sites are - some of those sites are also serving as - were just pay per click advertisements.

And finally the newer study shows that knowing the domain has potential commercial activity does not provide additional insight as to the Registrant type or the WHOIS address of the Registrant.

So it's not a very useful predictor, you know, that variable. So those are the findings. We encourage you to view the report online on that. With that I'll pass this to my colleague Brian to talk about Red Cross, IOC and IGO names. Brian?

Brian Peck: Thank you very much Steve. Hello everyone. My name is Brian Peck and I'm a Policy Director with the ICANN Policy Staff. We - I'm going to briefly give an update with regard to the work being done on considering the special protections for the names of the Red Cross, International Olympic Committee and other international government organization names that is taking place within the GNSO.

The GNSO Council initiated a PDP last November to determine whether special protections should be provided to prevent the registration of domain names using either the Red Cross, Red Crescent, IOC or IOGO names in all gTLDs at both the top and/or second level.

And that PDP is still ongoing and indeed there will be a session in Beijing. In the interim the ICANN Board has adopted certain measures to protect these organization names.

Specifically with regard to the Red Cross, Red Crescent and IOC names those organization names are now on a reserved names list in the new gTLD Registry Agreements, which basically prohibits the registration of such names at the second level of the first round of new gTLDs.

With regards to IGO names the Government Advisory Committee, or GAC, and the IGOs are currently collaborating to determine a list of organizations that would qualify to be placed on that same reserved names list in the new gTLD Agreements.

And this will also be protected at the second round of the new gTLDs. As I mentioned the GNSO Council has launched a PDP that is currently ongoing. It is looking at determining whether indeed special protections should be provided for the names of these particular organizations at both the top and/or second level, not only in the new gTLDs but in all gTLDs for let's say IGO and international - non-government organization identifiers as well as the Red Cross, Red Crescent and IOC names.

The PDP Working Group meets on a regular basis and is currently considering permanent protections for the identifiers of these organization names, specifically looking at some of the issues that are listed here on the slide.

For example defining or quantifying the scope of the number of organizations that indeed would qualify or be considered for special protection. They're also evaluating the scope of existing protections for certain international treaties that have been signed by several countries in terms of protecting both the Red Cross, Red Crescent, IOC names and the names of certain international government organizations.

The PDP Working Group is currently working on establishing criteria for determining which if any organizations could qualify for such protections, as well as what type of special protections could be provided at either the top and/or second level of all gTLDs.

And there is also in doing so looking at whether there are any substantive differences between the Red Cross and IOC and other international organizations, particularly a non-government organization.

In terms of next steps the Working Group's current goal is to publish a initial report of their work for public comment in early April. As I mentioned the Working Group is planning a session, a face-to-face meeting, in Beijing on Monday the 8th of April Local Time 1400 to 1730.

Further information can be provided by going to the ICANN Web site, looking at the schedule that is published on the Web site there for the Beijing meeting.

Once the initial public - excuse me, initial report is published and public comment is received, the Working Group will review that input and publish a final report providing any recommendations that it has determined.

Further information - the final issue report and additional information is provided on the links to this Web site. And with that I'd like to turn it over to my colleagues in the GNSO Department, Marika, Berry, Julie, Steve and Lars. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: I apologize. This is Julie Hedlund. I was on mute and I didn't realize it. Thank you very much. Just very briefly on translation and transliteration of contact information, and this is an issue report - a final issue report that the GNSO will be considering at its meeting in Beijing.

It was a result of a motion that the Council passed in October. The status is that there was a public comment on the preliminary issue report, and now the final issue report is being sent to the Council for consideration.

The next step is that the Council will consider initiating the PDP at its meeting in Beijing. And it's important to know that Staff does recommend initiating the PDP but is suggesting that the Council may consider deferring the start of the work, forming the PDP Working Group after the expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services has completed its work.

And that is due to be complete in May and at which point the Council will consider moving ahead. There is a link on here for your information, and I'll be happy to answer any questions when we move to the question part of this section. Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Julie. This is Berry Cobb and I'll be covering the next two topics, the first of which is uniformity of reporting. This is the initial report that was asked of the GNSO Council that's founded from a recommendation of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group in 2009, and as result of

identifying the need for access to data and reporting of common complaints related to domain registrations and various forms of registration abuse to better inform certain policy development.

Since then Staff has created the initial report and it basically outlines the latest efforts within ICANN, predominantly focused around the contractual compliance activity accomplishments for improving the contractual complaints function.

I won't go into details of the issue report but in short the compliance team is completing its last year of a three year transformation plan, much of which we believe satisfies the original recommendation created by the RAP WG.

In the coming months ICANN will deploy certain types of dashboards based on some of this transformation activity at which the community will have access to this information, which is something we're very excited about.

The public comment period for this issue report closes tomorrow with the reply period closing three weeks later. If we - if no comments are received Staff will prepare the final issue report for the Council to deliberate at the meeting in Beijing.

We also encourage community members to attend a contractual compliance session that's scheduled for Wednesday, April 10 at 11:00 am Local Time Beijing for the latest updates on that group's activities and the status of their three-year plan.

Next I'll move along to WHOIS service requirements. This Working Group was formed to measure community input on various possible technical requirements and then prove to its system based on a prior ICANN Staff report.

Such technical attributes that were reviewed were things just like definition of standard query structures, standard error messages for a WHOIS system, querying of WHOIS, internationalized registration data, authentication framework, WHOWAS and conversion to thick WHOIS among some other various topics.

The Working Group deliberated throughout all of 2012 to develop a draft survey, solicit community input to that survey and then we deployed the final version of the survey that was approximately 80 questions, all technical related to WHOIS that concluded at the end of 2012.

Currently ICANN Staff is analyzing the results of this survey, and we intend to return an initial report to the Working Group for review after Beijing with the eventual delivery for the GNSO Council.

And so with that I'll turn it over to my colleague Lars to give you an update on IR.

Lars Hoffman: Hi there. My name is Lars Hoffman. I'm a Policy Analyst in the ICANN Brussels office and I'm currently helping out with the - well overseeing from the Staff side the PDP, the policy development process, for the IRTP Part D, the Intra Registrar Transfer Policy.

It's a existing content as policy that is currently under review, and as you can tell from the title it's currently in its Part D. The preceding parts A to C underwent PDPs already.

They concluded subsequently in the years 2009 to 2012. This current Part D deals with the six particular issues that are listed in the charter of the Working Group.

Four of these issues relate to transfer disputes to the transfer dispute resolution policy, TDRP. One of the issues that the Working Group's dealing

with concerns the assessment of IRTP related penalties, and one issue concerns the usefulness or the continued usefulness of using forms of authorization when it comes to transfers of intra transfer - I'm sorry, intra Registrar transfers.

The policy has started its - the Working Group has started its work a few weeks back on the 25th of February. Since then it has adopted a work plan and sent out input requests to the GSNO's - GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and communities as well as to the other Supporting Organizations and Advisories - Advisory Committees.

So it's still at the very beginning of its work and the next step will then be to review the input that is received to those letters and requests that have been sent out.

The group is planning to publish its initial report for public comments by the ICANN meeting in Durban. The group is also holding a face-to-face breakfast meeting as it looks now on Wednesday the 10th of April very early in the morning, 7:30 to 9:00 am.

And if you need any more information it's on the Wiki and there's also a hyperlink on the slide. Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika again. So the last topic we're covering in this area is another policy development process that deals with a thick WHOIS. So this Working Group has been tasked to look at the question of whether there should be requirements for the use of thick WHOIS for all gTLD registries, both existing and future.

They've been asked to look at a specific list of issues in this regards, issues such as privacy and data protection, accessibility, stability, et cetera. So this Working Group started a little while back and it's currently reviewing the input

that it has received from GNSO Stakeholder Groups, constituencies as well as other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

And so this Working Group is also planning to publish its initial report by the ICANN meeting in Durban and they're also having a face-to-face meeting in Beijing, which is scheduled for Monday the 8th of April from 7:30 to 9:00.

So if you're interested in this topic please feel free to come along. All the GNSO meetings are typically open and would welcome additional participants and input.

So with that I think it wraps up the topics for the GNSO and we'll now have a couple of minutes for questions. So I'll hand it over to David.

David Olive: Thank you very much Marika. At this stage after the presentation of matters before the GNSO I'd like to open it up for questions. We'll be unmuting the telephone lines so that you can ask some questions.

Again there'll be an opportunity to put questions in the chat as we go along, and also at the end of the presentations we will have another question and answer period.

At this stage though I'd like to open it up to any questions on the materials presented before the GNSO by our experts. If there are no questions here again please in the chat or at the - you're more than welcome to answer that.

We will be moving on to the next session and that will be looking at ccNSO policy issues. I now turn it over to Bart Boswinkel.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you David. Good day everybody. I'll go into a few topics in the ccNSO very briefly. Just for everybody the ccNSO is say the SO for the ccTLDs and is a membership part of ICANN.

To date we have 136 members so there is a - the ccNSO still attracts ccTLD managers. The latest one is (Marinette) from Dot MK and they have joined in February of this year.

On the policy side and policy related activities I wanted to touch upon three topics. It's the IDM PDP Study Group for the use of country names and the framework of interpretation.

The first one is really a policy run through a policy development process. The other two are more policy related activities, so in that sense the ccNSO is a little bit different than the GNSO.

On the IDM PDP this is a very long ongoing process. It was launched in April 2007 and hopefully it will end by the Durban meeting. To date the interim report on the IDM PDP has been posted and public comments - so and the reply period closes today.

Based on the input, the interim report will be updated and then a final report will be submitted to the council for deliberations and voting at the Beijing meeting. Following that there will be a members' vote so from the ccNSO membership.

The interim report combines in fact the two aspects of the IDN PDP. One is the overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD streams and the second part which will be touched upon later in this presentation is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

The major points of the overall policy is that it builds on the fast-track methodology that has been developed in the meantime, knowing that the policy development process itself would take some time. The main characteristics is it's an IDN ccTLD stream needs contain at least one non (unintelligible) character and this requested stream needs to be a meaningful

representation in a designated official language of the name of the country or territory.

If would compare the overall policy with the fast-track process the major changes are the resolution we hope of the confusing similarity issues in the overall policy. A two-panel review process will be introduced. There is a place at this stage for the IDN variance management policy issues. In the ICANN community the IDN variant discussion is ongoing and there is an update and clarification of the processes involved in order to request an IDN ccTLD stream.

One of the major underlying policy principles is that the current policy of delegation and re-delegation applies to the overall selection of IDN or to the selection IDN ccTLD streams as well. This means that IDN ccTLDs will be delegated and re-delegated in accordance with the current policies for ccTLDs.

Looking at the second part the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, again one of the underlying overarching principles is that IDN ccTLDs and asking ccTLDs so the current ccTLDs should be treated similar. Again this is one of the results, not the result. This is how current IDN ccTLDs delegated through the fast-track process and ccTLDs are treated and in order to accomplish this the ICANN bylaws to the ccNSO need to be adjusted, so that means an adjustment of the membership definition, in order to maintain the balance within the ccNSO. The proposal is one vote per territory and a very minor edit with regard to the IDN PDP.

Now I want to turn to the second topic. Again this is ongoing and this is a spinoff of the IDN PDP that is inserting a study group into the use of country names and territory names as TLDs. Again this has been as I said long on the agenda. I just want to go into the current status of it.

In April last year the UNESCO initiated a survey under the umbrella of the MOU between UNESCO and ICANN and the survey went to 39 countries selected by UNESCO and to date, 15 countries have responded. The results affirm the typology that was developed by the study group so it means that say for the respondents and that is member states of UNESCO the typology is a meaningful set of categories of country names, country and territory names.

And the second conclusion that can be drawn it is very difficult to get to the relevant authorities even for UNESCO to seek a response. And this will be noted in the draft final report as well. But the study group is preparing a draft final report in which it hopes to publish before the Beijing meeting to inform the community and the ccNSO in particular.

Finally the framework of interpretation, again this is very long ongoing work. It is not a policy development process in the strict sense, this is -- and that's why I included it again -- this is one of the activities of the ccNSO where it starts to interpret existing policy and hopes to come up with recommendations to the ICANN board on delegation and re-delegation issues that have been identified by a previous working group.

Current status is that and the progress of the FOI since the Toronto meeting, the FOI is awaiting a response from the GAC on the significant interested party, draft recommendations and the working group is finalizing its discussion on issues around revocation and un-consented re-delegation of ccTLDs and this is one of the very contentious issues within the cc community as well on how to deal with it and how to interpret the current existing policy as documented in ROC 5921.

Some other projects in the ccNSO, the finance working group is reviewing the financial contributions from the ccTLD community to ICANN. It is exploring currently more a value-based approach for financial contributions which will be discussed at the Beijing meeting with the broader community and it is

developing hopefully a fair and equitably distribution model so how the total sum expected from the ccTLD community will be divided across the ccTLD community.

The second ongoing and standing working group is the strategic operational planning working group. It will be meeting at the Beijing meeting. Since the Toronto meeting it has been not very active and it's awaiting ICANN's operational plan and budget and the new developments around the strategic planning process -- ICANN's strategic planning process.

Some ccNSO council committees, currently there are three council committees. The final one on the sheet the committee to advise the council to balance the workload and volunteer capacity has just finished its final report which has been sent to the council and will be discussed at the Beijing meeting both by the council and presented to the ccNSO community as well.

One of the interesting recommendations in that final report is on the prioritization of the workload for the ccNSO in order to balance the volunteer capacity. The second one is - the council committee is the ccNSO Tenth Anniversary Celebration Committee. This will prepare some events at the Durban meeting so you will hear more about it between the Beijing and Durban meeting. And finally there is the committee on the review of the election guidelines. The ccNSO has developed a set of guidelines on the election of its councilors and on the election of its board members.

During the last council election some issues surfaced and as a result the guidelines need to be reviewed for a short-term solution. As a result there is a discussion on some of the underlying principles on representation on the council and the role of council and the role of membership.

To conclude my presentation just a few remarks on some of the joint working groups in which the ccNSO is involved. One is the joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN working group. This working group is preparing its draft final report on the

universal acceptance of IDN TLDs which is hopes to publish prior to the Beijing meeting.

It is one of the three topics in which the joint ccNSO or the (unintelligible) has been working on. The first one on the single character IDNs has been concluded and it's following - and the third one is following the discussions and understands potential policy implications on IDN variant management.

Finally the second major joint working group is the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group, the DSSA. This working group has been dormant since the Toronto meeting and it will revisit its status at the Beijing meeting and try to understand whether it needs to continue its work or that is has completed its work with the publication of its phase one report prior to the Toronto meeting.

Thank you and I now hand it over again to David for questions.

David Olive: Thank you very much Bart. Again if there are any questions we will unmute the lines and have people ask some questions of Bart and the presentation on the ccNSO, the country code operators and organization activities. Of course again you may chat a question at any time and of course at the end we'll allow questions for you.

Any questions for our ccNSO presentation and Bart's comments?

Okay we thank you for your attention and I thank Bart for his presentation. We move now to our next session with Barb Roseman talking about the ASO and RSSAC policy issues. Barb the floor is yours.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you. The ASO is the Address Supporting Organization and they're going to be holding their annual face-to-face meeting at the ICANN Beijing meeting. They will be holding an open meeting though there is no opportunity

in their meeting for participation from outside viewers; however it's a good insight into how they do their work.

They're also hosting a workshop on Wednesday. They're going to be posting the agenda shortly. And that is going to be back-to-back with the IPv6 workshop that's taking place on Wednesday. So both will be held in the same venue, same room and I believe will cover similar areas but different material.

There are no global member resource policies under consideration at this time and the ASO's finalizing their choice for board member for the upcoming three-year term and they're in the process of that now so I believe the announcement will be available in Beijing.

The RSSAC is the Route Server System Advisory Committee and they mostly deal with questions related to how the route server system operates. They advise the board on issues related to the route server system and they're compromised primarily of the route server operators with some additional participation by other groups that work with - with updating the routes.

So they're proceeding with their reorganization and they're adopting a new structure that's currently being approved by the current members. The bylaws amendment that addresses this will have that structure in place by July 1, 2013. And the reorganization is based on the review that was done of the RSSAC.

This group is also moving forward with documenting a measurement and metrics plans for assessing the health of the route server system. The document is in last call currently in the group and that means that they're accepting any final changes to it and includes agreements on which measurements to collect in a common repository for the data. So they'll all be doing the same measurements and storing the data collectively so that analysis can be done on all the data collectively.

Another document that they have under review establishes basic performance standards for route server operators. There is a current IATS document but it's a bit outdated. It doesn't address any casting or IPv6 utilization and all of the route server operators currently include that in their services. So this would be an update to that document and they're really looking forward to having some agreed basic performance standards.

And with that I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund and Steve Sheng for an update on the SSAC.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Barbara. This is Julie Hedlund. I'll start off this brief presentation on the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and then turn it over to my colleague Dr. Sheng.

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee is an advisory committee to the ICANN board supporting organizations' advisory committees to the staff and the general community. It was formed in 2001 and began operations in 2002. The charter states that the SSAC will advise the ICANN community and board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

There are 38 members in the SSAC at this point. They are appointed by the ICANN board for three-year terms and a third of the members are reviewed on an annual basis. And provided on the slide is the Web site where you can get more information on the SSAC.

But very briefly there is a great deal of work going on in the SSAC right now. In 2013 there are several committees and work parties. There is the membership committee that considers requests for membership, there are work parties on identifier abuse metrics, route key rollover and the SSAC participates in the development of the DNS Workshop Program Committee. These are the DNS workshops held at each ICANN meeting on the

Wednesdays of the meeting and there will be one in Beijing on the 10th of April.

There are also work parties who are working on SSAC meetings with law enforcement representatives at ICANN meetings, developing a workshop for the Internet government forum, considering a new gTLD success metric, abuse of the DNS DDOS attacks, MDNS complexity challenges in the DNS and the SSAC also participates in the DSSA working group that my colleague Bart Boswinkel mentioned in his previous presentation.

I'd now like to turn over the presentation to my colleague Dr. Sheng. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Julie. I'll briefly talk about two advisories that SSAC produced. One is already published on internal name certificates.

In the SSAC report it talks - it defines what are the internal name certificates and the security and stability issues it causes. The SSAC did both a empirical research as well as case studies looking into these security implications for these certificates and recommend ICANN to take immediate mitigation steps.

I also want to highlight in Appendix A of the report it highlights a chronology of mitigating security risks. So as a result of the SSAC report and ICANN action, part of the risk has already been mitigated and current mitigation efforts ongoing. All of these are in the document in the URL below. I invite you to read that document.

The other report SSAC is working on is on domain name registration validation. As we know the accuracy of registration data has been a hot topic in the ICANN development and one of the ways to improve accuracy is through validating the registration data. So this SSAC report talks about why is accurate registration data important. It surveys from past SSAC advisories as well as current literature on this topic.

It also lists various reasons why today the registration data is inaccurate and really calls out that as the ICANN community debates various proposals, it needs to look deep into the underlying cause to make sure these underlying causes of inaccuracy are addressed.

It also proposes a taxonomy of validation separated into three types of validation and I have a lengthy section that talks about for each of the data elements how to implement validation and in concludes with a series of findings and recommendations. This report is currently in SSAC review and will be published shortly before the ICANN Beijing meeting. So I invite you to check in then to view this report.

Next I'm going to pass over to my colleague Heidi to talk about ALAC policy issues.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you Steve. Hello everyone my name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Director for At Large and I'm delighted to give you a brief on the ALAC's policies and process activities as well as outreach and capacity-building sessions taking place in Beijing.

First the highlights of the policy issues being discussed within ALAC. The ALAC produced 19 policies advice statements in response to open public comments between mid September 2012 and mid March 2013. This follows a record-breaking 2012 with an all time high of 51 statements submitted. These policy advice statements include four related to IDN, three related to Whois and two related to trademark clearinghouse issues.

The policy advice development process that the ALAC uses include close collaboration with the five regional At Large organizations and over 16 active working groups ensures that ALAC statements reflect the views from the interest of the At Large community.

At Large also periodically holds briefing sessions on topics of interest to the At Large community as part of both ongoing capacity-building activities as well as their policy device development process. And since the Toronto meeting there have been for At Large briefing sessions all of which have been extremely well attended. The first one was on the R3 whitepaper making ICANN relevant, responsive and respective.

The AT Large Future Challenges Working Group has been working on a whitepaper since late 2011 that identifies four challenges ICANN is facing and makes recommendations for how to overcome those challenges. In Beijing this group will be holding a roundtable on the ALAC R3 whitepaper on Monday the 8th of April, focusing on the next step to take with its recommendation.

The second was the postal Wicket webinar following the world conference on international communications in which several members of the At Large community participated. The ALAC held a webinar that offered the exchange of perspectives on the outcome and the implications of the meeting proposed at ICANN and At Large.

The third was a Whois briefing session. ALAC in collaboration with the members of the At Large Whois working group held a briefing session on Whois issues that highlighted the diversity of perspectives on Whois. There were over 30 participants who attended this webinar. In Beijing the At Large Community Working Group will be holding a meeting on Wednesday the 10th of April.

And finally the ALAC recently held a briefing session on the proposed 2012 RAA and this was part of a not only for capacity building but also a way for the community to help develop its statement in response to this current public comment.

More information on all of the statements that the ALAC had submitted are available at the At Large Correspondents Page which is listed on the slide.

Turning next to the ALAC process activity, I'd like to highlight three activities between Toronto and Beijing. The first is the current effort to revise the ALAC rules of procedure. Revisions of the ALAC rules of procedure were mandated by the ALAC At Large Improvements Project and the revised ALAC rules of procedure are the product of an extensive process carried out by some 33 members of the At Large community in both face-to-face and teleconferences over the last half year to review the ALAC rules on participation and interpretation, organization of the ALAC, conduct of this adoption and amendment of the rules of procedure. And the ALAC will begin their vote on these revised ROPs this next week.

The second process activity is that related to objections for the new gTLDs. In ICANN's new gTLD program the ALAC was given responsibility, its first operational responsibility to consider and possibly file objections to new gTLD applications. These were limited to both limited public interest and to community grounds objections.

And following the review objections received by all levels of the At Large community in a process that was fully designed by the At Large community and full analysis of the At Large new gTLD review group, the ALAC voted to file three objections based on community grounds for three separate dot health applications.

The third process activity is the current one on transitioning from ALAC 3.0 to that of our version 4.0. And the ALAC has identified a need for At Large community from its current version to the next version, version 4.0 in light of the challenges to the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model in a postal Wicket environment.

The key elements of moving to version 4.0 will include increasing the effective input from the At Large working groups and the RALOs into the ALAC policy development process, increased outreach to new members including universities and increasing capacity building and leadership training orientation activities. And the members of the At Large community will be discussing all of these issues in Beijing.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the capacity-building events going on in Beijing. During the Beijing meeting the Asian, Australasian and Pacific Island regional At Large or APRALO will be holding a series of meetings for over 25 of their At Large structures. And these meetings planned entirely by members of APRALO are intended to strengthen the ability of the APRALO to be able to participate effectively in the At Large community.

These include an APRALO multi-stakeholder roundtable. That will be held on Monday the 8th of April (unintelligible) on two themes. There will be a panel one's going to be on new gTLDs and the implications for the APRALO regions and (unintelligible) implications for the APRALO region. There will also be an APO general assembly and APO monthly meeting as well as four joint past gTLD sessions for the APRALO, ALSs and RALOs.

And finally - sorry there will also be a Chinese ALS meeting for Chinese-speaking ALSs and APRALO outreach activities.

Another highlight of the APRALO Beijing event is a showcase. That is going to be on the theme of celebrating APRALO's regional diversity. This will be held on Monday the 8th of April between 19:00 and 21:00. Speakers include Fadi Chehade, ICANN President and CEO and it will also feature over 25 APRALO structures who will be displaying their activities, end users as well as their cultural diversity.

So you're all very warmly welcomed to this event on Monday and this concludes the ALAC update and I hand this back to my colleague David Olive for questions.

David Olive: Thank you very much Heidi. We're going to unmute the lines for people caring to raise a question about the recent presentation on the activities of the advisory committees as presented by our policy team members.

I noticed there was an active question-and-answer period in the chat about some of the presentations and I appreciate that. That's another way we can answer your questions.

Man: (Unintelligible).

David Olive: Yes please. Please go ahead if you have a question. Someone was trying to ask one but if not please put it into the chat and we'll be happy to provide an answer.

At this stage I would like to also mention that the slides and the recording will be made available to all. I will provide the link again, it was provided at the beginning of the session, so that you can refer to it at your leisure. We will also be translating the remarks into Chinese for our Chinese language colleagues as we approach our Beijing meeting in a few weeks.

With that I would also like to say you can keep informed about policy development activities including many issues that are open for public comment and for your input and commentary in particular the monthly policy update we present each month as a reminder and reporting on the various activities of the supporting organizations and advisory committees in their policy activities. You can read it online and it is also in the six UN languages for your review. By clicking that link on subscribe you can get it automatically each moth as soon as it published and it available in the languages that you see here.

Again before going back to any further final questions I wanted to let you know about the wonderful team that is supporting the various SOs and ACs as we call them, supporting organizations and advisory committees of the policy staff, of ICANN. They are listed here and we're always ready for any questions or please contact us if you see in Beijing in you're going to be there or through remote participation. We appreciate your interest and involvement here. Again to subscribe to the policy monthly that is another fine way to keep informed about what's going on at ICANN.

Again I will allow at this stage to turn it over to unmuting the line and if there any questions we're happy to take them here online. Of course you can always contact us at policy-staff@icann.org for questions that may come up after your review the slides or review the transcripts for your information.

If you are pleased obviously with the presentation I'm glad to hear that. Again we will have the transcript and the slides available to you and you're more than welcome to review that. With this I will give one last call for any questions or comments you may have.

I see some of us typing in the chat so we might want to wait a bit.

So on behalf of the ICANN Policy Development Support Team I would like to thank you for your participation in our webinar as we prepare for the important work in Beijing and I wish everyone a good morning, good afternoon or good evening, wherever you may be. Thank you very much for joining us.

END