

Pre-Dublin Policy Update Webinar

Thursday 8 October 2015 19:00 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.

David Olive: Greetings everyone and welcome to our Pre-ICANN 54 Policy Webinar Update. I will ask people to start the recording. We will be recording this session and making that available as well as the slides we're presenting today for your reference. And we'll provide that URL at the end of the session.

Let me just also say that at this stage we will have a question and answer period at the end of our presentations. However, if you need to ask a question and wanted to put a question to us during each presentation, please put it in the chat and we'll try to answer that soon thereafter so that you can have an answer quickly to your questions or you can wait until the very end.

Again, my name is David Olive, ICANN's Vice President for Policy Development Support and the General Manager of ICANN's Regional Headquarter Hub in Istanbul. And I am presenting this Webinar from Istanbul this evening my time.

We and the policy staff are very happy to present this presentation before each ICANN meeting to allow people to know the policy issues coming before the ICANN community, in this case ICANN 54 in Dublin, and to provide an

update for those who want to learn more about the status of various policies and advice that are being considered for action or additional work at ICANN 54. So to that extent we're very happy to have you here and to share with you our update and summaries.

Looking at ICANN 54 as an outlook basically, there are a few major elements. Because this is an annual general meeting, we will have a change of some leadership positions within the supporting organization and advisory councils.

And as a result we have a leadership training program to provide an orientation to new leaders coming into the ICANN structures conducted by existing leaders and Board members. And that will be taking place before the ICANN meeting starts.

Of course there'll be preparatory work by the various groups during that weekend but the official start is Monday with a welcoming ceremony and many other sessions planned on Monday mainly focusing on the transition and accountability issues.

Tuesday is an important day for the stakeholders and constituencies to meet in their groups to interact with each other and importantly to have their interactions with the Board of Directors. It's a good day to see the various stakeholders in action and we encourage you to participate in that day as well.

Wednesday is usually the Council day or Council's day. Many of the supporting organizations and other groups have their official public meetings on this day. And with that I would highlight the GNSO Council meeting and the ccNSO Council meeting as well as the EURALO and European joint networking event. Thursday is the wrap up day at ICANN with the public forum and finally with the ICANN public Board meeting.

But looking at a focus of some of the main topics within the conference in Dublin. We see obviously a big concentration on the transition and accountability issues.

And here are several of the sessions that are being planned so that the various working groups who are preparing proposals for the SOs and the ACs can be discussed fully looking at areas of agreement, bridging areas of differences and coming up with a plan that will be agreed to or at least moved forward due to the face-to-face meeting of all the community in Dublin.

And here are some more resources for you. When you get the slides you'll be able to click on these URLs for more additional information about the IANA stewardship transition and the Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN accountability.

We would now turn to the Policy Development Support Team that we support your efforts in the policy development and advice activities of the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

We of course are supporting your work not only in the working groups and Council meetings but also to inform and educate other stakeholders of the important issues that you are dealing with and the complex issues you are trying to find good solutions for.

And of course the Policy Team does manage the process so that it is fair, effective and efficient and that all stakeholders have a opportunity to consult, provide their views and import their ideas as the process moves forward to a final recommendation to the Board for its review and approval.

Of course policy development in ICANN starts with the supporting organizations; the ones listed here on this slide dealing with the address community, the country code community and of course the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

And these are added to and inputs are by the advisory committees dealing with At Large, from the governments, from the root server systems and the security and stability advisory committee groups that also have - play a role in providing input and advice to the Board relating to these activities.

I wanted to share with you as we move forward before introducing members of the Policy Team who will be presenting on the activities that they've been most involved with.

This is a particular part of our dashboard where we're collecting information, which I am pleased to say shows the hard work of you and the community in your activities to develop policy and advice at ICANN.

And this is just something that we are beginning to collect. It is still a work in progress. But we hope to have a little more details over the coming months to show the number of meetings or calls, the average length of time at those meetings and the number of email exchanges that are part of our consensus process in looking at police development or advice development.

We'll also be able to fill in the face-to-face meetings if we look at the meetings just supported at an ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires at ICANN 53. The Policy Team supported 160 meetings that you have conducted, were active in and were part of advancing the process of policy and advice. So we thank you. And that's just some indication of the hard work that you're doing and how we try to support that activity.

With that, I'll turn to my colleagues and experts who have been there on the day-to-day work and readying the preparations for Dublin. I'll now ask Marika Konings, our Senior Director dealing with the Generic Names Supporting Organization to start us off. Marika, the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much David. Hello everyone. Thank you very much for joining us today. As David said, my name is Marika Konings. I'm currently based in Costa Rica and a Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the Generic Names Supporting Organization also known as the GNSO.

So in addition to the work that's ongoing in relation to the IANA stewardship transition as well as enhancing ICANN accountability, which David spoke about in his introduction, there are also numerous other projects that the GNSO is working on including a 13 policy development process in the various stages of their lifecycle.

And it's not possible to cover all these projects in the time that we have allocated for this Webinar. Our contribution is going to focus on those efforts that have recently achieved an important milestone or for which decisions or next steps are expected to be considered in Dublin.

And for the first one of those, I will turn it over to my colleague Julie Hedlund who is covering in for Steve Chan today who couldn't be with us.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Marika. This is Julie Hedlund and I am part of the Policy Team on supporting the GNSO and I also support the SSAC and I'm based out of Washington, D.C. I'm pleased to be able to fill in for my colleague Steve today.

So actually I'll go back to the first slide just to remind you of the topic here. This is a preliminary issue report on new gTLD subsequent procedures. And this has actually gone out for public comment.

A little bit of background. Back in 2012 once the new gTLD program began, the GNSO Council formed a discussion group following that in June 2014 to discuss the experiences gained from the 2012 round and to identify subjects for a future issue report that might lead to changes or adjustments or subsequent application procedures.

And so the Council has requested a preliminary issue report. And that is based on the work completed by the discussion group. And what has happened now, as I just mentioned, is that this preliminary issue report has gone out for public comment. It went out on the 31st of August and will close on the 30th of October. And you see the link there on your screen to that forum.

The current status and next steps are that this preliminary issue report on new gTLD subsequent procedures is establishing the initial scope for a possible PDP and it includes five provisional groupings, each with a set of subjects with a total of 38 separate subjects.

And this preliminary report includes preliminary thoughts on work processes. The next steps are for the public comment period to be completed and the summary and analysis of those comments to be published. And then a final issue report will take into consideration those comments. And that will be provided to the GNSO Council for deliberations and the possible initiate of a PDP.

And here you see more information with some links to the preliminary issue report. And in Dublin there will be a session on new gTLD program reviews and related activities and also an update on the preliminary issue report. And there you see also a link to the summary of the discussion group activities.

At this point I would like to turn things over to my colleague Berry Cobb who also is filling in for Steve Chan today. Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Julie. This is berry Cobb also assisting the GNSO Policy Team. This particular topic centers around data and metrics for policy making. This group was started out of a prior effort that was dealing with registration abuse policies.

Eventually staff was tasked to write an issue report. And subsequently the GNSO Council approved the formation of this group. It's been going on for a while but it's finally coming to a close.

But essentially the working group was exploring opportunities to review standard methods and reporting of metrics that better inform fact based policy development and decision making.

As a part of the deliberations of the group they also reviewed how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and also equally important other service providers in the sharing of metrics and data to help facilitate those deliberations.

Some of the tasks that the DMPM Group has done - they first started out doing a review of prior working group efforts to understand what cases or what groups were using data and forming their deliberations and what groups didn't in understanding some of the gaps that may have - should have improved that particular process.

And out of that then the group kind of started their discussions around better understanding the issue identification and scoping as well as prioritization around some of the issues that were being discussed.

There were discussions as it related to some of the key performance metrics or recommended policy and most important is kind of an assessment of policy outcomes once they're implemented. And those deliberations have formed some of the group's recommendations.

The group did complete their initial report back in July and hosted a 40-day public comment period. The link is provided below. I believe the group received around nine or ten comments from the community. And we reviewed through those comments to understand how that might change or enhance any of the recommendations.

The public comment report will be posted later today. And pretty much the group will be looking to submit their final report to the GNSO Council by tomorrow.

So essentially there were seven recommendations that the group came up with. The first one, which is probably the biggest one is to initiate a pilot effort for stakeholder groups and constituencies to request data and metrics on a smaller scale. The using of the word is tactical so it's not confused with much larger types of data requests that would require larger resources.

But the idea of making this pilot effort available is not only for current working groups to help inform their particular deliberations but it's also to try to enhance the initial stages of the policy process, which is typically the issue identification and issue scoping stages of that process.

But essentially the idea is that if an issue is discovered from the community and they would prefer to try to find additional data and metrics that would help reinforce that the issue does exist and has the proper scope.

The idea is that information would help form or formulate a better outcome of understanding what that issue is before it is delivered to staff to create an issue report and then subsequently a possible working group or PDP. There's a lot more information about this particular recommendation and some recommendation details within the report that'll help you understand that.

The rest of the recommendations are pretty much more or less updates to the working group guidelines that is a particular annex of the GNSO operating procedures.

The first kind of change is around Recommendation 2, which touches on the early outreach part of the process when a working group is formed. Typically a sort of questionnaire based on the charter questions that have been

developed at the drafting stage are sent out to not only the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO but to the broader SOs and ACs.

And two of the - two aspects to that are to update these procedures that where possible that a working group should first consider outreach even beyond the SOs and ACs where it makes sense and as well as to potentially include a quantitative component to that outreach. Typically they're mostly qualitative at this point in time. So that's just some updates to the guidelines to offer that up.

The third recommendation is more or less - it wasn't necessarily out of scope from the group but it was kind of a predecessor to the remaining recommendations and that was to direct staff to create formal templates that a working group would - a working group's work products that would be created. So the idea here is that a standard template will be created for issue reports, for the charter and the final reports.

And once these are completed, then it'll set the stage for the next three recommendations - or I'm sorry, Recommendations 4 and 5, which essentially one of those was to include within the charter a section that would help the drafting team - help them understand what kinds of metrics may be beneficial for the group to seek as well as to force a standard recommendation that should any future working group create any policy recommendations that there's sort of a review of those possible recommendations for the this just to ensure that it met the intent of the policy change.

And again, those are much more detailed in the final report. Recommendations 6 and 7 touch on a few of the work products that were created out of this group.

The first is a metrics request form whereby community members would complete the form and submit to the GNSO Council when they're seeking out

certain data and metrics as well as a decision tree to help facilitate that process all of which will also be loaded into the working group guidelines.

Essentially there's a summary section that introduces this new aspect of that request for metrics. And then there will be links to this decision tree that I just mentioned.

So essentially where we're at today is that the working group will - this is the last day to finalize the final report that will be submitted to the GNSO Council tomorrow. As I mentioned, we did review through the public comments and made changes as required to the final report.

And as I also mentioned, the public comment review tool will also be posted up at the public comment forum. And it does a really good job of creating a continuity between a particular comment that was submitted how the working group deliberated on that particular comment, any proposed action and then noting whether it was completed or not, which then translates over into the final report where those changes are highlighted as directed by the comments.

And so with that, that draws this to a close. Again, the GNSO Council is expected to review this at their Wednesday GNSO Council meeting to consider the recommendations from the group. So with that, I'll turn it over to Marika. Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thank you Berry. I'll be talking next about the next generation gTLD registration director services to replace Whois final issue reports, also I think referred to as next generation RDS.

I think many of you are familiar with Whois and know this was created in the 1980s as a collection and publication of domain name registration data services by Internet operators to be able to identify and contact the

individuals or identities responsible for the operation of a network resource on the Internet.

But although ICANN's requirements for domain name registration data collection accuracy for gTLD registries have undergone some important changes over the last years including some of the changes that were introduced in relation to registration data publication services specifications with the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement or RAA. And Whois policy and underlying protocol have been the subject of debate for nearly 15 years.

Comprehensive Whois policy remains a source of long running discussion related to issues such as the purpose of collecting data, the accuracy, privacy, anonymity, cost, policing, intellectual property protection, security, et cetera.

So to address these issues the Board launched an initiative back in 2012, which is recently reconfirmed for a Board initiated policy development process or PDP to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to the gTLD registration data and to consider safeguards for protecting data using the recommendations developed by the Expert Working Group on this topic as an input to and deemed appropriate as the foundation for a new gTLD policy.

And so to defend it staff published a preliminary issue report in July of this year for which 13 comments were received. And those comments generally speaking fell into the following three buckets.

First of all, there were comments that suggests clarifications, corrections or enhancements to the preliminary issue report. There were a number of comments that were made in relation to the recommended process framework, which I'll be speaking about a little bit more shortly, which is also reflected in the charter that was included in the preliminary issue report.

And then there were also a number of inputs and potential recommendations and implementation guidance to be generated by the PDP Working Group, which is (unintelligible) put forward to the working group itself, as it's the standard input that they should be considering as part of their process.

So following the review of these comments, staff finalized the issue report, which we submitted yesterday to the GNSO Council for their consideration. The final issue report itself contains a wealth of information on this topic. All relevant background information has been covered or is being linked to the additional input that has been provided by groups such as the GAC as well as the Article 29 Working Party have been included as maybe relevant information for the working group to consider.

The final issue report also covers the Expert Working Group final report and recommendations and provides an overview of the process framework that was developed jointly by the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council to deal with the many significant and interdependent policy areas that are included here.

And of course the final issue report also covers the issues that are expected to be discussed and addressed as well as a draft policy development process working group charter, which outlines the scope and proposed approach for the PDP Working Group based on the previously mentioned process framework.

So a little bit more detail on the process framework as, you know, it's an important aspect of this process and is expected to underpin the subsequent steps of the policy development process.

It is expected that the work is carried out in three phases with the first phase focusing on the policy requirements definitions, the if and why question basically. Secondly the Phase 2 policy functional design or the what question. And thirdly the implementation guidance phase or the how to questions.

So it's foreseen that at the end of each of these phases there's consideration of the outcome and recommendations and a decision is taken by the GNSO Council in consultation with others on whether to move forward to the next phase of the policy development process.

So how this looks in a graphic depiction can be seen on this slide where you can also see that for each of the phases based on the same issues and questions come back but with a different focus. And you will be able to download this slide after our presentation so you can look at this in more detail if you would like.

As noted before, the GNSO Council is expected to consider the outputs of each phase before proceeding to the next phase. And in doing so they're expected to do that in consultation with the Board Working Group or registration data directory services that has been recently created as it's a PDP that has been requested by the ICANN Board.

It's the expectation that there will be close coordination with the Board throughout the different steps of the process. Further consideration will need to be given by the PDP Working Group in relation to the timeline; what work can possibly be done in parallel and what interdependency may exist and how to best conduct its work to ensure broad participation and consultation but also to ensure progress.

And so where are we now? As I said, the final issue report has been submitted to the GNSO Council, which is now expected to consider the PDP Working Group charter for adoption.

Now following adoption of the charter, the PDP Working Group would be formed, which (actually means) that the next - which starts the next milestone in this process. And of course we hope that many of you that may be

interested in this topic will sign up for the working group when the time comes.

And with that, I'm handing it over to my colleague Mary Wong who will brief you on some of the other activities that are ongoing in the GNSO.

Mary Wong: Thank you Marika. Hello everybody. This is Mary Wong. I'm a Senior Policy Director with the Policy Team primarily supporting the GNSO. It's my pleasurable duty to give you a brief rundown of some of the other projects that the GNSO is currently undertaking starting with two ongoing PDPs or policy development processes.

The first that we wish to highlight is one about the access to curative rights mechanisms, which would mean the longstanding uniform dispute resolution policy and the newer uniform rapid suspension procedure in terms of access to these by certain types of organizations, which would be international governmental organizations or IGOs and international non-governmental organizations or INGOs.

As you see from the status bullet on the slide, and I'm not going to read the slide to you, the working at the moment has narrowed its work to focus solely on the issues concerning IGOs. And it is engaging with the Governmental Advisory Committee naturally as well as with representatives of some of the affected IGOs themselves.

There have been some considerations and communications. What's notable is that the working group is currently awaiting a proposal from those IGO representatives in order to consider a possible solution to the topic as part of this ongoing PDP.

There will be an open community meeting in Dublin. So please consult the schedule to see where and when that is. And the target is that after considering the updated IGO proposal and working through some of its

remaining issues the group hopes to produce its initial report for publication something after Dublin.

The second PDP we wish to highlight on this slide is about the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers. You may know that an initial report was published by this group for public comment in May and the group is currently reviewing all the public comments received.

One noteworthy point is that this particular topic attracted a lot of public interest. And so the group has had to extend its timeline somewhat in order to do justice to all the comments received and the concerns that were expressed.

The hope is still to produce a final report for the GNSO Council by December of this year. And in order to do that, the group will be doing an intensive face-to-face working session just prior to the Dublin meeting. But it will also be holding an open community meeting during the Dublin meeting to discuss where it is and to perhaps give you a glimpse of what its final recommendations might look like.

Another PDP but this one has been completed is about the translation and transliteration of contact information in gTLDs. You see there the two questions in the PDP charter that this working group was tasked to answer.

The final report was adopted by the GNSO Council and I'm pleased to report that just late last month this report and its recommendations were adopted by the Board as well. And so the next target date would be to develop an implementation plan, which we hope to do after Dublin.

Another potential PDP in this case -- so it has not yet launched; is actually only just approaching the preliminary issue report phase -- is about the review of rights protection mechanisms for trademark owners.

And the scope of this preliminary issue report will cover both the longstanding UDRP that I mentioned earlier as well as the newer RPMs, rights protection mechanisms that were developed for the new gTLD program.

Our hope is to publish the preliminary issue report within the next few days so that we will have an opportunity to present it to the community in Dublin, kick off the discussions as the public comment period will be open throughout and following the Dublin meeting as well.

And of course as I think many of you know, the final issue report will be prepared based on the public comments and sent to the GNSO Council who will then review it and vote on whether or not to kick off a new PDP on this topic. And we hope to do that in December or around that time.

Finally, this is not a PDP but is also a completed project on which we have some recent news for you. A GNSO Working Group was chartered to look at certain questions relating to policy and implementation. And as a result amongst a number of recommendations, the group recommended three new processes designed to facilitate the GNSO's policy processes other than the development of consensus policies.

The news that we have now is that not only have all these recommendations including the three processes been adopted by the GNSO, it was also adopted by the Board at its most recent meeting.

So just as with another completed project I spoke about earlier, we will be developing an implementation plan and we hope to do that shortly following the Dublin meeting.

Here's some information on the GNSO projects and our meetings. At the Dublin meeting we hope to see you there at least virtually if not in person. And on that note, I will hand you over to my colleague for the ccNSO Bart Boswinkel.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Mary. And I will update you on some of the events taking on at the Dublin meeting and some of the work starting in Dublin - at the Dublin meeting and some of the working groups.

As could be expected, the ccNSO sessions - at the ccNSO sessions accountability and stewardship and transition process will be a major point of attention and other sessions, which may be relevant for the community. So that means the broader community are included in this presentation as well.

So looking at the accountability sessions, I want to explain a little bit around the ccNSO process relating to the decision making. As most of you will know, the ccNSO is one of the chartering organizations of the Accountability Working Group.

And as most of you will know, the ccNSO is comprised of its Council and also of its membership. That's a set or subset of all ccTLD managers. And the ccNSO Council will take the final decision to submit the accountability proposal as they did with the stewardship proposal to the ICANN Board.

And - but ultimately this decision reflects the level of support of the ccTLD community for the final proposal. So hence it was considered very urgent and important that the ccTLD community will be fully informed around the process and the substance of the proposal and the current state of play.

So effectively at the ICANN meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday there will be seven hours dedicated to the CCWG, CWG and ICG proposal across five blocks or sessions ranging - and they start on Tuesday and then end on Wednesday afternoon with a panel discussion focusing on the core issues at the moment in the view of the CCWG and some other stakeholders.

I will not go into the details of the sessions themselves as they change with the work of the Accountability Working Group. And I refer you for a full overview of the sessions to the ccNSO agenda.

Other topics and other sessions that will be discussed at the ccNSO meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday are around marketing and in particular focusing on the - say the developments, the ccTLD communities see in their local market. There will be at least two presentations on that aspect. So it gives you a - it is an opportunity for not just the ccTLDs but also for the broader community to understand developments at a local market.

Another session, which is also usual, is ccTLD news session, which is around the developments of ccTLDs in the different regions. So again, ccTLD focused but it may give you some understanding of what the ccTLDs are focusing on.

Another interesting part for the broader community might be the discussion on the Meeting B Strategy. This was initiated at the BA meeting and will continue in Dublin and post-Dublin in order for the ccNSO to determine what the ccTLD community intends and how they look at the Meeting B in future.

And finally, one of the other sessions at the - and this one is on Wednesday morning is around discussions around the legal status of domain names, et cetera, in the ccTLD arena. You can see in the slide the example and the focus of the discussion this time.

So moving forward in Dublin and beyond some of the more say better known and probably of more interest work items the ccNSO is undertaking. One is from a standing working group, which is call the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group.

At the Dublin meeting they will have the kickoff meeting to focus on the five-year operational plan update - ICANN that is; ICANN's five year operational

plan update and on the fiscal Year '17 draft operational plan and budget. So there will be initial discussions.

The goal of the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group or the SOP Working Group is first of all to provide input into that planning of these planning processes but secondly, also to engage and reach out to the ccTLD communities to get involved in these processes.

And over time it has developed the habit of informing other supporting organizations and advisory committees around their findings. So probably by the Marrakech meeting you will say the other supporting organizations and advisory committees will be informed by the SOP on the regular interaction meetings.

So a second ongoing work item, which I want to draw your attention to, is what is called the Guideline Review Committee or GRC. As some of you will know, the ccNSO has some internal guidelines and rules, which guide the internal governance structure of the ccNSO.

Most of these guidelines were developed in 2008 and since that time the ccNSO has developed and has grown. And the governance practices of the ccNSO has evolved with the growth as well.

So around a year ago the ccNSO felt it necessary to start reviewing these internal guidelines and rules. And at this meeting the GRC will probably submit a guideline for adoption by the ccNSO Council and consult with the ccTLD committee present.

To give you an example of - a few examples of the guidelines I'm talking about, one is on the maintenance of the ccNSO work plan and what drives work items for the ccNSO. And a second one is on the establishment of working groups including appointment of members, et cetera, which is a practice that has grown and has grown over time.

So looking at some new work items that again went through the process described in the current version of the work plan guideline. So one is a new working group on the second panel on the (confusing) the similarity review.

This is a typical institute that was developed for the Fast Track process for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings and which is also part of the overall policy for the IDN ccTLD strings.

As a result of the last review of the Fast Track some issues have been identified and at the request of the Board the ccNSO has initiated this working group and shortly the GAC and the SSAC will be requested to participate in this work in a matter - in a matter they feel most appropriate.

A second new working group or group is the Standing Oversight Committee for the TLD-OPS email list. This is the successor of the Security Working Group, which developed a email - a repository for contact details of security officers of ccTLDs in order to be able to inform them in a trusted manner on some incidents.

This Oversight Committee will provide guidance to the administrator of the list, which is the ccNSO Secretariat. But more importantly it will be - it will do some further outreach to those ccTLDs who have not been - who are not part yet of the TLD-OPS list and to initiate for the development of the use of that email list. So this working group will have its - or the Standing Committee will have its final or the first meeting in the - in Dublin.

So this ends my short overview of the ccTLD and ccNSO items for this policy Webinar. And I'd like to hand over to my colleague now Carlos Reyes.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks very much Bart. Hello everyone. This is Carlos Reyes and I support the Address Supporting Organization in conjunction with my colleague Barbara Roseman.

As an overview, the ASO Address Council manages global policy development activities, which includes oversight recommendations concerning IP address policy.

The Address Council is composed of 15 members, three from each regional Internet registry. The regional policy form of each RIR elects two members. And the Executive Board of each RIR also appoints one person from its respective region.

Like other community groups at ICANN, the ASO Address Council is experiencing leadership changes for - during ICANN 54. Just recently the APNIC community re-elected Tomohiro Fujisaki. And the APNIC Executive Council reappointed Aftab Siddiqui.

Also the ARIN Board of Trustees appointed John Sweeting to finish the term of Ron Da Silva who was selected by the ASO Address Council to join the ICANN Board of Directors earlier this year.

Related to Board selection process the ASO Address Council has also recently started its selection process for Seat 10 out of the Board of Directors, which will take place next year.

And I notice in the chat that one of our participants is actually at the ARIN meeting right now. So I'm sure you can learn about regional Internet registry policy development through those meetings.

Focusing more on global policies. This is a very narrow scope for the ASO. And only policies that require a direct outcome or action by IANA are considered global policies.

So when a policy is proposed, every RIR has to approve the exact same policy. And then the ASO Address Council coordinates its referral to the Board of Directors for approval and ultimately to IANA for implementation.

Current RIR policy development has focused on Internet number resource policies, specifically IPv4 and Autonomous System Number transfers. This is particularly important in ARIN where the IPv4 free pool has been depleted as of late September. And of course the RIRs have been preparing for the transition to IPv6 with various allocation policies.

Looking ahead to the meeting in Dublin, the ASO Address Council will have various work sessions throughout the week. Obviously much like everyone else the ASO Address Council is going to focus on the IANA stewardship transition and the enhancing ICANN accountability efforts.

Related to that of course is the CCWG second draft report and the service level agreement between IANA and the RIRs. That is currently in its second draft.

And beyond that the ASO/NRO workshop will take place on Wednesday providing an update on specific policy development efforts across the RIRs as well as an NRO operational update from the five CEOs of the RIRs.

And with that, I will hand it over to Steve Sheng who will take us into the advice work of our advisory committees.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Carlos. Since ICANN 53 the Root Server System Advisory Committee has produced two documents and chartered one working group. The first document is the RSSAC comment on the ICG proposal for IANA stewardship transition.

In this comment RSSAC has reviewed the ICG proposal and observed the ICANN community process that led to it. The RSSAC states its support for

the proposal from its operational perspective of the root server system. The RSSAC believes that the proposal it's workable and it will be a positive step to replace the U.S. Government oversight with community oversight over IANA functions.

The next report is the RSSAC report Root Zone TTLs. TTL stands for time to live values. It's a technical parameter in the DNS that specifies the amount of time the DNS data may be stored in a cache as part of a DNS query and response. The TTLs are there in order to lower the load on the various authoritative servers, in this case the root servers.

Since 1991 TTLs in the root zone has not been changed. It is six days for the authoritative data, two days for delegations and two days for glue records. Given today's Internet environment, the RSSAC proactively considered the extent to which these parameters are appropriate for today's environment; the impact of change it has on the wider DNS.

Through a series of empirical studies, five or six studies, the RSSAC finds that the root zone delegation TTLs are still appropriate for today's environment. And second, root zone TTL values could be reduced to one day without any significant impact on the amount of traffic the root server.

(I think) the exact number is 99.8% of the queries queried the root zone far between zero and 24 hours. So if you reduce it from two day to one day, it will not impact traffic the root server significantly.

However, given the conservatives and principles in general to be applied to the root zone and advanced planning of operations, the RSSAC cautioned to change the TTL; specifically increasing root zone TTLs should only be done with careful consideration of the DNSSEC related implications.

And finally, the RSSAC identified two potential problems related to the interaction between the start of authority expire value and the root zone signature validity periods.

With these findings, the RSSAC made two recommendations. The first recommendation is to the root zone management partners to increase the signature of validity periods for signatures generated by the Key Signing Key and the Zone Signing Key.

The Key Signing Key they recommend to increase the validity period to 21 days, the Zone Signing Key for 13 days. The RSSAC also stated that the issue is now urgent and - is not urgent and it just should be addressed within abysmal amount of time. Now that's contrary to what's on popular press saying about this report. The RSSAC also recommend no further changes to the root zone TTLs be made at this time.

The RSSAC since - in July - on July RSSAC also chartered a work party to look at the history and technical analysis of the naming scheme used for individual root servers.

The current naming scheme is A to N dot root dash servers dot net. So the RSSAC wants this technical history - why such naming schemes to be used to be documented and consider the changes to the naming scheme.

In particular moving from the root server's dot net zone to the root zone. And consider the impact on the (primary) responses and as well as the various risks associated. The work party has been meeting weekly and expects to finish its work in mid-November, which we could prove a update in the next policy Webinar.

Looking ahead at ICANN 54, the RSSAC has two work sessions; joint meetings with the Nominating Committee and the Board of Directors. Its public session is going to be on Wednesday at 2:00 to 3:15 pm in auditorium.

In addition, this is the first time RSSAC will participate in how it works tutorial explaining the root server system.

Okay. Quickly moving on to the SSAC. Since ICANN 53 the most recent publication from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee is (SAC) 73. The SSAC comment on ICANN root zone Key Signing Key of rollover plan.

The SSAC review - ICANN's KSK rollover plan compared against - with an early advisory it has issued on this topic (SAC) 63. What the SSAC knows that there is not a comprehensive correlation of the recommendations in (SAC) 63 with the ICANN's KSK rollover plan.

The SSAC reviewed its recommendation again and believe the recommendation (SAC) 63 are still valid and important to implement. So you ask - the advisors they ask design team to respond in its final report directly to each of the recommendations in (SAC) 63 and provide a rationale if it chooses not to address the SSAC recommendations.

I will hand over now to my colleague Julie Hedlund to finish this part of the update on the SSAC activities at ICANN 54. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Steve. This is Julie Hedlund. And just very briefly there are some interesting SSAC activities at ICANN 54 in Dublin. In particular we'll start the week with session on DNSSEC for everybody, a beginner's guide. This is an extremely popular session that contains an informative skit. That will be on Monday the 19th from 5:30 to 7:00.

Following that on Wednesday the 21st will be the DNSSEC workshop that will commence at 9 o'clock am and complete at 3:15 pm. And consult the schedule for the various locations for these meetings.

Finally, there is the SSAC public meeting on Thursday the 22nd. That will be from 8 o'clock to 9 o'clock am and that one is in the auditorium. The SSAC

also will be meeting with the community including the ALAC, the ICANN Board and the GNSO.

And here you see some links for additional information on the SSAC including the main Web page and the publications. And at this point I would like to turn things over to my colleague Olof Nordling for the GAC update.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Julie. And good evening to you all from the Brussels of (Oberesa). And my name is Olof Nordling. I'm Team Leader for support of the GAC.

And the GAC is of course spelled out the Governmental Advisory Committee, which currently has 154 governments as members and 33 IGOs or Intergovernmental organizations as observers meaning we have added two more members and one new observer since the Buenos Aires meetings. So it's going the right direction.

The GAC typically meets face-to-face and traditionally always done. So and those are the most intense moments of interaction for the GAC. But with time the intersessional work has become much more important and almost dominating the activities. So today by email conference calls in plenary and most importantly an increase in the work of the working groups.

And the (unintelligible) of the GAC is to provide advice on public policy matters to the ICANN Board and essentially advise on any matter in the view of its policy - the public policy implication.

So what is the GAC up to in Dublin? Well, as to policy, well, like for everyone else the top of the bill is IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability. The plenty of particular aspects that the GAC is interest in; for example, the so-called Stress Test 18 and the aspects of the structural changes that have been proposed by the Accountability CCWG.

And of course quite importantly for the reason that the GAC like many others is a chartering organization for this particular CCWG. There are also still remaining issues with the new gTLD program. And well Mary already mentioned it when Council protection of IGO names and acronyms; we're not yet out of the woods but things are advancing.

Also implementation of the GAC (stakeholder) advice delivered ever since the Beijing meeting is the reason for the GAC to contemplate has it been done properly or should we ask for some rectifications here.

The working groups, which are more and more, have particular meetings as well and the topics address by some of them for example are geographic names mind you for the future new gTLD rounds and the protection of the geographic names in those.

Also the working group on Human Rights and International Law; that's an obvious connection to one of the provisions proposed in the CCWG proposal. And the Public Safety Working Group consisting of primarily law enforcement agencies and consumer protection experts from the GAC members and observers dealing with a number of issues like the security framework for the new gTLD program frequently called Specification 11.

And also taking care of developing GAC views on the next generation directory services, which was managing the - well, the GNSO activities in that regard.

The GAC will be meeting with the GNSO, the ccNSO, with the ALAC and the Board more or less in tradition fashion provided time still remains after all that has to be done with the accountability of course.

But there are also other activities on the schedule. One of those is election of GAC Vice Chairs of which the GAC can have up to five and currently has five. And this promises to be a very smooth exercise this time around. That's not

necessarily the case but this time it seems to be sort of coming from a very good position.

Other activities include the internal review of the GAC operating principles. May sound a bit dull but is certainly most important and has also some connections to the accountability work. And preparations for the new meeting structure, in particular how to deal with the Meeting B as it's called frequently.

And obviously preparations for the next ICANN meeting in Marrakech and in particular since that will feature the next and the third high level governmental meeting taking place on the Monday in Marrakech hosted by the Marrakech host, (unintelligible).

So to conclude, the GAC sessions from Saturday till Thursday noon as (help) indicates will the last few years are all open with one exception. And that's the communique drafting on Wednesday afternoon.

So I can truly say that you're welcome to the GAC meeting room on the spot or remotely. It's called Liffey A and you can then enjoy the proceedings in no less than seven languages. And with that, I leave it over to the soothing voice of Heidi Ulrich to tell you about ALAC and the At Large. Take it away Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much Olof. Hello. And one, my names is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At Large and here for ALAC support. Today I'm joined by two of my teammates, Ariel Liang, Policy Analyst; and Sylvia Vivanco, Manage At Large Regional Affairs.

We are delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the At Large Advisory Committee or the ALAC and the At Large community consisting of the five regional At Large organizations and over 190 At Large structures or ALSes that have taken place between the ICANN meetings in Buenos Aires and Dublin. We will also provide a preview of At Large activities that are being planned for ICANN 54.

So first I'd like to begin with ALAC main topics between ICANN 53 and ICANN 54. In run up to Dublin, ALAC is focusing on three main topics. And the first one is ICANN accountability and transparency.

And as a preface since August 2014, there have been weekly calls of the At Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the tradition of U.S. Government stewardship of the IANA function or Transition Working Group for short. And these calls have been covering the CWG as well as CCWG issues.

Now moving on to the CCWG statement from the ALAC. It was submitted on the 11th of September. And in general the ALAC supports the CCWG proposal but with some reservations.

And the current statement is not what ALAC would have preferred as it has no membership level, has less legal enforcement, more good will; it has more complex structure than the ALAC would like; and the same mechanisms, which deliberately make it difficult for the community to override the Board also make it difficult to change as Internet and world evolve.

And ALAC will be discussing this topic over five hours during meetings of ALAC and the Transition Working Group on Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday in Dublin.

The second main topic is the ICG proposal. And the ALAC submitted their statement on this in response to the ICG consultation on 8th of September. And the key point in this statement was that especially a split resulting in IANA functions being undertaken by more than one IANA (coaching) operator would be likely to introduce instability.

And then secondly, in the event of an operational community reaching the decision to replace the IANA functions operator they should discuss their decision with other operational communities prior to proceeding forward

taking all ways to keep all of the IANA functions undertaken by a single IANA functions operator.

And as the CCWG topic, this hot topic will be discussed during meetings of the ALAC and the Transition Working Group on Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday.

And finally the third main topic - hot topic for the ALAC in Dublin will be the At Large Structure Criteria and Expectations Task Force. And immediately following ICANN 53 the ALAC moved forward with the ALS Criteria and Expectations Task Force that would be reviewing the criteria for ALS applications as well as expectations for their activities once they joined.

This task force is divided into four teams. They are the application process, ALS criteria, ALS operational expectations and individuals. And in Dublin the ALAC and regional leaders will continue to process - be assessing the criteria and expectations of becoming and remaining an At Large structure.

As a byproduct of this process, the ALAC will be improving the two processes to ensure full engagement of ALS' and their members in ICANN activities. I would now like to hand the floor over to Ariel who will provide an update on the ALAC policy statements submitted since ICANN 53. Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thank you Heidi. This is Ariel Liang, Policy Analyst supporting ALAC. In addition to the ALAC policy advice on the IANA stewardship transition proposal and the CCWG accountability second draft report that Heidi summarized previously, since the ICANN 53, the ALAC submitted or is process finalizing nine other policy advice statements.

Now I will provide you with a summary of these statements and then highlight a few. First, the ALAC has commented on the initial report from one (active) GNSO PDP Working Group as well as the preliminary issue reports of two potential GNSO PDPs.

Regarding the potential PDP on the new gTLD subsequent procedures, the ALAC believes that consumer trust is about any and all other issues and the next round should not be launched in a rush.

The topics of community applications - applicant support program and the global public interest continue to be very important to the ALAC. This topic will be discussed further during ICANN 54 meeting.

Regarding the next generation gTLD registration directory services to replace Whois, the main concern from the ALAC is related to the end user community engagement in this potential PDP, which may amount in long-term commitments. The ALAC will be vigilant to ensure that measures to enable the broadest participation is considered and implemented.

Second, the ALAC commented on the deliverables from two GNSO non-PDP Working Groups. Specifically the ALAC and At Large representatives have been very active in the Policy and Implementation Working Group and supports the proposed ICANN bylaw amendment recommendations in general.

The ALAC has two concerns. One is GNSO's ability to arrive at an equitable solution when public interest is in conflict with the needs of contracted parties. The other is for the implementation of complex policy such as the new gTLD process.

The number of referrals back to the GNSO elongates the over - implementation process. The ALAC recommends that the ICANN Board monitor both issues.

Lastly, the ALAC has developed statements on the public comments related to ICANN organizational reviews and is in process finalizing comments on the work of active and potential ICANN Cross Community Working Groups.

In particular the comments of the use of country and territory names as top level domains has been developed though in depth consultation within the wider At Large community with a dozen of contributors.

My colleagues will speak about those types of the Cross Community Working Groups towards the end of this Webinar. For more information about ALAC policy advice you may visit the correspondence page on the current At Large Web site for (adopted advice) or visit the At Large policy development Wiki workspace to follow the ones under development. Back to you Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much Ariel. I'd like to now move over to ALAC and At Large activity at ICANN 54. During the ICANN meeting the At Large community will be holding 30 formal meetings and smaller groups will also be holding several informal meetings. And some of these go from 8:00 am to 8:00 pm. So very busy days for the ALAC.

Of note there'll be two new meetings in Dublin. The first will be the ALAC strategy and working session scheduled for Saturday, 17th of October. This is an all-day strategy and working session that will allow the ALAC and mutual lead chairs to be looking at the upcoming week and allow for additional time for policy advice discussions.

The second new meeting for the ALAC will be the ALAC development session to be held on Friday, 23rd of October. This session will be for current or ongoing and incoming ALAC members. And it will be a team building exercise.

The ALAC will be meeting with the ccNSO, GAC and SSAC leadership as well as senior ICANN staff as well. And for the At Large group, At Large working groups are one of the key ways in which they develop their policy advice. And in Dublin there will be nine At Large working groups meeting face-to-face to facilitate progress in both policy and process activities.

And the dates and times are available on the ICANN 54 meeting schedule that has been posted. Of note, EURALO will be holding face-to-face general assembly during Dublin. And as of now I'd like to hand the floor over to my colleague Sylvia who will provide more information on the EURALO general assembly as well as the planned activities of the other regional At Large organizations. Sylvia.

Sylvia Vivanco: Thank you Heidi. Hello. My name is Sylvia Vivanco. I am Manager of At Large Regional Affairs and I will present the EURALO meetings in Dublin. AFRALO will hold the AFRALO African joint meeting on Wednesday, 21st October on the same IANA and ICANN accountability transition Africa perspective.

This meeting will include an opening address by Alan Greenberg, ALAC Chair; Pierre Dandjinou Global Stakeholder Engagement Vice President for Africa; Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ICANN's Board member; Fadi Chehade, ICANN's President and CEO.

And the topic will be introduced by Mohamed El Bashir, AFRALO Vice Chair and Vice Chair of the ICG and by Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO member and ALAC's Vice Chair. And the presentation of this draft statement will be done by Seun Ojedeji, incoming AFRALO ALAC member and member of the CWG.

APRALO will hold this meeting on Wednesday, 21st as well. And again, that includes the review of the activities undertaken jointly by GSE and APRALO under the APAC Hub APRALO framework pilot.

And we'll have the participation of speaker of Yu-Chuang Kuek. He's VP of the Global Stakeholder Engagement in Asia; Samiran Gupt, GSE Head of India; and Zheng Song, GSE Head of China. And the introduction of Kaili Kan

(unintelligible) to the ALAC from the Asia, Australia and Pacific Islands Region.

EURALO will hold the general assembly in two parts on Wednesday, 21st October. And I will provide more details on this meeting in the next slide. APRALO will hold this meeting on Monday, 19 October.

And this meeting will include an update of the ICANN's GSE Latin American, Caribbean ALAC strategy by Rodrigo de la Parra, GSE for - VP for Latin America and the Caribbean; Albert Daniels, the Stakeholder Engagement Manager for the Caribbean; and Rodrigo Saucedo, Project Manager for Latin America and the Caribbean.

And NARALO will hold the meeting on Monday, 19 October. And this meeting will review the year's accomplishments, challenges and upcoming projects. The invited speakers for this meeting include ICANN's compliance department Allen Grogan, ICANN's Chief Contracting Council; and Chris Mondini, VP for Stakeholder Engagement for North America.

And there will be a Cross-RALO meeting. This is a customary meeting where all the five RALOs meet to discuss issues where their collective input and action is required. And this will be on Monday, 19 October.

And I will now speak about a EURALO general assembly 2015 and EURALO GSE European networking event. The EURALO general assembly is taking part in two sections. The Part 1 on Wednesday, 21st at 10:30 until 12:00 on the same public interest in the meeting room we Wicklow H1. And this part will have us invited speakers Nora Abussitta, ICANN's VP for Development and Public Responsibility; Bill Drake, EURALO's member; and Konstantinos Kimaitis of ISOC among other speakers from the EURALO community.

The Part 2 will take place in the afternoon from 1545 to 1730. And guest speakers include Wolfgang Kleinwachter, ICANN Board member; Rinalia

Abdul Rahim, ICANN Board member selected by At Large; and Alan Greenberg, ALA Chair; and Jean-Jacques Sahel, VP Stakeholder Engagement for Europe. And this section will focus on a review of EURALO's achievements and upcoming plans.

This will be followed by the joint EURALO and European Coordination and Networking event, which starts at 1830 until 2030. Everyone with an interest on European views on Internet governance and ICANN issues is invited to attend. The full program is posted in the Wiki page on the slide. And please you are welcome to join us and participate in this event. Thank you very much and over to you Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thank you Sylvia. This is Ariel Liang speaking again. I would like to conclude the ALAC At Large session with one piece of exciting news. The At Large Web site has come through a redesign process and the new site will serve as the template for future Web site redesign of ACs and SOs.

Its beta testing site will be unveiled during the ICANN 54 meeting in Dublin on Tuesday, the 20th of October at Wicklow H1. Everyone is welcome to attend the session and provide your feedback on the beta site.

Furthermore, ICANN staff will also be available at the newcomer launch - newcomer booth on Tuesday, October the 20th and Wednesday, October 21st to distribute the new URL. And anyone interested is welcome to stop by, test out the site and share your experience on the spot. The development of the site will continue after the beta launch and the office site will meet the public towards the end of 2015.

Next I will turn the floor to my colleague Lars Hoffmann who will introduce you to the ICANN Cross Community Working Group. Lars.

Lars Hoffmann: And hello from Brussels. I'm going to talk to you about the Cross Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names as top-level domains.

The group (unintelligible) on the same issue and (unintelligible) to (propose) the policy framework on two character and three character (on short names) representing country and territory names and as I said before, on top level domains meaning that second level or any lower level domains is out of the scope of this working group.

The group has tentatively concluded its discussion on two character codes and maintaining the status quo of two character codes, I'm sorry, being reserved as ccTLDs. Looks like the most likely outcome at the moment.

Also a survey was sent out by the group to all of the ICANN supporting organizations and the (better) committees as well as the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the ccNSO to ask about their views on three character codes of top level domains in relation to country and territory names.

And as you can see on the slide, the outcome with the feedback received from that request as well as the general discussion on three letter codes would form the core of the group's discussion in Dublin.

And then finally the initial report is tentatively scheduled for ICANN 55. And with that I'm going to pass on to my colleague Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you Lars. Hello again everybody. And it's perhaps fitting that we draw this section of our update to a close by talking about an effort to develop a framework of principles that will guide the formation as well as the operation of future cross community working groups.

I say this because as you all know there has been a new reliance or interest in the use of cross community working groups recently. And yet we don't

have a uniform framework that applies across all the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees that would actually provide a consistent set of rules.

So this particularly cross community working group, which as you can see is affectionately termed CWG Squared and was spearheaded by the GNSO and the ccNSO although the members do come from various SOs and ACs.

There is no update planned for Dublin. But work is ongoing on developing the framework I spoke of. And the hope is that there will be a draft document that we can share with the community shortly after Dublin. So please look for that. And on that note I will turn you over to my colleague Carlos Reyes who will take us through the rest of the session. Carlos.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you Mary. At this time we'll open up the lines. For those participants that have any questions, please press star 1 and we'll take your questions. In the meantime as people on mute or join the queue. We collected two questions ahead of time and I'll briefly go over them here and provide some answers.

The first question was about - well, I'll read it. If ICANN receives individual complaints about Whois inaccuracy from a third party, how does ICANN inform the relevant registrar and can ICANN share these requests with the domain owner?

So here we provide a link to ICANN's compliance approach and processes. But essentially the domain name owner is able to see these requests. And registrars have obligations to provide affirmative responses. And all of this has to follow validation methods based on the RAA accreditation.

The second question is regarding ICANN's engagement in Iran and specifically how ICANN can best support those who seek change toward multi (stakeholderism) and Iran's policies.

And since in November of 2014 ICANN staff visited Iran and there have been several meetings, which have resulted in some good progress including a potential DNS security workshop Tehran later this year. I'm going to invite my colleague Olof Nordling from the GAC and he'll also provide some insights in Iran's current engagement with ICANN. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Carlos and yes, hello. This is Olof again. And I would only like to highlight that Iran is most active member of the GAC since quite some time. And I think many of you would recognize the name Kavous Arasteh as the GAC representative for Iran and who has been most active not only within the GAC but also in the ICG.

And well, truly supportive of the multi (stakeholderism). So while there are glimmers of hope in that regard I will say. Back to you Carlos.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you Olof. Are there any questions on the line? It doesn't appear like we have any callers. So with that, we'll go ahead and - we'll go ahead and transition to ending the session here.

How to stay updated. For those of you that are interested in following the work of the ICANN Policy Development Support Team, please follow us on Twitter. We have several ICANN handles including (ICANN) GNSO, ccNSO and ICANN At Large. Those are run by our support staff and we provide updates on activities.

Also if you need to contact us, we're always available on policy-staff@icann.org. We have a monthly policy update and that is published. The pre-ICANN 54 issue will be coming out next week. So if you're not already registered, please go ahead and sign up and you'll receive that.

And the GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House Sessions, this is a new effort essentially providing community led sessions for community

members that are interested in joining GNSO working groups. And they provide information about how they proceed and how they conduct their work.

All right. With that, I'll transition to David Olive. And thanks everyone.

David Olive: Thank you Carlos. And I'd like to thank my Policy Team colleagues for organizing and presenting the latest update on the policy and advice activities as we proceed to prepare for ICANN 54 in Dublin.

Just to - I'll close by saying we are a team of 27 people in nine countries in five time zones using at times 15 languages in support of our global community active in our policy development activities.

With that, I would like to thank all of you for taking the time to be with us. And we will see you either in person in Dublin or if you cannot, we look forward to greeting you remotely to remote participation at many of the sessions.

Here we have a workplace where you can download the recording of the transcript of today's session for further reference at your convenience. And with that, thank you very much and I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be. Thank you and either see you in person or hear you online at ICANN 54 in Dublin. Thank you very much.

END