ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
25 February 2010 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar 25 February at 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. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-update-2-20100225.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

David Olive: Thank you very much. Welcome to ICANN's Policy Update Webinar. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development and I'm happy to present today the Second Policy Update, which is now set to become a reoccurring event ahead of the ICANN meeting, in order to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help all of us prepare and focus our efforts.

In addition to the policy update Webinar, our Policy Team is also in the process of preparing an Outreach Policy Program that will focus on newcomers and provide an introduction into how the policy development takes place and how one can (unintelligible) to participate.

Stay tuned for information in the near future. There is a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and recordings we made available following this session, so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information at their leisure.

A few housekeeping items to begin with, as the introduction, I have to do this, to reduce interference, please mute your phones. There will be an opportunity to answer questions at the end of the session and then we can unmute the line for that purpose.

This is an Adobe Connect room and the slides will be viewed and questions posted and there's a link to this room is in the email that you receive with the invitation.

There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end. However, during the session, you can submit questions in the chat box that is below the Adobe Connect window and we'll do our best to answer your questions. In case questions arise on the meeting or to follow up on any of the discussions, please feel free to contact us at policy.-staff@icann.org.

One note of caution, please do not use the "call me" button. That is used for recording this session. And at the end of the session, of course, please state your name, and you'll be added to the queue or you can use the feature of "raising your hand" in Adobe Connect and we'll recognize you for that purpose.

The goals of the session, ICANN's, of course, Nairobi meeting. Many of you are planning to participate there, either in person, or remotely, recognizing that for this meeting, many participants will be looking for remote participation and service and special attention.

So, we're putting our efforts to making sure we have a more standardized approach on the remote sessions, a more level playing field for participants irrespective of the bandwidth they have, and create a more equivalent experience for those participating in the room from those outside.

And we'll also have monitoring services during the sessions. So for further details on the Remote Services provided, you can contact the Nairobi Web site on at ICANN.

In addition to a number of policy related activities that will be highlighted throughout this presentation, there are a number of other important sessions

taking place in Nairobi, such as a new gTLD update, an expression of interest, panel sessions, affirmation of commitments discussion, fiscal 2011 operating plan and budget consultations, and the abuse of the V&S Forum.

Again, for further information, this is all posted on our Web site for the Nairobi conference.

Turning to Policy developed at ICANN, the focus of this presentation is on Policy Development process and as most of you are aware, the following bodies are responsible for such policy development.

The GNSO develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domains, the country code supporting organizations develop policy recommendations applicable to the country code managers, and the addressing supporting organization reviews and develops recommendations on the Internet protocol address policy.

The advice provided at ICANN is done by the supporting organizations that have the capacity to develop policy recommendations and as we know, there are a number of advisory committees that provide advice to the ICANN Board.

And so, when we look at the topic covered, slides 7 through 9, will give you an overview of this session. It might be worth putting out one note that, this is just a selection of activities going on in the different supporting organizations, the highlights, if you will, and for further details, we ask you to go to the respective supporting organization Web sites where there is more detail available.

I'll now turn to experts on the Policy Staff to present various parts of this program and starting off with GNSO, I turn to Rob Hoggarth. Rob please.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you David. Good day everybody. Welcome and thank you all very much for joining us. It looks like we have a really good turnout.

In terms of an overall view of the GNSO policy issues, we have a wide range of issues that we're currently working on. The list on Slide 11 is - reflects a number of the issues we'll be talking about today, but there are a total of about 17 Working Groups and work teams currently underway, varying from the very specific technical items, like inter-registrar transfer policy, to much more general, but just as important, management and administrative organizational type issues like the GNSO restructuring and improvements area.

And that's the first are we're going to talk about today, GNSO improvements. It's an important issue for the GNSO community, because, of course, the GNSO is the primary policy driver and maker for the generic name space.

Like the other supporting organizations and advisory committees in ICANN, the GNSO is subject to regular reviews. And there were some real critical objectives that the community identified to a review of the GNSO back in the 2007 timeframe that we are still, and this is a hint to all of you in the ALAC, that the GNSO is still implementing.

The process was very long and involved. There was a lot of public input and comment, a lot of community participation, both online, in person, and through comment forums.

And the three fundamental areas that the review improvements efforts focused on, were maximizing participation of members of the community in the policy development process, a real emphasis on reexamining the policy development process itself, and seeing how it could be improved, in terms of how it's conducted, what sort of preparatory work goes into it, and how various members of the community can participate in a substantial and realistic way.

And then a general recognition that throughout our community, regardless of our SO or AC, it's very important to make sure that we're communicating in an effective manner and also making sure that everyone who's participating has the appropriate administrative and staff support.

Now, the GNSO improvements area really focused in five major goals and expectations. Those are reflected on Slide 14. The real critical sort of touchstone of all of the areas of improvement was the GNSO Council and the restructuring of that body from, in a sense, a legislative body that did a lot of the detailed work, to becoming more of a strategic manager and coordinator for policy development.

And that's important, because one of the goals of the improvements effort was to really move the new policy development process to a Working Group model of policy development.

And, you know, the anticipation of that was that there would be much more community participation, many more groups coming to the table to participate in an organized fashion and mechanisms that could exist that would provide the broadest possible substantial participation and policy development.

Pieces of those important areas of improvement also included enhancing the structures of the GNSO, the constituencies that continue to exist in the process, as well as, a new structure that we're calling stakeholder groups that I'll talk about in a moment.

And then, of course, finally one of those major areas that I touched on the goals in the previous slide, the importance of improving communication, not just within the GNSO, but between the GNSO and other bodies.

Slide 15 basically just gives you an overall picture of the new structure of GNSO Council and how it's set up. I could spend 45 minutes talking with you

all about the details of that slide. And so I'm not going to do that today, but suffice to say, that the fundamental framework and model, as you can see with the outlined areas on this slide, is that the GNSO Council now is essentially formed through a bicameral house structure in which the interest of contracted parties and the interests of non-contracted parties in the GNSO are balanced.

And through a lot community discussion that balance is reflected through voting thresholds, operating procedures, and just the structure and make up of how counselors are ultimate appointed or selected for participation on the GNSO Council.

I'd be delighted to answer any questions offline about the details of this slide or, you know, in separate forum, talk to you all about how those processes work.

Fundamentally, what you can see on this slide, is that, in addition to the two party houses that exist, the fundamental structure of constituency's remains, but there's this new piece, that we call, stakeholders or stakeholder groups, that are reflected by the registries, the registrars, the commercial stakeholders and the non-commercial stakeholders in the GNSO.

Now currently, what's happened is that, in Seoul the new council was seated. That took a tremendous amount of community effort that included bylaw amendments, a lot of real challenging discussions about operating procedures, how the council would transition to the new structure.

That's now all in place. As I noted, these stakeholder groups' structures were created. The Board has approved permanent stakeholder group charters for the contracted side of the GNSO for the registry and registrar stakeholder groups.

The stakeholder groups on the non-contracted side of the GNSO, the commercial stakeholder group in the non-commercial stakeholder group, are currently operating under transitional or temporary charters that the community members are still discussing and that the Board hopes will be resolved by the Latin American ICANN meeting later this year.

Currently, and in a critical part of the GNSO improvements work, is a collection of work teams and steering committees that are at work within the GNSO who are focusing on the five main areas that you see on Slide 17.

We've got a work team that's currently getting quite far along in discussing the policy development process, how that can be improved, modified, adjusted, so that work is a critical piece of the effort.

We also have a work team that's focused on developing the Working Group model of policy development, where ultimately the GNSO Council will essentially create a charter document that then a Working Group made up a broad cross section of community members will participate in.

And that group actually, has produced some general guidelines that have been posted for public comment. And so, we hope members of the community will have an opportunity to look at that and comment on that.

There's a very critical work team that was tasked with developing and now revising the council's operating procedures. That involves some very technical work in terms of reading the bylaws, looking at past practices of the GNSO and trying to create mechanisms and systems that support that balanced GNSO Council structure.

Another important work team is the Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations work team. Their focus and goal has been to develop operational processes and procedures that are going to assist and make sure that the various stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO operate on a

level playing field, so that everyone is comfortable that, although they won't have precisely the same operating procedures or specific mechanisms, that at the very least, there is a commonality, so that any member of the community can be comfortable that those structures are operating transparently, openly, in a fair manner.

And then finally, a work team that is pretty much concluding a significant portion of its work in the last week or two, that's focusing on communications improvement. A big piece of that they have made some significant progress on, is a design for a new GNSO Web site and other technical considerations that will make Working Groups, collaborative efforts, comment forums and the rest operate much more efficiently.

In terms of next steps, leading up to Nairobi and then between Nairobi and Brussels, we're going to continue to see a lot efforts and work taking place in the various work teams.

Another important component of this process of GNSO improvement is that review of the existing constituencies, something the Board has called a reconfirmation process, and those efforts will likely continue through the Nairobi and up through the Brussels meeting by the individual communities.

There's also going to be, as I mentioned before, continued work within the communities with respect to the permanent charters for the commercial stakeholder group, their non-commercial stakeholder group.

And then, as many of you have heard and perhaps seen in the comment forums, since the Board approved these new structures almost 18 months ago, we've had several proposals, I think, by various stakeholders for new GNSO constituencies.

Four have been filed to date. The Board has processed through three of those. There's still a pending proposal for a consumer's constituency and

there a couple of others in the works, some that you may see before Nairobi, others likely after Nairobi where other interested community groups are thinking about forming new GNSO constituencies where they will seek further community input and comments.

So, it's a very long and involved process, one that's very important to insuring fairness across the GNSO spectrum and staff and members of the community who are working on that certainly welcome additional input, feedback, contributions to their efforts.

So, please reach out to Glen the Secretary for the GNSO. Her email address is identified there in Slide 19, if you're interested in helping out or contributing to the effort.

Also, we've set up a GNSO improvement information Web page. The link is produced on Slide 19 there and we, you know, welcome you to go there, check for some of the latest developments, find background information, find Board resolutions and the rest. It's sort of a one stop shop for everything related to the improvement efforts in the GNSO.

I want to conclude there. Please feel free to ask questions on the "Chat Room", you know, at the bottom of the screen. Also, we'll be hanging around at the end of this call for questions as well.

Thanks a lot. And Marika I'll turn it over to you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Rob for that. Good evening everyone and thank you very much for joining. And I'll be talking first about the inter-registrar transfer policies, also known as IRTP.

And this is a GNSO consensus policy that was actually adopted in 2004 with the objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain and registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation of that policy, it was decided to carry out and review the policy in order to determine whether it was actually working as intended, or whether there were any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvements.

And as a result of that review, a number of issues were identified that were then grouped together in five different policy development processes and they're known as PDP, which were tiled from A to E and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

A PDP Working Group is now considering the issues part of the group titled B, hence the name IRTP Part B PDP Working Group.

So this Working Group is reviewing a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain and registration that has been inappropriately transferred, either as a result of a hijacking or other conflicts and reviewing whether a separate or provision should be introduced to address such instances.

In addition, the group is discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

Since policy development processes was initiated in June 2009 and since then the Working Group has been discussing the charter question, in parallel they're soliciting public comments, as well as, constituency and stakeholder group inputs.

As required by the Working Group charter, ICANN Compliance Team has been playing an active role in this Working Group and as more specifically provided data on the level of complaints and topics about which ICANN receives complaints in relation to the transfer policy to help and form the deliberations of the Working Group.

A draft and issue report has already been developed, which aims to capture the different discussion and positions. And the next step for this Working Group will now be to agree on recommendations for the different charter questions and publish our relation report for public comment and discussion.

There's no meeting planned at the Nairobi meeting. So this slide is just to provide you with a snapshot of the information that has been provided by the ICANN Compliance Team as referred to in the previous slide, which concerns that issues related to unlocking of the name and registrations, wrongful denial, but also lack of understanding of how the transfer policy works are some of the main reasons of complaints received by ICANN from registrants in relation to the IRTP.

Information like this has helped inform the deliberations of the Working Group, as well as, serving as supporting evidence as to why it is important to address these issues from a registrant's prospective.

So even though this Working Group is well on the way and new members are always welcome, although you might want to hold out for some of the upcoming IRTP PDPs we'll address issues related to dispute policy enhancements, penalties for IRTP violations, and operational enhancements.

In addition, you will find on this slide some links to back order documents, as well as, the Working Groups work space.

The second policy development process that is currently on the way is about post-expiration domain name recovery. And this is an issue that was brought to the GNSO by the at large advisory committee, which raised a number of questions in relation to the predictability and transparency of existing expiration and renewal policies and practices.

In addition to those issues, the Working Group is also addressing questions like do registrants have adequate opportunity to redeem their domain and

registration following expiration and is there adequate notice that a domain name registration's about to expire?

This Working Group is expected to make recommendations to the GNSO Council for best practices and/or changes to existing or proposals for new consensus policy.

So in order to help inform the deliberations of the Working Group, a survey was conducted that reviewed the renewal and expiration practices of the top gTLD registrars, which account for approximately 69% of gTLD registrations.

The survey found that there's a lot of variations in registrars in relation to renewal and expiration practices and part of the Working Group's discussion now focuses on this question, whether variation is a good or a bad thing.

For further details on the registrar's survey, I would recommend that you visit the Working Group work space where you can find further details.

In addition, the Working Group has reviewed and analyzed public comment, as well as, constituency stakeholder group's statements received. For this group, the first draft of the initial report has also been prepared, which captures the discussion and data gathered to date, but the most difficult task is still ahead, which is comments to agreement on recommendations for each of the charter questions, if any.

In order to help the group forward in this process, we're now conducting a survey amongst the members of the Working Group, in order to assess their views on the different charter questions, in order to determine where there's a common ground and where there's actual further work that needs to be done.

This Working Group had initially planned and open Working Group session in Nairobi, but unfortunately, due to lack of attendance from Working Group members, it was decided earlier this week to cancel that meeting.

So for those of you interested in the topics addressed by this Working Group, I would encourage you to follow the deliberations of the Working Group by monitoring the work space, as well as, looking out for the publication of the initial reports, which will be accompanied by a public comment period.

So next up, is the registration abuse policy's Working Group. And as a background, this observation was made in the GNSO Council, that registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches in dealing with registration abuse, but the question was also asked, does this actually matter?

In addition, what goal should - I can play in the drafting registration abuse and what issues, if any, fold into the scope of GNSO policy development?

So in response to the questions, the GNSO Council passed a pre-PDP Working Group. So please note that this is not a policy development process at this point in time, to gather further information on issues, such as what is the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse, as distinguishing the two is important in order to determine whether consensus policies can be developed or not, and what is the effectiveness of existing abuse policies, and would there be any benefits to having uniform provisions in registry and/or registrar agreements in relation to abuse?

And, as you can imagine, these were not simple questions to answer and the Working Group made use of several sub-teams to conduct some of the legwork on these questions.

And now after many months of hard work, the Working Group has published its initial reports for public comment and review earlier this month.

So the report itself consists of over 100 pages, which detail the deliberations and findings of the Working Group on the different issues outlined before, as well as, an overview and description of the different abuses the Working

Group was able to identify and much of this information serves as a backdrop to the focal point of the report, which are the recommendations that are now being put forward by the Working Group for public consideration and comments, before finalizing these and submitting those to the GNSO Council.

Recommendations included relate to issues such as Fibros squatting, whether there's a recommendation to initiate a PDP to review the uniform dispute resolution process or UDRP, and recommendations in relation to who has access and some issues using domain names, etc. You see some of the other issues here listed on the slide.

And many of these recommendations are unanimous consensus recommendations, but there are also a number where no unanimous consensus was reached and alternate views have been expressed, so the Working Group is therefore, especially interested to receive public comment and views on those recommendations where there are different proposals.

So, a mentioned, a public comment forum is now open until the 28th of March and everyone is encouraged to submit their comments there. You see the link here on the slide.

In addition, the Working Group will be organizing an information session in Nairobi on Wednesday, 10th of March from 4 to 5:30 in the afternoon local time.

And following the closing of the public comment period, the registration of these policies Working Group will review and analyze the comments received and update the report, where appropriate, in view of submitting a final report in time for consideration by the GNSO Council at the ICANN meeting Brussels.

And with that, I'll hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thanks Marika. I'm going to talk to you about some of the policy initiatives that I've been supporting. The first one, is the GNSO Council has recently approved a policy development process, a PDP, on the issue of vertical integration between registries and registrars.

And this is the issue regarding whether there should be rules or restrictions on a registry's ownership of a registrar or vice versa or if there is common ownership, whether there should be additional restrictions or requirements, such as equal access or non-discriminatory terms.

And so that is the focus of the process development process. It's just getting underway. And it's important to the ICANN community, because, as many of you know, there's the new gTLD program is currently underway and ICANN has proposed in the past and will propose models on how to deal with the distribution of new gTLDs.

This is one of those issues that needs to be resolved before the new gTLD program can be launched, because the terms, whether they allow separation or cross ownership, would be incorporated into the registry agreements that would be signed b the registries for the new gTLDs.

It's important to note that the GNSO in its prior deliberations for the new gTLD program did not include recommendations specifically on this point. And so the questions remains whether the GNSO Council thinks it's prudent to come up with a uniform policy that would apply across the boards to all gTLDs, not just the new ones, but also the existing ones. And these are some of the issues that the PDP Group will be evaluating.

Currently, there's no uniform approach or understand with respect to the issue of vertical integration and for that reason the GNSO Council felt it was important to look at the issue and provide guidance.

Recent developments. If you want to learn more about this issue, there was an Issues Report that provides the background on the issue and provides some of the reasoning behind the current situations.

Many of you will have questions on how this affects the new gTLD program and as you read the Issues Report, you'll note that the policy development process is on a separate track from the new gTLD Implementation Process.

In other words, the proposals for the new gTLD program will proceed and if the GNSO Council comes up with recommendations in a timely manner that are approved by the Board of Directors of ICANN, those recommendations would, depending on when they are approved, be incorporated into the new gTLD program.

The question is, whether they would be implemented in the first round of applications or a subsequent round and that really depends upon how quickly the GNSO Council can come together and produce recommendations on this issue.

When the PDP was launched, the GNSO Council recognized that there's a need to pursue this issue quickly and set a timeline for 16 weeks to complete the policy process.

So how can you participate? As I indicated, this will be a very active policy development process, to be completed in 16 weeks. Currently there's a drafting team finalizing the terms of the charter. As soon as, that charter is approved by the GNSO Council, they'll be volunteer recruitment for individuals that may be interested in participating on this issue.

There will also be public comment forums to provide your viewpoint on this particular issue.

It's also important to note, that we encourage the community to participate in the new gTLD implementation processes. A lot of the meetings in Nairobi will focus on this, so that you can have impact on the earlier rounds of applications in the event that the GNSO Council is unable to produce recommendations in a timely manner.

I also want to turn to the work that's being done with respect to the registrar accreditation agreement. We call that RAA. As many of you know, the RAA is the agreement that ICANN signs with each of the registrars that authorizes them to be an ICANN accredited registrar.

And that document is a standard document that describes the rights and obligations of a registrar. It is updated not very often and we're in the process right now of identifying possible amendments to the RAA.

There's a Working Group that's convened that consists of members of the GNSO community, as well as, the at large community to evaluate what would be appropriate additional amendments to the RAA.

The group is considering things such as terms that would provide better tools to obtain registrar compliance. There's suggestions for additional protections for registrants and there's also a series of recommendations that deal with additional security requirements and due diligence on registrars for consideration in the new form of RAAs.

In addition, the Working Group has also worked on something called the Registrar's Right Charter. And that is a document that describes all of the rights that are referred to in the regis- the RAA as they relate to a registrant and that is - will be a useful tool for registrants to really understand what registrars are obligated to do with respect to dominion registrations.

That document is being finalized and be finalized and relate. There is also something called the Aspirational Charter that is also being developed,

primarily with the at large community. And the idea there is that there may be additional protections that are not currently in the RAA that might be highlighted and useful for additional consideration for future amendments.

The next step with respect to this project is that the list of RAA amendments will be finalized shortly. The Working Group is coming up with a methodology to rank the amendments, high priority or low priority, and - where they will produce a report that will be sent to the GNSO Council that will describe these amendments and make suggestions on how to finalize them in the future.

The next issue I wanted to talk about with the new gTLDs is specifically the special trademark issues that the GNSO Council has evaluated. And to provide you some background, as many of you know, with the new gTLD program, one of the areas of concern that has been identified as an overarching issue, is how to protect trademarks in new gTLDs, specifically there's a concern that there may be a higher incidence of cyber squatting and infringement in a larger name space.

About a year ago, a special group, referred to as the IRT, the Implementation Recommendation's Team was convened and this group comprised mostly of trademark experts that produced a series of trademark related recommendations for the community to consider.

After feedback when the initial report was published, it became apparent, that some of the recommendations did not have consensus and the ICANN Board in trying to move - to address these issues, sought - reached out to the GNSO Council to ask them to provide further input on specific portions of the IRT recommendations and this included a proposal for a trademark clearinghouse, which would be a database that could be used - a centralized database that could be used to collect trademark or registration information to make the new Sunrise processes more efficient.

And there's also recommendations for a uniform rapid suspension procedure, which would be a takedown procedure, a very quick one, in instances of clear and convincing infringement in new gTLDs.

So the GNSO responded to the Board's request and put together a group of volunteers from a broader section of the community to evaluate these recommendations and to come up with something that would potentially have greater consensus.

And they were able to do that and produce the STI Report which is - you can read it at the link that I provided on the slide. ICANN staff fixed those recommendations and revised their proposals to incorporate the STI recommendations and there will be a session in Nairobi on Monday afternoon to explore the latest recommendations and we certainly invite you to participate in that, whether remotely or in person, to provide your input on, whether or not, those additional proposals are acceptable.

There's also a public comment forum that has been opened with respect to the recommendations and I have provided the link there.

And now I'm going to turn it over to Liz and she'll talk to you about two of WHOIS studies. Thank you.

Liz Gasster: Thanks Margie. Good day to everyone and thanks for the terrific turnout today. That's really great.

The first few of my WHOIS studies are basically just providing general background and then the later slides will provide an update on each of the study areas that the GNSO Council has asked staff to look into.

As you know, WHOIS policy has been debated for many years. I should take a step back and just say, WHOIS does provide public access to contact information for registered name holders and requirements for WHOIS are

specified in ICANN agreements with registrars and registries, but WHOIS policy has been of concern for quite some time.

There are many competing interests with very valid viewpoints. For example, law enforcement, many intellectual property owners and cyber security experts want to improve the accuracy of contact information in WHOIS. There are many individuals who have registrations, domain registrations and privacy advocates around the world who are concerned about privacy protection, particularly noting differences in privacy regimes in different countries.

Governments are quite concerned that their legal regime be followed in the context of WHOIS. Service providers are reluctant to absorb new costs related to WHOIS and many registrars and others earn revenue from various privacy services.

So, in light of this, debate has really not lead to new consensus policy. And as a result, the GNSO Council identified five WHOIS study areas that they hope might result in study data that would provide an objective factual basis for future policy making down the road.

So, the Council asked staff to take a look at these five study areas and to determine the cost and feasibility for conducting each and report back to the Council so that they could decide, what if any, studies should be conducted.

So the next part of this presentation is just an update on each of those five study areas, beginning with the WHOIS misuse studies. These are a group of studies intended to assess the impact of public WHOIS on increasing harmful acts.

One study that was proposed with survey registrants and registrars and also research and law enforcement organizations about instances of cases that they've experienced or are aware of where WHOIS, public WHOIS data might have been extracted for the purpose conducting a harmful act.

The second study would compare harmful acts associated with public WHOIS data, versus non-public WHOIS addresses.

We the staff, decided to use an RFP approach, a request for proposals to determine the cost and feasibility of these - the study area. And we did post requests for proposals and received three responses.

We are in the process of analyzing those responses. We're actually just about done with that, but unfortunately just couldn't quite it done in time for the deadline for the Nairobi meeting. So I hope to provide a little more detailed update in Nairobi, but by the end of March, we will have an analysis and some costs to provide to the Council on WHOIS disputes.

The second area of study that the GNSO Council asked us to look at, is kind of range of studies looking at how registrants are identified in WHOIS and the extent to which domain names used by commercial entities are not clearly identified as commercial entities in WHOIS.

Perhaps their identity is a key word or suggests that the registrant is a non-commercial entity. And then also, would correlate that to the use of privacy and proxy services.

So we also used a RFP approach to try to get guidance from expert researchers on the cost and feasibility of doing these studies. We issued a RFP in October. We've received five responses.

We are just finishing up this analysis, but unfortunately, we couldn't get done in time for posting for the Nairobi meeting, but again, I hope to provide some high level information in Nairobi and provide a report to the Council, shortly thereafter. Hopefully, by the end of March.

The third area has to do with several facets of proxy and privacy services and I've categorized them as privacy and proxy abuse study and then separately a privacy and proxy reveal study.

We are thinking that we would use the RFP approach here as well, but RFP's have not been posted yet for these two studies.

The privacy abuse study, or proxy and privacy abuse study, would really look at the extent to which domain names are used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities and the extent to which those are registered via proxy and privacy services.

Now we think this could be challenging because of the need for assistance from many input sources and would likely need extensive community participation, but we're still just scoping that RFP and we do hope to release that later this month.

The reveal study, and we're probably calling it reveal kind of for short, would measure the responses of proxy and privacy services to request to reveal information about the registrant or licensee of the service.

This study is challenging, because it would seem to require that there be actual victims of actionable harm to originate the reveal request accompanied by evidence of harm.

So we're continuing to assess how we might be able to approach that study, to make it a viable study.

The fourth area of study was a request to examine basically a technical analysis of how various client sized software displays non-ASCII registration information, registration information that is input into a registration say using non-ASCII character set.

We've decided to put this study on hold for the time being, pending some work, there is a board convened internationalized registration data Working Group that is a joint Working Group between the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and the GNSO.

And this group is sort of at the early stages considering, you know, what we should require from international registration data. And we'll also address technical questions regarding how data elements might be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from registration information, displaying in familiar characters for local characters and script.

So while this work is underway, we've just temporarily put that study on hold. We're hoping that guidance from the group might either preempt or help conduct that study.

And then the last area of study was a request that the GNSO Council made subsequently. These first study areas I've been describing were requested in March of 2009. This particular request was made in May of 2009. And it's a little bit different. It asks staff to compile a list of WHOIS service requirements or potential WHOIS service requirements, based basically on two areas or two categories.

One would be, requirements that exist is WHOIS today. It's specified in the RAA and registry agreements. And the second would - sort of category of potential WHOIS service requirements, would be gleaned from policy discussions that have previously occurred over the years with regard to WHOIS.

And rather than taking an RFP approach or addressing - we basically decided to move ahead and conduct these compilations ourselves and the staff is very close to producing a first draft of this compilation and we're hoping again, we kind of missed the deadline for Nairobi, but we should have it released later in the March timeframe.

And our next steps would be to solicit input from the GNSO Council and from other SOs and ACs about anything we may have overlooked in this compilation or - also seeking advice about the format of the compilation and whether this meets the expectations that particularly the GNSO Council had in mind when it requested these studies.

So that's a summary of the five study areas. There will be - and clearly there is more information forthcoming in the near term. I will be giving an overview of the WHOIS studies twice in Nairobi. One at the Saturday GNSO Working Session at, I think, 11:15 local time and then again, at the GNSO Public Meeting on Wednesday. And again, I hope to provide a little more information about what we are finding in terms of our analysis of the first two study areas, but you'll be receiving a full report on that later this month.

And that concludes my presentation and I'm going to turn it over to Bart Boswinkel now. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you ladies. I'll take you through some of the major ccNSO activities between the Seoul, Nairobi meeting leading into the Nairobi meeting.

The main focus has been on the IDN ccTLD policy development process, the delegation, re-delegation, retirement Working Groups, strategic and operational planning and I will briefly touch upon the other activities going on and which will be on the agenda of the ccTLDs in Nairobi.

First of all, the internationalized domain names country code policy development process. It's been going on for quite some time now. It has two major areas of attention.

One, the first one is, developing the overall policy for the introduction of IDN ccTLDs. This is the broader framework for the fast track as well. So, what will happen and why it takes so long, is the CCs have decided to take in the

experiences of the fast track process which includes the advisory work of the IDNC Working Group, the fast track implementation plan and the current - the first applications and how that went on, and that say, the overall policy has to address some of the issues that came out of the implementation as well.

The second area of attention, is - as some of you may know, the ccNSO was created with just ccTLD managers in mind. And with the first IDN ccTLD managers put into the -all the first IDN ccTLDs put into the route, hopefully this year, we will have IDN ccTLD managers and they need to be included one way or the other in the ccNSO.

So that's the second point of attention of the IDN CCPDP, but it has to wait on say some of the outcomes of the first area.

Where are we currently with the IDN CCPDP? Last - this week, the Working Group designed or developing the proposals for the overall policy had its final call prior to the Nairobi meeting.

What will happen is, by tomorrow the chair of the Working Group will produce an initial draft which will touch upon the main areas which need to be addressed and some proposals to address it for the overall policy.

It's one or two of the main areas, is there is the IDN ccTLDs will be considered or the proposal is to consider them similar or the same as ccTLDs, and as a result, the current mechanisms for delegation, re-delegation, retirement of ccTLDs will apply to IDN ccTLDs as well.

So that's now a more a proposal and there were some other consequences to that as well. But that will be in the draft input paper.

It's - if you look what will happen at the ccNSO meeting, the proposals will be discussed on the Wednesday morning session of the ccNSO in Nairobi and so that's the proposals for the overall policy and it will focus on some of the

experiences of some of the applicants under the fast track, so that can be used as input into the overall policy as well.

So how do I get involved? It is participating in the public comment period on the draft, the chair's draft paper and the discussions at the ccNSO meeting, if you are interested. And so that's on Wednesday morning and you can find all this on the calendar at the ccNSO Web site.

A second point of attention or focus of the ccTLDs since, so has been delegation, re-delegation, retirement of ccTLDs. The ccNSO created a Working Group and this Working Group is focusing on delegations, re-delegation.

One of the starting points and probably of interest of - for those who are not so familiar with the ccTLD environment, the - this is from the IANA glossary, these terms, what is a delegation? It's an assignment of responsibility of the domain, so of the TLD to trust the re-delegation, the transfer and retirement, the decommissioning, what makes it very difficult, is although these are the IANA glossary terms, it is already clear that some of the people on that Working Group tend to disagree with these definitions.

One of the reasons is, that -and probably the main reason, is delegation, re-delegation, are fundamental and policies are fundamental to ccTLDs. It is almost of existential nature for them.

So a change or a definition or a change in the definitions of delegation, re-delegation, may have a direct impact on their position within a country and on their relation with ICANN.

So if you look at what does this Working Group do? It is more a fact finding and identifying issues - excuse me for a moment- sorry. It's - this Working Group needs to advise the Council whether to launch a PDP and that is based on their fact finding and the issues they identify.

It is not - the Working Group is not in a position to propose any resolutions or to these issues they've identified, that is, if it comes to a PDP that is for the PDP.

Where are we now? The Working Group will publish a progress report tomorrow, as well, and that will be the focus of the discussions in Nairobi. The Working Group also organizes a workshop on topics they've identified in Nairobi, and unfortunately, progress is not as fast as they'd hoped.

They'd encountered the Working Group and that's in the progress report as well, they've encountered two major difficulties in their fact finding mission. Is there is no clear authoritative source for policy or documented policies and there are different say, documents and policy documents and guidelines, which they have to deal with.

And there is no real publicly available source on the current practices of regarding delegation, re-delegation and retirement. So they have to work through the different documentation in asking questions and they're really on a fact finding mission.

The workshop on topics in Nairobi is open for everybody and it focused on the Working Group wants to understand what the issues are? Some of the ccTLD managers and other stakeholders in the ccNSO environment are looking at, if you talk about delegation, re-delegation and retirements.

How do I get involved? You are participate in public comment groups and participate in the public sessions in Nairobi. As I said, there is a workshop on Sunday afternoon and there is a ccNSO meeting session on Tuesday afternoon, as well, and you can find these on the ccNSO Web site.

So these are, what I just addressed, are two of the more substantive topics in the CC environment.

Now, I want to move onto one of the Working Groups, which I think is illustrative of how the ccNSO operates and it's the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group.

So, what is this - what does this Working Group do? It tries to facilitate and increase the input of the ccTLD community into ICANN's continued operational plan. And how does it want to accomplish this, what is the - so what is the output of the Working Group?

It's summaries -it is organized summaries of the ICANN Strategic and Operational Plan. It is organizing workshops at ccNSO meetings and it's conducting surveys.

So what has been done recently? It has conducted a survey on the strategic topics that are perceived to be relevant to the ccTLD community and it's - it is not just a topic, so on the perception, but also a more in-depth analysis on consistency, whether the CC community thinks that what they perceive as the strategic priories, whether they were funded, and whether the ICANN is achieving these strategic priorities as well?

The summary - the results of this survey are available on the ccNSO Web site, so you could have a look at it, as well as, a - the results of a - the workshop conducted by this Working Group in Sydney.

The second thing, what has recently done, has been done recently, is providing a summary and questions relating to the current draft strategic plan and this was used for - or this was sent and made available to the ccTLD community to structure their input into a system in their input into the current strategic plan process.

So - and if you have a look at the ccNSO Web site you can find how they work on this.

And if you look in the near future, say one of the things that will happen at the Nairobi meeting, is that the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group will organize a session with ICANN CFO to go through the operational plan and as - to focus on the areas of attention of the - for the ccTLDs in the upcoming draft operational plans.

Again, how do I get involved, especially with this one? You participate in - you can participate in all the open sessions of the ccNSO at the ICANN meeting, so in this particular case, at the Nairobi meeting the session by the SOP Working Group will be conducted on Tuesday morning, from 9 to 10, if you're interested and this is - some references to this Working Group.

So I just touched upon three major areas of the ccNSO. I just briefly want to touch upon some of the other activities in the ccNSO and so you have a bit of an understanding of how the ccNSO and the ccTLD community works.

One of the major other Working Groups, is what is called, the Technical Working Group. It organizes sessions - it organizes a session on Mondays and it's focused on sharing operational and technical information among the ccTLD community and they often invite members of other communities to either participate or give a presentation.

A second, I would say, point of focus, is the Incident Response Planning Working Group. This was - this Working Group was established in the aftermath of the configure issue. It was felt necessary - it was felt - yeah - felt necessary by the ccTLD community to start planning responses to configure and other DNS attacks in a coordinated and cooperative manner.

So the Incident Response Planning is setting up mechanisms to make this possible.

And a third type of working group, is what is called, the Wall Star - Walcott Study Working Group. This was established after the Sydney meeting or in response - and in response to one of the Board resolutions and first of all, it is there to provide information to the ccTLD community on the impact of Walcotting, but secondly, it wants to engage with CC's who use Walcotting and to try to understand why they use it and to provide this type of information to the ccTLD and broader community as well.

How do I get involved? Attend Tech Day. If you are interested, the agenda will be up shortly. The Tech Day is always a Monday and the ccNSO meetings they are open for everybody and they will be conducted on Tuesday and Wednesday.

That's all for me. And I'll now hand it over to (Olof).

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and hello everybody. Now, we'll concentrate on the last end in the ICANN name, notably numbers. Like IP addresses, so essential for the inter workings of the Internet, and of course, requiring policies as well for assignment and allocations.

And that's the area for the addresses supporting organization or ASO and we'll lead with it. I'll talk a little about policy issues, but first of all, some background about ASO, since it's quite a different structure from the ccNSO and the GNSO.

Well, first of all, the supply chain, if you like, for IP addresses and uses usually get verified by IP address from an ISP, which in turn, gets IP addresses in big blocks from a regional Internet registry or RIR, which in turn, gets addresses in a really huge chunks, from the IANA function within ICANN.

And in that food chain, if you like, well the RIRs are really the essential actor, when it comes to the development of policies.

What is then an RIR? I've never managed that acronym myself actually, is a regional Internet registry of regional organizations which have existed in most cases, longer than ICANN and based on membership from the ISPs and there are five of those.

For Africa, there is AfriNIC. For Asia Pacific APINIC. For North America, it's ARIN. For Latin America, it's LACNIC. For Europe and the Middle East, it's RIPE.

They also cooperate in a global manner in an organization called NRO or spelled out, the Number Resource Organization.

Now, the ASO, what is that then in the context? Well, it is actually a memorandum of understanding between the NRO, the RIRs, and ICANN where NRO is appointed as fulfilling the function of the ASO, the address supporting organization, which in the policy sense, has a particular roll to play when it comes to global policies.

Now, simple isn't it? Well, one thing to remember for you all, the policy development takes place within the regional Internet registries. Do remember that.

Okay. Let's talk a little about the global policies. I mentioned that. What is that then?

Well you shall see within the RIRs that real vast majority of policies that are developed are policies for regional application. They could be different for each region and quite frequently are. In some cases, there are coordinated policies across all regions which then are called coordinated policies and there are global policies, but global policies in this sense only means that the policy has an affect on the IANA -IANA's activities for IANA location to the RIRs.

So, it is a very limited definition, actually when we say a global policy in the addressing feat. And of course, in those cases, they have to be agreed upon in a similar fashion by all the regional Internet registries.

There are two such proposals in pipeline. One for ASNs or autonomous system numbers and another one for recovered IPB for address space, and we'll talk a little more in detail about those starting with the policy proposal for ASN.

Now, autonomous system numbers a bit archaic perhaps, but those are the addresses that the ISPs use among themselves to route traffic between them. So, they take care of addressing on the highways, let's say.

And there is already established policy for ASNs, a global policy, which also includes a transition from 16 bits to 32 bit ASNs, since we're running out of space in the 16 bit field.

But, there was a reality check, I think, a year and a half ago, when it was realized that all the 32 bits met with problems in practice, due to legacy equipment and legacy software, so there was need to defer the full transition to 32 bits with a year.

And their current proposal only covers that particular deferral. And it's very far advanced. All the RIRs have agreed on the text. It's just the formalities that remain. It's says on the slide that a proposal has been adopted in three RIRs. Actually, since day before yesterday, it's adopted in four and a fifth is absolutely imminent.

So, the final adoption will take place in the very near future. What happens then?

Here comes the role of the ASO in the strict sense. Once it has been adopted by all the RIRs, a proposal then goes to the NRO and the ASO Address Council for what could perhaps best called, a due diligence step, where they verify that all the procedures that have been fulfilled properly.

And once they're satisfied with that, they ASO Address Council forward the proposal to the ICANN Board for ratification and once ratified, it's implemented by IANA.

And this is likely to happen within the coming months, that it appears before the Board and well, there is no reason to believe anything else, and it will be very quickly implemented as well.

Now, that was pretty straightforward. The second proposal is about recovered IPV 4 addresses. Well, they're certainly are to the four address policies, global policies in place. But, this particular one, address is the situation when the IANA Free Pool of IPV 4 addresses has been exhausted, which I think we're on 22 so called slash eight left of as of today. So it's getting depleted and once it has been depleted this proposal would give IANA a roll to be able to receive and reallocate address blocks that have been recovered in the RIRs.

It can do so already with the current policies, but not with less than a so called slash eight, which is 16 million addresses and that's very unlikely that a return of such address bases would be done post the depletion.

So smaller address blocks could also, again according to proposal, be returned. And the current status of this, it has also advance pretty far, but it does reach some kind of bifurcation, because there are two proposal texts that have been adopted.

One version in three RIRs already has been formally adopted. And the slice is different one, within the ARINC regions and well, the fifth one, yeah that's

right where it has not been advanced past the discussion stage, pending what the outcome will be in the other regions.

And the difference is perhaps very, very small. It's just a matter of a word. Would it be voluntary or mandatory in a particular circumstance? So, it's just one word, but fairly important at that.

So, the major issue right now, is whether the two versions can be consolidated into a joint global policy proposal put forward in front of the ICANN Board.

And the jury is still out on that one, and there is dialogue between the RIRs in order to achieve some solution of this. But the outcome is far from certain.

So, next. If you're interested in global policies or the regional addressing policies, well how do you then proceed? Well, it's very, very straightforward. Do just contact your regional Internet registry where you happen to be located and they have very well established automatic policy processes and all right, their members may be the "ISPs", but their policy development processes are wide open for anybody to take part in.

And they conduct multiple meetings, open meetings per year, as well as, all of them have open meeting place, you just can register and be part of the policy development.

So, that's my private advise for those of you who are interested in getting deeper involved into this and with that, a little advertisement, I conclude from my side and hand you back to, I think, it's Scott Pinzon that will bring you to some final concluding remarks. Scott over to you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much (Olof). This is Scott Pinzon. I'm the Director of Policy Communications and we are nearing the end of the prepared portion of the presentation and are looking forward to taking your questions in a moment.

But first, I want to make two quick announcements about how to stay updated. If you've enjoyed the information you're getting here today, you don't always have to wait until just before an international meeting to get more policy updates.

Assuming most of you are aware, that we also have a monthly publication called the "Policy Update". It usually comes out between the 15th and the 22nd and updates on all these issues you've heard about today.

If you haven't looked at it in a while, it's a very different publication that it was a year ago. We have streamlined it. It's better organized and more easy look into the particular SO or AC that you're interested in.

So there is the URL for you there and we encourage you to check it out.

And then we have one other announcement that I'm kind of excited about, because you're in this presentation today, you're hearing the first public announcement of a new Pod cast that we have begun producing.

It will go live on the Web site next week, but if you are familiar with RSFs feeds or you use ITENs, you can hear it now.

The purpose of this Pod cast, as you know when you come to ICANN, especially if you get involved in a topic that people have been discussing for a while, there are loads of papers, none of them are really written for a newcomer. It's very difficult to find your way into an issue and for those of you who are leaders in your constituency or your AC, you probably have newcomers and they don't quite know where to get started.

Well that's what this Pod cast is designed to solve. In each episode, we take one issue and they answer five basic questions about it, such as what is it, why does it matter, who does it affect, and as a result, each episode is under

20 minutes, with the thought being that you could get up to speed on an issue during an coffee break or a 30 minute lunch or something.

So we will be producing a new Pod cast on a new issue every month. You can look for it on the first of the month and if you are in North America, Australia or the U.K. you should also be able to find it in ITunes, by going to their Pod cast section and simply searching on ICANN Start. So we hope you'll check that out.

Almost the entire policy staff has contributed to this presentation. We just wanted to show you who some of these folks are. As I said, we will be taking questions in a moment, but we might not be able to get to them all, so we wanted to let you know, that you can always address all those people in the previous two slides, by sending an email to policy-staff@icann.org. We all watch that email alias and the appropriate person who tracks whatever subject you asked about, would be happy to respond to you. So if we don't get to your question in the next ten minutes, you can always send your question there.

So with that, I would like to open the floor to your questions. You can either type it in the "Chat" box or you'll see down in the lower left hand corner, there's an ICANN of a person with their hand raised. If you would use that button, then I can see who would like to ask a question and we can open the floor to you.

So at this time, any questions are welcome.

Olof Nordling: Scott if you'll permit this is (Olof). I saw a question in the "Chat" box concerning IPV 6. And nothing about IPV 6, well from a global policy prospective, was there is, since almost three years, a global policy for IPV 6 in place, implemented and all of the RIRs have received their slash 12, which is a humongous number of addresses.

So they have for - and nobody has come back yet to ask for more to IANA. So just to say a few words on IPV 6, since that was missing. Thanks.

Scott Pinzon: Okay, I see (Evan) has raised his hand. The floor is yours (Evan).

Evan Leibovitch: Can you hear me on this call? I'm calling in from an alternate bridge provided by Adobe Connect.

Scott Pinzon: I can hear you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have a couple questions in the "Chat" and they have to do with the Pod cast. I mean, I appreciated when you brought us the first one at the last meeting. I wanted to find out how soon there's going to be transcripts available of them, mainly because most of the people in that lurch are not native English speakers.

This information is really, really useful and it's even more useful to people that are new to ICANN and aren't - don't speak English.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you for the question (Evan). We've started the Pod cast with the notion of also having them done in French in Spanish and we've been put on hold for this trimester because of budget shortfalls.

I have just put in for the first official episode to be transcribed and we are expecting to have that up somewhere around March 23 and the best thing you can do to facilitate it, you know, giving permission to have them in other languages, is to send an email to start@icann.org and just voice your support that there should be translations and if we can show strong community support, then that can help us push it through the budgetary process.

Evan Leibovitch: And the last thing I'll say before I get - put my hand down, is just if there's a way that you could put the Pod cast up on the ICANN Web site, so people

that don't have ITunes have easy access to it, that shouldn't normally be a problem.

So I'd really suggest that, you know, ICANN's got a very good Web site and there's no reason that it shouldn't make this stuff available there.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you for that comment. We certainly agree. Actually it was supposed to go live this week, and I don't know why it did not. But if you will watch icann.org-learning, we have a new E-Learning page that will aggregate Webinars and the Pod casts and other audio briefings, that - such as the kind at large has been doing all in one spot.

So icann.org-learning. It should be live by Monday.

I see some notes of support for the Pod cast in the "Chat" box. Thank you very much. And please also fee free to suggest topics that you wish we would cover for your various groups, because we really much want it to be on point for your needs.

I'm watching for further questions at this time.

Marilyn Cade: Can you take questions by voice?

Scott Pinzon: Yes, we are welcome to. You have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn Cade. Thank you for the briefing. I was impressed by the level of details, but also I might make a suggestion, if possible, in the future, to be able to allow questions, even one or two, right after each presentation.

My comment relates to looking at the agenda for Nairobi and noting that there are very few scribing notations. In the workshops for Nairobi, many of them on the very topics you've been covering. And to follow on to the comment made earlier, it is - certainly many of our interested business user members,

are not native English speakers, and they often do turn to the transcripts for factual updates, as well as, just to be able to follow a topic.

And of course, the transcripts are available historically. Is there a way to address having transcripts for more of the meeting other than those that are just in the main meeting? And I know you may not be able to answer that today.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you for the question. Rob Hoggarth will be filling in on the public participation aspect of Nairobi, so Rob I'm going to ask if you would like to respond to that?

Rob Hoggarth: I would love to respond Scott, but I don't have an answer for Marilyn. I'll certainly follow up with Nick Ashton-Hart. Just FYI a lot of the scribing from a technical standpoint, is actually going to be taking place remotely and (Nick) has been working very hard this week in putting together the information on the Web site about the remote participation opportunities and capabilities. So I'll certainly follow up.

He has done a really good job of updating the Web site on a lot of that stuff, so I'll see if we can come up with a means to answer your question Marilyn, so that many more people can hear what his answer is.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Just a quick time check here. Officially the presentation is supposed to end in three minutes. Many of us on the policy team have some time flexibility and we will stick around and answer questions, somewhat after that time.

So if you have time to stick around, we'd love to be with you.

And I see, Avri has her hand up. Avri the floor is yours.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I had asked this question in the "Chat", but I think it got lost. I think the idea of the Pod cast and the education stuff is great. I think it's something that's been needed.

However, one of the things that I'm wondering about, is in preparing these things, is there a practice of basically having them listen auditions, that is whatever works, in front of some of the community experts and leaders before they go live, just to make sure if there's an ambiguities or any issues that are perhaps still controversial among the participants, those things can be flagged, so that what goes out is basically as neutral as possible?

Understanding that, of course, staff tries to make it as neutral as possible, but sometimes we don't know when we're not being neutral.

Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you Avri. That's an excellent question. With the Pod cast being such a new effort, all the processes are not in place yet, so I don't have an official process for vetting it yet, but you are correct, it is very much our interest in keeping it neutral and just factual.

I guess, think my best suggestion would be if you would be willing to listen to a couple of them might suggest to us, you know, ways we can have it vetted. The other thing we still need to develop, is the first few episodes are all policy team members and we would like to also involve the community in a fair and representative fashion.

So all suggestions along those lines are quite welcome. You can send them to me specifically, or send them to staff@icann.org. and we will try and improve as we go along.

The floor is open for more questions.

Joly Macfie   Can you hear me? I'm - this is Joly

Scott Pinzon: Yes. The floor is yours.

Joly Macfie   Well, I could also throw into outreach here, what I could also suggest is you have an ICANN I think Facebook page. There are ways you can use the system called network logs to see your Pod cast automatically into your Facebook page and then people will just pick up straight, you know, they'll - that's the whole point of having a Pod cast. People don't listen to them on IPods. They are excessive to point, but once people subscribe, they keep receiving this stuff, a small suggestion.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much. And on this URL that is showing on the slide, it does give you an opportunity to select what kind of RSS leader you would like to subscribe in.

                   So I Change I one option that, but obviously your favorite one can also be used. So thank you for pointing out.

                   And I haven't got it hooked up to Facebook yet, but that is on the agenda.

Joly Macfie   I appreciate it.

Scott Pinzon: All right. I think we are ready for our last question, so whoever raises their hand next is going to get the final question and then we will end the meeting.

                   Do I have any takers?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I have another question.

Scott Pinzon: Certainly Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: It again is about the Nairobi meeting. In going through the information that is available on the detailed agenda and looking for documents and links, in particular I noticed that the Board Committee Reports on Friday are merely Power Point bullets that Power Point - are Power Point documents with bullets that actually don't have substance to them.

Will there be more detail in the meeting reports, or will the content of those reports be only available on Friday?

Rob Hoggarth: Marilyn this is Rob. If I can clarify your question or ask you to clarify it. Are you talking about the slides of the actual reports of the various chairs of the SOs and ACs?

Marilyn Cade: I am. And if you look at them Rob, there's, you know, there's like a bullet point that said, something like the committee considered X topic. But there's not detail behind that. And in preparing for the meeting, which I intend to do by reading as many of the detailed reports ahead of time, and in helping the business constituency to think about which reports to focus on, normally if there's going to be a Board Committee written report, I just would need to know that and make sure that people are aware they need to download it.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, I'll look into that for you. (Nick) and I have discussed the SOAC Reports by the various chairs...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, those are typically developed onsite.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure exactly. And you know, those'll be developed, you know, within the, you know, the 12 to 18 hours prior to that, those sessions. I don't know. I'll follow up with (Nick) and (Diane) with respect to what the plans are for the Board Committee reports. Most of the Board Committees typically meet the weekend before the ICANN meeting starts...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: ...so I would be surprised if you had anything prior to that. Unfortunately Dennis dropped of the call, so he might be able - he would have been able to give us a better prospective on that, so I'll follow up with (Nick) and (Diane) on that question.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: All right. With that folks, I think we are going to call it a meeting. Thank you very much for your participation. It's been our privilege to serve you and there will be slides posted later today and then this recording will have to go through some conversion process, but it will appear on the Web site later on.

So thank you very much for your participation and we will se you around the community.

Good day.

END