ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
22 November 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 22 November 2010 at 14:00 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-webinar-20101122-en.mp3

on page:

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

David Olive: Again my name is David Olive. I'm Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN and I'm pleased to welcome you to our update Webinar with the Policy Team.

As you may know this is a recurring event which we started initially before the Nairobi meeting in order to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help you prepare and focus your effort in ICANN meeting, and so we're pleased to do this again before the Cartagena meeting.

There is a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone can have an opportunity to review the information at your leisure.

In addition we will be sending out to you a short survey in the next few days and we ask for your feedback about this Webinar program. I do have a few housekeeping items.

To reduce interference please mute your phones. This will be an - there will be an opportunity to ask questions afterwards, and at that point you can unmute your line to ask the questions.

There is an Adobe Connect room for this session in which the slides can be reviewed and questions posted. The link is in your email that you received and the details.

During this session you can submit questions in the chat room at the bottom of the Adobe Connect window. The Policy Staff will do their best to answer your questions.

In case questions arise after the meeting you can follow up with them on any issues, and please feel free to contact us, the Policy Staff, at policy-staff@icann.org.

Please do not use the Call Me button in the Adobe Connect. It is solely to facilitate the recording of the session. And at the end of the meeting if you want to ask a question, you can either state your name to be added to the queue or raise your hand in Adobe Connect, and you can raise your hand by changing the status on the ICANN icon at the lower left hand corner.

The goals of this session are to provide an update to you on policy work, review issues to be discussed at the ICANN meeting in Cartagena, provide more information to you on initiatives and ways to input into those initiatives and of course to answer any questions that you may have on the process.

Many of you are planning to participate in Cartagena either in person or remotely, and of course they will have remote participation tools as well for you to do that.

We ask you to look at the Cartagena Web site for further information about the conference and the remote facilities that will be provided. In addition to a

number of policy-related activities that will be highlighted throughout this presentation, there are a number of other important issues taking place at Cartagena and we just wanted to highlight a few of them here, including the New gTLD sessions, security and stability, the abuse DNS forum and the Public Participation Committee update.

Again for further information we ask you to look at the Cartagena Web site. The URL is listed there on this screen. The focus of this presentation is on policy development at ICANN, and as most of you will be aware the following bodies are responsible for such policy development.

The Generic Names Supporting Organization develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top-level domains. The Country Code Supporting Organization has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to country code top-level domains, and the Address Supporting Organization reviews and develops recommendations on Internet protocol address policies.

Advice provided at ICANN are done through the various Advisory Committees. In addition to the Supporting Organizations they have the capability to develop policy recommendations, and there are a number of these groups that you see listed here, the At-Large Advisory Committee, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Route Server Systems Advisory Committee and the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Topics covered today in this session - I've just provided some outlines of the Cartagena meeting. We will have Rob Hoggarth talk about GNSO improvements.

Margie Milam will talk about the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Vertical Integration PDP, as well as morality and public order objections. Steve Shang will talk to us about internationalized registration data and Marika will talk to us about the registration abuse policies.

From the Country Code Supporting Organization Bart Boswinkel will talk about the IDN ccTLD PDP and the delegation and redelegation process. And from our Addressing Organization Olof Nordling will talk to us about the autonomous system numbers and the global policy on IPv4.

I now turn to my colleague Rob Hoggarth to begin talking about policies on the GNSO. Rob, please.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you David and good day everyone. It looks like we have good turnout on the call as well as representatives from just about every one of those organizations that David listed.

So we're looking forward to making this presentation to you. We start off on GNSO policy issues because of the central role that the GNSO plays in policy development at ICANN, and because it has a pretty wide impact on all the rest of you in the various communities.

And so today we're going to go through a - this general list that you see on Slide 9 of a number of the specific issues. A number of these issues you'll note are not just GNSO issues, but are in fact the subjects of cross-community Working Groups, both bi-lateral and multi-lateral in scope and in form.

So they do have impacts on just about every community in every corner of ICANN's policy development. As you can see there from the list we'll range from the improvements work that I'm going to talk about all the way down through very specific items like PEDNR and RAP, WHOIS and other general issues that we hope that you'll be interested in hearing about.

As I noted one of the critical elements of GNSO in the work that it does is that it has an impact widely throughout the community. And the reason why GNSO improvements have been such a key area of attention for the last

several years is because GNSO policies do have impacts throughout the community.

The critical aspect of the GNSO improvements work that independent observers, that the Board, that you all members of the community said was important in terms of improving the GNSO was really to increase and maximize Stakeholder participation.

And that was not just in terms of the people who were engaged at present, but to find new roads, new opportunities for new people to join the organization and also to make sure that everyone who wanted to participate had the means and the capabilities to truly have quality participation as well.

Another critical aspect was to make sure that policy development was really based on a common understanding of what the issues were so at the very beginning of a policy development process there was an understanding of the questions, the problems, the potential challenges for implementation solutions and the rest. And then a real key critical area of course, improving communications and administrative support not just within the organization but to external Stakeholders as well.

So the GNSO improvements effort has really focused in five major areas. They're illustrated on Slide 12 in the five different colors there and I'll touch on each one just very briefly.

First, the key cornerstone was of course restructuring the GNSO organization, restructuring the GNSO Council to help change it from really a legislative body which it had been operating as for many years, to more of a strategic manager of policy development within the organization.

And that initial work in restructuring the Council, determining the correct relationships between Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, finding the

right numbers and balance within the community for participating took a considerable period of time.

And so when the new Council was seated in Seoul, South Korea last year at this time, it was a significant benchmark and milestone for the GNSO improvements effort.

The other area that you see on this slide, Enhancing Constituencies that I've also now checked, really reflected a desire and goal to make sure that the individual communities who take a part in policy development in the GNSO really had the capabilities and operated on an even, level playing field with their corresponding organizations.

Two other critical elements of the improvements effort, and if you look at the two - top left corner and the bottom right, were reexamining the policy development process, looking at a lot of the original rules, the processes and procedures and getting community input on how some of those could be tightened, how some of those could be loosened, really trying to find a practical set of mechanisms that would work everybody as well as possible.

The mobile of the Council meeting shifted from a legislative body to a strategic manager really requires us to establish a new model for our Working Group efforts.

And as you'll hear in a couple of moments we've made a lot of progress and there's been some significant strides in that work over the past six months, and that's slowly coming to a conclusion.

And then on the bottom left hand corner you see improving communications with ICANN structures. As I noted on the previous slide that's really an effort to make sure not only that we've got internal communications together, but there are broader communications vehicles, messages, things like these

Webinars that really get the word out, allow all of you to participate to the maximum extent possible with as much information as possible as well.

And I see your question (Eric) is who's making the presentation? It's me, Rob Hoggarth. The next slides shows for you the general structure of the GNSO Council as it exists today and the critical sort of realignment that took place.

When you're looking at the structure here it took place in the Non-Contracted Parties House, that house symbol in the bottom right hand corner, where the Commercial community essentially gave three of their existing seats to the Non-Commercial community.

And so there was a rebalancing that took place within that House where formerly it was, you know, nine representatives from the Commercial standpoint and only three from the Non-Commercial standpoint and now you see we have much more of an equalization or balance in terms of the numbers of representatives that play those roles in the GNSO Council.

That's a slide that we could spend two hours on with history and description, but I'll leave that for separate 101 discussions or separate questions you may have.

In terms of the latest news and what's been transpiring over the last several months, most of the efforts that we've seen have taken place in the various communities and with changes that impact the various Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies that currently make up the GNSO.

In the early August timeframe the GNSO Council made a number of substantial decisions in adopting new operating procedures. They essentially added a new chapter of the GNSO Operating Procedures entitled Operating Principles and Participating Guidelines.

And these were to really focus on Stakeholder Groups and constituency operations and really to provide some guidance and some balance in terms of how individual Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies should operate.

These included things as simple as making sure that there are clear and appropriate membership rules to how the different executive committees should operate, how they should communicate their decisions and basic procedural elements like that.

Since that decision took place in early August, a number of the communities have been - and some of you may be participating in these - have worked to revise their charters, to update their by-laws, to take advantage of some of these recommendations, some of these new procedures that included things like absentee voting, proxy consideration and the like for the GNSO Council operations.

There has also been a lot of work on charter developments, particularly in the Non-Contracted Party House by both Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Both of those Stakeholder Groups received approval from the ICANN Board or - in the middle of last year for transitional or temporary charters. And for the last year those two groups have been working hard on coming up with permanent charter documents.

The CSG has formally submitted theirs and the NCSG has been working with the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board to resolve their charters, and so we'll expect to see a final version of that soon as well.

Also a part of this whole milieu has been a further proposal from a new Constituency Group, a not-for-profit organizations Constituency, that's come forward with a formal petition to the Board.

A number of things are going to be taking place in Cartagena on a number of the topics I touched on the earlier slides. There's going to be some continuing discussions with respect to revisions to the policy development process.

The Working Group guidelines as I indicated are winding their way to some finality, and so that work continues. The Staff recently circulated to the leadership of the GNSO and the Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies an implementation plan for a toolkit of administrative support services for GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

And we anticipate some additional discussions with leaders of those communities in Cartagena. And a critical aspect of the communications plan is that we hope to debut for many of you the new, improved GNSO Web site in Cartagena.

I think Scott Pinzon and Chris Chaplow are planning a presentation on the first weekend in Cartagena to members of the GNSO to show progress in that area.

Also what's going to take place in Cartagena is some technical, logistical work. The structure right now of the implementation and improvements effort includes a number of Steering Committees.

Their charters have to be reviewed. As I indicated to you all a little bit ago, we've had the CSG and NCSG doing a lot of work on their charter documents.

We would anticipate fairly soon public comment forums on both of those documents that the community will have an opportunity to look at. Members of the Board are talking about potentially revising the process for new Constituency applications, and if the Board chooses to go forward with that there will be a public comment forum.

We're also anticipating either this week or early next week having out a public comment forum on that not-for-profit organizations Constituency. All of these things will run through certainly the end of this year in terms of the opportunity for public comment, and some will run into January of next year as well.

Based on the timing of things we would expect that the Board would have the opportunity to act on some of them in the timeframe of the San Francisco public meeting that's coming up in March.

So that's a - the general overview of what's going on. There's still plenty of opportunities to get involved. Obviously with the number of those public comment proceedings coming on board, you'll want to use that as an opportunity to express yourself there.

There's certainly opportunities even within the general ICANN rules for people to participate or observe existing Stakeholder Groups or Constituencies, and so we encourage you all to examine interest that you might be interested in there.

And of course we work to keep updated information as regularly as possible on the gnso.icann.org GNSO improvements Web page, and I've got the link there on Slide 17.

So I will pause there. If there are questions I'd be happy to address them at the end of this session. But for now I'll leave you there and turn things over to Margie Milam, and Margie, I'll let you talk about Vertical Integration between Registrys and Registrars. Thanks.

Margie Milam: Hello everyone, and I'm going to spend some time talking to you about Vertical Integration between Registrars and Registrys. And I'm going to start with - can everyone hear me okay? I hear a little bit of an echo.

I just want to make sure the sound is okay. Essentially what is going on with this issue as many of you know is that the implementation of the New gTLD program is underway.

And in connection with that a lot of proposals have been made regarding new models of distribution. And the issue of whether a Registrar can own a Registry or vice versa and what rules should apply have never been a topic of a prior GNSO policy recommendation.

So what the GNSO Council did was look at this and decide that given that there was no policy recommendation in the past on this and that current practice varies with no particular uniform approach, the GNSO Council initiated a policy development process, a PDP as we call it, to look into this issue and to see whether they could come up with a recommendation that would affect the New gTLD program but - and also the existing gTLDs, in other words the dot com, the dot net, the dot info Registrys to see whether a uniform policy should be adopted.

And this PDP went - started in February of this year and the group was very active, and there was about a 70% Working Group that spent a lot of time trying to develop a consensus position to recommend it to the GNSO Council.

And the group started by identifying different solutions to the problem of Vertical Integration to see whether they could get consensus within the Working Group.

And after months of work and many, many phone calls and meetings, the policy development group, the Working Group, was unable to reach a consensus on a proposed recommendation for the first phase of its work.

The group identified two phases of work, Phase I being trying to come up with a solution that would be in effect - that could be in effect by the first round of applications for New gTLD applications.

And then the second phase of work would begin to apply to the broader issue of what the policies should be for a long-term approach beyond the first round of applications.

But unfortunately the group was unable to come up with a consensus recommendation for this first phase and issued its interim report basically describing the fact that they were unable to come up with a proposed solution.

They informed the GNSO Council of this and the GNSO Council informed the Board, who was eagerly awaiting some recommendations from the GNSO Council.

What ended up happening was that the proposed final Applicant Guidebook took a different approach with respect to Vertical Integration. In the Board meetings that led up to the publication of the proposed final Applicant Guidebook, the Board announced that it would eliminate restrictions between Registrar and Registry cross-ownership.

And so now there are no restrictions in the Registry Agreement. The way that the Board looked at this issue is that it encouraged Staff to come up with a Registry Agreement that would include a Registry code of conduct that would address some of the potential harms that might occur with respect to Registry and Registrar cross-ownership.

And they also included in the agreement a notice provision that would provide notice to ICANN if there was cross-ownership, and at that point ICANN would have the opportunity to refer to a competition authority if it felt that there were concerns there.

So that is what's happened with respect to the Applicant Guidebook. Because the Working Group was no longer able to come up with a consensus

recommendation in time for this first phase of applicant - applications, the GNSO Council is now considering voting to terminate the PDP on Vertical Integration.

And that is likely to be on the agenda for the Cartagena meeting. So if you're interested in this topic we would encourage you to look at the documents that I posted here.

We have the proposed Registry Agreement and that is the - where the - these restrictions or these new conditions are posted. We also invite you to attend the New gTLD session in Cartagena that will give you an overview of all the changes with respect to the New gTLD program.

And most importantly if you're unable to attend Cartagena, certainly take the time to comment in the public forum, which is open until December 10 with respect to the proposed final Applicant Guidebook, and that is where you could provide your comments on this topic of Vertical Integration.

The next issue I would like to talk to you about is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement as - we refer to it as the RAA. And this is the agreement that ICANN signs with all Registrars.

It's a uniform agreement and the form of it rarely changes. The last time the agreement was changed was in 2009 following the Register Fly fiasco, where there was a lot of issues that arise when a Registrar went out of business and the agreement was updated at that time to address some changes.

At that time in 2009 the GNSO Council along with the At-Large Community formed a joint Drafting Team to take a look at the RAA and to see whether it could be further enhanced, and in particular to look at the Registrar rights and obligations in the agreement and to see whether it could include additional protections for Registrants or include additional security requirements.

So this Drafting Team was tasked with several things. One thing was creating something that is called a Registrant Rights and Responsibilities charter.

And that essentially was a document that the At-Large Community was looking for, particularly to provide information to Registrants on what rights and responsibilities that arise out of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement so that they would be aware of what Registrars were required to do under the agreement.

So there's actually a forum charter in this final report that I've provided a link to here on this page. The report also includes a number of new topics to consider as amendments for the RAA.

And what happened in the Working Group was that the Working Group spent several months gathering ideas for amendment topics, and these included information that were provided from the law enforcement community, because the law enforcement community took this as an opportunity to provide input of what they thought might be helpful whenever they're dealing with issues related to Registrars and Registrants.

And so these law enforcement input and other input from the IPC community, from ICANN Staff were collated and put into this final report that has been prioritized and includes several priority levels for the GNSO Council to consider.

If you take a look at the report you'll find there's high priority topics, which are the topics that the group thought were important to address quickly. And then there's also medium priority and low priority topics for amendments to the RAA.

It's interesting that in Brussels the Government Advisory Committee, the GAC, took a look at the law enforcement proposals for amendments to the

RAA and endorsed them in their communiqué in Brussels, that this is a topic that it has importance as well to the governmental community.

So in Cartagena - as you look forward to what's happening in Cartagena, you'll find that the GNSO Council will be looking at this. There's a workshop in the weekend.

It's on Sunday prior to Cartagena to talk about what the next steps are with respect to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and to figure out how to come up with a new form of RAA.

So if you're interested in following this topic I encourage you to participate by observing the workshops in the weekend prior to Cartagena, and also this may be a topic as well in the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday.

Finally, I'll - I'm going to talk now about the morality and public order objections. And, this is an area that relates to the new gTLD program, and it specifically - this issue arises out of a concern that grew in the community regarding the implementation of what is called Recommendation 6. And for those of you that are not familiar with this topic, Recommendation 6 is one of the recommendations that the GNSO Council made when it made recommendations to the ICANN Board to create the new gTLD Program.

And on this slide, I have provided you the text of Recommendation 6. It essentially states that strings should not be contrary to generally accepted legal norms related to morality and public order that are recognized under international principles of law.

And what's happened since the early Applicant Guidebooks have been published, concern rose in the community regarding the implementation. And a group of members of the Government Advisory Committee, the GNSO Council, the GNSO community and the at large community came together to

form this cross-community working group to see if it could come up with a better implementation of Recommendation 6.

And as the group has published in a report, and the record has highlighted that the group felt that there was a consensus that the implementation model that ICANN had proposed in the past was flawed and needed to be improved. So if you take a look at that report, you'll find that there's various recommendations that were - that achieved a level of consensus within the working groups to improve the implementation of Recommendation 6.

And these talk about issues such as the Board rule, for example there's a lot of information there about the opinion that the Board should be involved in objections related to morality and public order, and should look to experts for advice. That's one of the recommendations in the report. There's also recommendations related to terminology. And in criteria, the felt that other treaties should be referred to, and the criteria to file an objection should be clarified.

There is also recommendations related to the rule of the independent objector. The independent objector is a notion that ICANN proposed, and the groups felt that the independent objector should be able to take input from the at large committee and the GAC in order to make objections when these groups felt that issues in morality and public order were effective.

There's also additional recommendations related to the objection. A lot of focus on what the Board role should be and what votes should be required if the Board was to reject an application on grounds of morality and public order. And then there's also general statements about process. So, I invite you to take a look at that report. I have a link to it on this slide, or I can provide it if you'd like to see the actual report.

Recent developments in respect to this issue have taken place as a result of recent Board resolutions. And essentially what the Board has done is it's

taken a look at the recommendations and made several statements, specifically that the Board recognizes that the responsibility for the new gTLD program does rest with the Board, but that the Board would like to rely on expert determination.

Unfortunately, the cross-community report came very quick - wasn't given - the Board did not have sufficient time to consider the recommendations, so the Board is not instructed now to commence a consultation with the working group to determine which of the recommendations that are not inconsistent with the existing process can be accepted into the new gTLD program.

So at the current time, GAC has initiated a consultation with the working group to try to identify which recommendations in their report can be incorporated into the gTLD program. And, there will also be - as part of the Cartagena meeting, this consultation will continue. And I have provided the link here to the meeting information if you would like to attend that consultation.

And with that, I will turn it over to Steve Sheng, and he will talk to you about internationalized registration data. Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Margie. And my name is Steve Sheng. So in 2009, the Board directed the GNSO an asset to create the internationalized registration data working group, and the objective is to study the feasibility and suitability of displaying IRD for services that provide domain name registration information. So currently we call - you know, most of them know them by the WHOIS service.

So there are two issues here. One is the feasibility and the other is the suitability. The feasibility issue is - so the question is if and how to internationalize the domain registration data. Currently, most of these data are in US ASCII. So as we're moving into the internationalized area, should these data be remain in US ASCII. So, that's one of the questions.

And for example, if it's desired that people can submit these information in a language and a script of their own, how do we ensure that we don't cause a Tower of Babel effect for WHOIS? So, that's the suitability issue.

And, there's also a feasibility issue that the current WHOIS protocol has no mechanism for indicating characters that it use. So you know, how do we internationalize the WHOIS protocol? This is more of a technical question, but it obviously has quite some policy implications to it.

So, why is it - this topic important? As I mentioned, accommodating this data is an important evolutionary step for WHOIS services. What we are seeing is an increasing use of Internet in all geographical regions, and by a diverse linguistic groups. So, we have a strong demand for multi-lingual Internet. More and more intense. And, the introduction of IDNs at the top level accommodate the global efforts to fully internationalize the domain name system.

But, the issue with that is you know, while we have IDN guidelines for the domain name labels, there's no standard or guidelines to define how WHOIS data are composed and displayed, and how are they submitted, and - you know, across the wire. So, that's why it's important evolutionary step for the WHOIS service.

How can I get involved? The IRT working group has been working for about over nine months now, and they've an interim report that will be published you know, at this URL. So if you're interested, I encourage you to comment on this interim report.

We ask a specific set of questions for the community input. For example, we defined a couple - four models on how to internationalize this data, and will love to see comments from those models. There's also going to be a public session in Cartagena on December 9. We'll also have a link attached. And

finally if you have expertise in this area, we welcome you to join the IRT working group.

So with that, I would like to hand it over to my colleague Marika on the Registration of Use Policy.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Steve. This is Marika, and I'll be talking to you about the Registration of Use Policy initiative that the GNSO Council has undertaken recently.

So, why is it important? The GNSO created the Registration of Use Policies, or also know as RUP working group, in 2009 to address the issue of registration of use. It was known that registries and registrars seemed to lack uniform approaches to deal with registration abuse, but the question was asked at the same time, does this matter?

Another question that this group was tasked to address was to determine what role ICANN actually has in addressing registration of use and what issues if any fall within the scope of GNSO policy development.

And as noted here, the working group itself was not a policy development process working group, but it was tasked to determine which issues if any would be suitable for GNSO policy development.

So, the working group delivered its final report to the GNSO Council on the 29th of May, 2010. The report itself consists of around 125 pages which detailed the deliberations and findings of the working group on the different questions that were raised in its charter.

It also provides an overview and description of the different kinds of abuses the working group was able to identify. And, much of that information serves as a backdrop to the focal point of the report, which are the 14

recommendations that were put forward to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Recommendations included in the report addressed amongst others issues such as cyber squatting. A (unintelligible) recommendation was made to initiate a policy development process to review the uniform dispute resolution process, also known as UDRP. WHOIS access, where a recommendation was made to request further information from ICANN Compliance staff. Malicious use of domain names where the development of best practices has been recommended, and also other topics such as fake renewal notices, uniformity of contracts, and collection and dissemination of best practices.

And as almost all of these recommendations require additional work, and not all of them were adopted by unanimous consensus of the working groups, the GNSO Council decided to task an Implementation Drafting Team to develop a recommended approach for the GNSO Council on how to deal with the list of recommendations.

So, this Implementation Drafting Team gathered and reviewed the recommendations that were contained in the report, and decided to organize them based on the consensus level achieved by the Registration of Use Policies working group. The expected workload and scope of the work, possible dependencies that might exist with other efforts and have received priority, and they also identified possible next steps for the GNSO to consider.

The result of the Drafting Team's efforts were submitted to the GNSO Council on the 15th of November. It's recommended approach identifies first off two recommendations that they called the so-called low hanging fruits, which are deemed to require little GNSO resources, and could therefore be implemented without too many problems.

The other recommendations have been ranked from Number 1 to Number 14, with the top four recommendations being the creation of non-binding best

practices to address the malicious use of domain name. Secondly, determining what additional efforts are needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible. Thirdly, a review of the UDRP. And fourthly, uniformity of contract in relation to registration abuse provision.

So, the GNSO Council will now discuss this recommended approach in further detail at its session over the weekend in Cartagena. This session has been scheduled for Saturday, 4 December from 5:15 to 6:15 local time. So for those of you interested, this session is open to the public and remote participation is possible. So, you'll be able to find further details on the Cartagena schedule.

Here is some additional information with a link to the letter that was sent by the Drafting Team to the Council that contains the recommended approach and the ranking of the different recommendations.

So - and this is through the issues covered so far. There are other initiatives ongoing in the GNSO, but unfortunately, it's not possible to cover everything in this Webinar. But, we briefly wanted to highlight the following initiatives.

So, the first two on this list are two other policy development processes that are ongoing in the GNSO in addition to the Vertical Integration PDP, which Margie talked about before. So, these other two are the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP, also referred to as the IRTP, and the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery at PDP, also known as PEDNR.

As discussed in a previous edition of this Webinar, both of these working groups published their initial reports ahead of the Brussels meeting, and since then, they have been working on reviewing the comments received on the initial report and are working on finalizing their report. But, they have not produced any new materials for discussion at the ICANN meeting.

The Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group will have an open working group session in Cartagena that is open to the public, so for those of you interested, you'll find a link here to that session.

If you have any questions on these initiatives, just feel free to ask those at the end of the session or post them in the chat window. And for WHOIS, I'll hand it over Liz.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone. Liz Gasster here. I'm just going to continue the theme of other important activities that are going on in the GNSO that we're not focusing on in detail in this presentation, but that we want to mention to you because of their importance.

The next is WHOIS studies. We are not covering WHOIS studies today, but I recently gave a presentation to the GNSO Council - an update on the status of the WHOIS studies. The presentation is linked there in this presentation for your review, and feel free to contact me if you have further questions about the status of WHOIS studies.

I also wanted to highlight another WHOIS activity that's going to be going on in Cartagena. Steve Sheng gave you an overview of the work of the Internationalized Registration Working Group.

Steve is also going to be conducting along with others a technical workshop on the evolution of WHOIS, really focusing on recent community concerns, ongoing concerns that the WHOIS protocol does not meet the community's needs, and certainly evolving into the future. And, he identifies in this presentation some other options to consider discussing with the community that are outlined further in the presentation.

I also want to highlight another important event that's going on in Cartagena - oh, just to mention that WHOIS Evolution workshop is Thursday at 11:00 am local time. And then, I'd like to mention another workshop on the Joint SOAC

New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group, which will present highlights of the recently published report that looks at developing a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants who require assistance in applying for and operating new gTLDs.

So, this workshop will be giving an overview of the main recommendations from that working group, who should receive support and what kind of support should be given. So, that's Thursday at 9:00 am, and you'll want to make a point of attending that if that's an area of interest.

Thanks. Now I'd like to turn it over to Bart Boswinkel to talk about ccNSO activities. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you ladies - oh, what am I doing? Excuse me.

I just want to - let me check in. Oh, there it is.

I just want to focus on two topics within the ccNSO. As was said at the start of this Webinar, we mainly focus on policy development processes, so - in the ccNSO. Although the scope is very limited, we will focus on the two main topics on policy development. Clearly, it's the IDNC selection and inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO policy development process, and the second one is on delegation, redelegation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

Although this is still a working group, that working group was established to advise the ccNSO Council whether or not to launch a PDP on any of these processes and practices.

I'm focusing on the IDN PDP. Why is it important? I think it's been ongoing for quite some time now, and it is to provide an overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs. As you all may know, the fast track is just a temporary mechanism, and it has to be. And, it's been developed through other

channels in the policy development process. And it's limited in scope, so there needs to be an overall policy in place.

A second item of that policy development process is the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. Currently, although everybody probably agrees and there is a large consensus that IDN ccTLDs should be considered ccTLDs, due to the current language in the by-laws, they cannot become members or cannot apply for membership in the ccNSO. So that's part of the PDP as well, to identify the changes needed.

Going into the overall - more detail on the overall policy, where is that process? Currently, the working group has chosen an approach to separate the criteria and requirements for the selection from the process and procedures for selection.

If you look at the fast track process, these two are very much mixed up, and it's - makes a discussion on the selection and possible changes more difficult. So since Brussels, the working group has chosen to work on this more two step approach. First focus on the criteria and requirements, and then on processes and procedures in order to make it work - these selection mechanisms.

The working group has at least reached basic - of consensus on the basic criteria and requirements, such as that the IDN ccTLD string should contain at least one non-ASCII character. So, this is based on the (IDNA) protocol definition. It still needs to be - the IDN ccTLD string needs to be represent a name of a country or territory in a designated language. And, a designated language is a change in name of official language. The criteria as - in the fast track process, the criteria are still the same, but in order to avoid confusion about official languages, in some countries an official language is too limited a concept. The working group decided to change from official to designated language.

And, the - as a other criteria that have been agreed upon is still the non-contentiousness for the selection of the IDN ccTLD string in territory, and that an IDN ccTLD should be considered a ccTLD. And at the same time, a second working group under the PDP is dealing with the inclusion issues. It has identified issues that need to be addressed. The main ones are the membership definition. It is - the membership definition is too focused on say ASCII ccTLDs to distinguish them from IDN ccTLDs.

The scope of membership is an issue. Currently, there are some - especially (IDA) - or some managers who both run the IDN ccTLD and the ASCII ccTLD in a territory, and it's unclear whether or not the membership applies to just say managing one ccTLD or should apply to both. That's one of the issues.

And the - for the members of the ccTLD, of the - and so, there are some voting rights, and these voting rights are still based on a one vote per member. And if you have more than one member in a country or territory, this could distort the whole make up of the ccNSO, so that needs to be addressed.

Regarding the last one, one of the potential solutions identified is to go for one vote per territory. And included in the interim report that will be published shortly, there are some mechanisms proposed to implement such a solution.

A next step is the interim report on the inclusion will be published shortly. There will be a public comment period on the interim report and the issues and potential solutions suggested. With regard to the overall policy, the working group will publish a progress report by the end of this week, and they will be reviewed and discussed at the ccNSO meeting in Cartagena. After the Cartagena meeting, the overall Policy Working Group will start its discussion to include policy aspects of variant management, and it's already started the discussions on process and procedures.

And of course - and, that was one of the reasons for starting the fast track process as well. It will include the outcome and evaluate the outcome of the fast track review process. So, that's with regard to the IDN PDP. This - I think the open ccNSO meeting session will be on Tuesday, 7 December, and you always - and you of course will have the opportunity to provide written comments on these two reports. That's the progress report and the interim paper.

Going over to Delegations, Redelegations, and Retirement Working Group and its activities, Delegation, Redelegation, and Retirement policies are fundamental for ccTLDs, although one would expect it - and it hardly happens, especially now with the IDN ccTLDs, delegation is - we are - happens on a regular basis, and redelegations as well. Especially given the interest of governments in some countries, the delegation has - is under - through the current manager, it is under scrutiny by the government and the local Internet community.

Moving forward, the IDN - oh, the working group has identified no authoritative documentation in the past, so that was in the Nairobi/Brussels period. And, it also identified in the Nairobi/Brussels period that some changes in policies have occurred. So based on that, the working group started to do an in-depth analysis of the cases reported at the Brussels meeting.

And on retirement, the working group has research consensus on the main issues and on the recommendations. The main issues are that, say, there is no policy or clearly evolved practice documented and ICANN, as a policy-based organization, in particular with regard to delegation redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs, should have a policy, and therefore the recommend - the draft recommendation to the ccNSO council will be to launch a PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs.

The second bit is on delegations and redelegations. The - excuse me. This needs to be changed. I'm looking for the delegation slide. Oh, I can tell you. It's included. I'm sorry for the confusion.

But the working group has discussed delegations and reached consensus on the issues on delegation as well. And again, it appears in the view of the working group that there have been significant changes over time on the - in the implementation and policy itself on the delegation of ccTLDs.

The - there has been no consultation on these changes or on these - on policies itself and ICANN as it - is in need of, say, a clear documentation of policies. So the recommendation of the working group will be either to develop a framework of interpretation of the current practice and policy or launch a PDP.

The reason for not directly go to a PDP is mainly that the framework of interpretation can be achieved in a shorter timeframe. A PDP will take quite some time and it will absorb a lot of capacity while there is clear need for a clearer direction with regard to all that (unintelligible) the working group with regard to delegation and redelegation.

The working group is still discussing redelegations. Hopefully, they will reach consensus on the issues and the recommendations of what they consider redelegations with the consent of the incumbent ccTLD manager. And the more complex redelegations will be addressed after the Cartagena meeting. And the report will be published as well.

The working group will publish its third progress report at the end of this week, hopefully. And the reports, the in-depth analysis, and detailed reports on retirement and delegations at the ccNSO meet - and (unintelligible) will be requested at the ccNSO meeting in Cartagena. And there will be an opportunity to discuss the reports and the draft recommendations and issues. And again, there is the opportunity to provide comments.

These - now that's my bit on this Webinar, and I'd like to hand over now to Olof to talk about the ASO.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Bart, and hello everybody. Well, yes, we'll talk about the Address Supporting Organization. And that means we reached the last N of the ICANN name - no (unintelligible) the numbers. Like IP addresses and autonomous system numbers and the like and they certainly need policies as well to be developed and that's where the Address Supporting Organization comes in.

But much more than that - the whole addressing community, if you like, and that is a particular universe, which is replete with acronyms like RIRs and RO and ASO. So let's have a quick look at this. And for those for which this is trivia, well please continue just doing your e-mail.

So the actual policy development is - total develop is a matter for the Regional Internet Registries - the RIRs - of where there are five -- AfriNIC for Africa, ARIN for North America, LACNIC for Latin America, and RIPE for Europe. They develop regional policies for their allocation of IP addresses and AS numbers and they cooperate through the NRO -- the Number Resource Organization. Now this is where everything is happening when it comes to policy development.

So what is then the ASO? Well, the ASO, Address Supporting Organization, can perhaps best be described as a memorandum of understanding between ICANN and the NRO that identified NRO as the body that will take on and fulfill the ASO function.

And what is the ASO function then? Well, one major task for the ASO is to handle global policy proposals. So now let's add another little piece to our explanation -- the global policies. What's that? It sounds very bold, doesn't it?

But it should be noted that the RIRs develop many regional addressing policies. And just a few and very few of those affect IANA and the IANA functions. And only those that have an incidence on what the IANA should do and should not do, they are called the global policies. So it's a rather narrow definition really.

And, well, I say here on this slide that global policy proposals in pipeline. Actually, we should use past tense. There are two of them that were in pipeline when we had the similar Webinar prior to the Brussels meeting and those were for autonomous system numbers, ASNs, and recovered IPv4 address space. And let's just recap what has happened.

First, AS numbers -- well, you could perhaps best describe those as motorways - motorway road signs in the addressing world. Those are the numbers that Internet service providers use for, one could say, bulk transfers of information over the Internet before they reach the final destinations with the IP addresses.

So they've been around forever and they have also undergone a change -- a need to expand them from 16 bits to 32 bits and that's been decided since a long time and the transition is already underway. But was a need to change the changeover date or defer that a little bit just to just a plain reality check. Turned out that much of the legacy equipment couldn't deliver the 32 bits as quickly as one should have wished.

So the proposal, of course in pipeline, was just the matter of changing the proposed transition date by a year. And this proposal had, before Brussels, been accepted and adopted in all the RIRs. And since it has been forwarded by the NRO EC to the ASO AC, which in turn forwards it to the ICANN Board for rectification. And lo and behold, there it is. It has been adopted and rectified by the ICANN Board and also implemented by the IANA. So it's not in pipeline anymore. It's an adopted policy.

Now to the next one on recovered IPv4. It's not in pipeline, but for a totally different reason. And we - this - so this idea was to enable the IANA to handle recovered IPv4 address blocks once the IANA free pool of IPv4 addresses runs out, and in particular, to be able to handle smaller sized blocks that are recovered and returned to the IANA than the usual size, which is the so-called slash-8, which is a whopping 16 million addresses. And it's unlikely that any such would be returned any time soon at least.

So that was the gist of the proposal and what happened was that they emerged and developed -- the proposal developed in two different ways. So in one RIR it was adopted in one version and in the four others it was adopted -- finally adopted -- in a different version. Not very many words were different, but those were important words like "must" and "may."

And well what to do with that? The NRO EC, which has the oversight of the subsequence that once such a proposal had been adopted in the RIRs, concluded that, well, this cannot be put forward and cannot be consolidated into global policy proposal with its name. So it's been since considered by the NRO EC as abandoned or one could say dormant.

There are potential ways of walking it up again, but more importantly, there are at least one alternative proposal that has now made its way into all the RIRs. So it's in - rather a substitution with a new text and hopefully that will come to fruition through the RIR policy development handling.

Now so that's where we are and now to how to get involved. Well, the simple advice and the only one that can be given that is to really get involved in your Regional Internet Registries. They all have open meetings for discussing addressing policies and they all have very open mailing lists where you can participate.

And come Cartagena, you also have an additional opportunity to listen to all representatives from all the RIRs presenting their current policy development

activities -- not only global policies, but all of them -- on Wednesday, the ninth of December in Cartagena. This will also be possible to access remotely. So if you're at all interested and want an overview, please use that opportunity and thank you very much for that.

With - and by that, I would like to give the floor to Rob to tell you how to stay updated. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Olof. That was very entertaining and interesting. Appreciate it.

Staying updated is relatively easy as far as the policy issues that we've been talking about today, including a substantial portfolio of other issues. We publish, as a team, a monthly update and it is usually published about mid-month and is available for free subscription on the ICANN Website and slide 60 shows the appropriate URL for that.

About two years ago, we started publishing the monthly updates in the Arab, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish languages. We continue to do that and have been very pleased to see increases in subscriptions for all those languages -- just a continual - continuing growth in all areas and so we're delighted to have that. We hope that in some ways, these Webinars are helping to publicize that.

We're preparing a special year-end double-issue covering November and December. So this November issue will be out a little bit later in about a week and a half and that will be available for folks going to Cartagena as well as those of you who won't be able to participate but will be available on the Web site and delivered to those of you who have the subscriptions directly to your inbox.

In terms of keeping updated, we're also making some substantial strides in improvements to a number of Web sties. Earlier, I mentioned to you the effort

underway to improve the GNSO Web site. There's also a parallel effort that Bart has been helping to shepherd for the ccNSO. And I believe both of those supporting organizations are going to be having information sessions in Cartagena to show to the community some of the improvements and changes there.

I can't speak specifically for the ccNSO, but for the GNSO, it is almost a complete redesign -- some additional new tools and capabilities. So that's something that will be shown in Cartagena. We won't be going live immediately on the GNSO side.

Bart, I don't know if you can comment for the ccNSO, when those changes will be live for community members, but I think it will be fairly soon, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, hopefully, yes. It is planned to be shown at the Cartagena meeting, but unfortunately ran into some issues. But it's still - yes, the intention to launch the new Web site, which is both a change of look and feel at or just after the Cartagena meeting.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thanks. And those of you from the At-Large community should take some pride that both from the ccNSO side and GNSO side we've taken substantial liberties to copy some of the designs and collaboration tools because they worked so well from the At-Large standpoint. And so there were a lot of valuable lessons learned from that roll out.

The At-Large community has also been a leader in the transition from the Socialtext wiki system to the new Confluence collaboration wiki that our ICANN IT team has been developing. There are going to be additional training sessions in Cartagena not only for members of the At-Large community who are becoming more and more familiar with the tool, but also for members of other communities because collectively the ICANN community is going to be shifting to that platform.

There are a lot of improvements, I think, visually in terms of the design and the layout. And so I think its' something that if you are interested and have the time, there will be some valuable opportunities in Cartagena to learn more about that.

You'll also hear a little bit from Rod Beckstrom and members of the communications team about the nascent effort to redesign the ICANN.org site comprehensively as well. That's a much longer-term project, but a lot of exciting ideas. I know there's going to be an interest in getting community input and shared ideas from that as well. So that's something also to listen fro both during the Cartagena timeframe and beyond because that will be continuing as well.

We had a really good team help to put together this proposal and on regular - and this Webinar. And just as a regular thing, we'd like to remind you of our global nature and our research. We've got a 15-member team lead by David Olive as the DP for policy development support. And on these two slides, you see that we're based in offices around the world both in our home as well as some of the ICANN offices as well. So 24 hours a day, we're - one of us is online and involved on a regular basis. So that's the list of me and my colleagues there.

In wrapping up and about to change - turn to questions and answers. I do want to remind you that Marika has set up a Webinar survey that's going to be sent to all of you who signed up via e-mail for this Webinar. If you've been getting reminders or announcements about the Webinar, you're likely to be getting the survey.

It's only about seven or eight questions, but it's a tool to help us continually fine tune this product to get your feedback -- if we're touching on the right issues that are of interest to you, if we're giving the right level of detail -- too much, too little?

So we really appreciate any feedback that you can provide on that. The final couple fields, I think, Marika, are dedicated to just people having the opportunity to make comments. And so things from, you know, "Are we having them at the right time?" to "Are they long enough or not?" we'd definitely like to get your feedback on that.

I'll take a quick breather here to see if we do have any questions. I'm noting that the - and I paused a couple times there because I see there's further dialogue in the chat room. What I'd like to do is invite you to either raise your hand if you're in Adobe Connect if you have a specific question that you would like to ask.

I know a number of folks have been typing questions. I think just about all of those have been resolved. But also if you've asked a question in the chat room and you don't think you've gotten a full response yet, we invite you to do that as well.

And I'll just turn to our hand-raised participants. Sébastien, I'll go to you first. And if you're on mute, you just need to come off mute and we'll be able to hear you. I must confess, I can still not hear you, so...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I (unintelligible) think that Sébastien has probably inadvertently disconnected, so maybe go to the next one first and then...

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...see if Sébastien dials back in.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I'm glad you're paying attention to that piece of the technology. Eric, you're the next one who's got their hand raised.

Marika Konings: This is Marika again. I see Eric putting in the chat that he's actually not on the phone, but he wouldn't like a response to the question he raised on .EH.

Rob Hoggarth: And if I recall, that was - he wanted to know the status of .EH. I don't know if that's for you, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: What is the - what do you mean by .EH? I know, say, the working group has been looking into some of your comments on .EH and .IQ and it should be in the detailed report on redelegations.

Rob Hoggarth: And where can that be found, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: It will be - it hasn't been the approved yet by the working group. So by the end - hopefully, if it's considered one of the redelegations with consent, it will be included. Otherwise, it will be published after the Cartagena meeting. But I do know Eric's comments have been taking very, very seriously by the working group.

Rob Hoggarth: Great.

Bart Boswinkel: I hope this answers your question, Eric.

Rob Hoggarth: Eric says, "Thank you, Bart," in the chat, so I believe so.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: Sébastien, have you rejoined us? Or if you can hear me, if you prefer to type your question into the chat room, that might be an alternative way to ask if you haven't reconnected. Sébastien's hand has disappeared from the queue, so...

In the meantime, what I'd like to remind folks, particularly if you have colleagues who are interested in the information that we provided today, we'll be conducting a second nearly identical Webinar later today at 20 UTC. That's noon Pacific U.S. time, 3 pm Eastern Time U.S., 7 am Sidney time. So

if you're in the middle timeframes or time zones there, you can calculate that that's going to be in just about four and a half hours. So for our colleagues who are sleeping and will be awakening, they'll be able to get this information as well.

I'm noting that Sébastien was unable to connect. Sébastien, what I'd offer you to do is, you know, please send me an e-mail or David Olive an e-mail with your question and what we'll endeavor to do is answer that in this chat box. And also we'll make an effort to answer it on - as one of the first questions on our next Webinar, so you'll have the benefit of not only the community seeing the question, but also getting to see the response as well. And I do note your request that we need this in more languages.

I'd note that in terms of leading up to the Cartagena meeting, we are going to be translating the slides from the presentation into Spanish and Portuguese in acknowledgement of our upcoming meeting. We've also had discussions about taking the transcripts from these Webinars, getting those translated as well.

We're just looking into the resource issues. As we've heard from a number of members of the At-Large community, French and Spanish translations at the very least are extremely useful and so we're investigating that because we certainly want to be responsive to those requests. So thanks, Sébastien for raising that.

Do we have any other verbal questions or folks in the chat? We're - we've got about three minutes left and certainly want to take advantage of any other queries.

Hearing and seeing none, I, again, on behalf of my colleagues, would like to thank all of you for your participation. Like our policy updates, we've seen an increasing attendance at our Webinars. So we like to think that they're a value and of use to you.

Please respond in the survey to give us your perspective. As I indicated, we really want to fine tune this process and make it as useful and valuable to all of you.

So we look forward to your participation in future Webinars and hope to see some of you in Cartagena or in the Western U.S. in the March timeframe. Thank you all very much for participating and we'll catch you at a future event.

END