Pre-Prague Policy Update Webinar
14th June 2012
First session 12:00 UTC

David Olive: Greetings and welcome. My name is David Olive. I am Vice (unintelligible) at ICANN. And we are pleased to present the Pre-Prague Update Webinar.

(Unintelligible) Policy Webinar, which we do (unintelligible) an ICANN meeting in (unintelligible) parties with (unintelligible). We think it's (unintelligible) and focus or (unintelligible) at the next ICANN meeting, soon to take place in Prague.

To help - some housekeeping matters, you'll see in the center panel some policy notes. To reduce interference, we ask you to mute your phones. They'll be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of this session, at which point you can un-mute your lines.

During this session, if you wish, you can submit questions in the chat box in the lower left-hand part of the Adobe Connect window. And we will try our best to answer those during the sessions, and of course they'll be questions and answer period at the end.

The goals for this session are as follows. We of course want to provide an update on our policy work. Review the issues that will be at the ICANN

meeting in Prague on policy. Inform you of other upcoming activities and opportunities for your input.

We'll have a special presenter, Heidi Ulrich, our Director for At Large, talking about At Large policy issues. And answer questions that you might have.

In addition to the policy-related activities, we'd like to highlight some of the other sessions at the ICANN Prague meeting. Such sessions will be an update on the RAA negotiations, ethics and conflicts of interest, ICANN and the Internet governance landscape, the new GTLD program update and the forum on the DNS abuse.

We will also have a session on newcomers track day. And it is the At Large ALAC anniversary. And we'll hear more from Heidi on that as well.

The focus of this presentation is some policy development at ICANN. And as most of you will be aware, the following bodies are responsible for such developments.

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

In addition, of course, to the supporting organizations, we have a number of advisory committees that are listed here. But also provide advice to the ICANN Board.

Topics covered at this session, we'll point these out. The status of things of various members of our policy team and special guest presenters will be talking about the PDP, the registrar accreditation agreement, who is updates, consumer choice competition and trust, cross-committee working groups and protection of international names, IOC and Red Cross.

We'll also be hearing from Bart Boswinkel on the country codes, CCNSO work, Heidi Ulrich on At Large and from Olof Nordling on the Addressing Organization's recovery of IPV6 exhaustion.

I'll now thank you for your attention, and turn it over to the members of the policy team to talk about their issues. In particular we'll start with the GNSO policy issues, I turn it over to Liz Gasster, Liz.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone. I'm just going to quickly review the policy issues that we'll be covering today and also some of the other, just mentioning some of the other projects that we have underway.

You'll see a long list on the slide here. We'll talk briefly about the new GNSO policy development process, the latest on intra-registrar transfers, post-domain name recovery, locking of domain names subject to UDRP proceedings, fake renewal notices.

As David said, more on the RAA. I'll give an update on who is studies and some other who is work that's going on. And issue reports that's underway on uniformity of contracts.

Again, David mentioned consumer choice, the cross-community working groups, protection of IOC and Red Cross names. And this is just a small sub-set of the different issues that we have going on in the GNSO right now.

We are not going to cover about 20 other projects that are also underway. So there is quite a big going on in the GNSO. And without further adieu, I'll turn it over to Marika Konings to talk about the inter-registrar transfer policy, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Liz. Hello everyone and thank you very much for joining our Webinar. So first we'll be talking to you about the intra-registrar transfer policy, or also known as IRTP.

So the IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004, and has this objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

And as part of the implementation of this policy, it was decided that it would be good to carry out or review in order to determine whether the policy was working as intended or whether there were any areas that would benefit further from clarification or improvement.

It might be worth pointing out that this is actually the Number 1 area of consumer complaints when it comes to issues that are raised with our ICANN compliance staff.

And as a result of that review, a number of issues were identified and then were grouped together in five different policy development process, or also known as SPDPs, which were titled from A to E. And which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

So the IRTP Part B PDP is - in the series is nearly complete. All of the recommendations have now been adopted by the ICANN Board, and several

of these actually came into effect two weeks ago on the 1st of June, including a requirement for registrars to provide a transfer emergency action contact, or also known as TEAC. Which allows registrars to contact each other in the case of emergency such as hijacking.

It also includes a requirement that the losing registrar notifies the registrant when a request for a transfer out has been made. This was before an optional for our registrar. Now it's a requirement.

And it also includes a clarification that an objection to a transfer must be provided with the expressed and informed consent of the registrants on an opt in basis. And upon request of the registrant, the registrar must remove the lock within five calendar days.

So for two of the recommendations that were adopted more recently, those relating to how to lock and unlock a domain name. And clarifying who is status messages relating to registrar lock, ICANN staff is currently in the process of working on the implementation details of those recommendations, so more to follow on those shortly.

So in the meantime, the IRTP Part C working group is making good progress. This working group is looking at three (charter) questions. The first one relates to the issue whether there should be a change of control or a change of registrant's function for GTLD registrations as this currently does not exist.

Secondly, whether the form of authorization which is used to initiate a transfer should be time limited. And thirdly, whether there should be a requirement for registries to use IANA IDs for - or to identify registrars instead of using proprietary IDs.

In order to gather further information on these issues, the working group conducted a data gathering survey. They held a public common forum. And they requested input from GNSO stakeholder group and constituencies, as well as reaching out to some of the other ICANN supporting organizations and the advisory committees for input.

So as a result of all that work, and based on weekly conference calls, the working group has now published its initial report for public comment. So this initial report includes four preliminary recommendations.

The first one recommends the creation of a change of registrant consensus policy, which would outline the rules and requirements for conducting a change of registrant.

One requirement of such a policy would be for the registrar to notify the prior and new registrant that such changes have been requested. And actually require a confirmation from both parties that such a change is desired.

There are a couple of outstanding issues that the working group is specifically looking for input on, such as should this policy be accompanied by a restriction that would prevent a change of registrar immediately following a change of registrants for 60 days? So should a lock be applied during that period?

Should this policy be incorporated as a stand-alone policy? Or should it become part of the IRTP? But you would have one strand that would be dedicated to changes of registrar, while the other one would be focused on changes of registrants. And whether - which changes to a registrant fields and who is should actually qualify as a change of registrant?

So these are some of the specific questions that the working group is currently looking for input on as part of the public comment forum.

The second recommendation relates to time limiting forms of authorization, or FOAs. The current working group's thinking is that there should be a time limit somewhere between 45 and 60 days. But this is also an issue that the working group is looking for further input on.

And a third recommendation that is linked to this previous one relates to providing an opt out mechanism to the time limited FOA, should a registrant decide to do so. Which for example might be desirable in cases where a domain name registration has been put of for auction, which could span a longer timeframe than 45 or 60 days.

Then there's also Recommendation 4, which would require all GTLD operators to publish the registrar of records IANA ID in the TLD stick who is. Noting that they should not prevent a registry to use proprietary IDs in the context of other operations as long as the IANA ID is also published.

And I said, you know, there's some outstanding issues that the working group is specifically looking for input on.

So if you're interested to hear more about the initial report and the recommendations, you're invited to join the working group at the workshop they're organizing in Prague, which is taking place on the Wednesday from 9 to 11.

And you're strongly encouraged to submit your comments to the public comment forum, which is open until the 4th of July, followed by a reply cycle, which will be open until the 25th of July.

And once the working group has had an opportunity to review the comments, it will continue its deliberations and aim to finalize its report for submission to the GNSO Council.

And here you'll just find some links to the initial report, the public comment forum and the actual existing IOTP for your information.

So the next topic I'll be talking to you about is a PDP relating to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings, or the UDRP domain lock working group as it's now being referred to as well.

So this is a PDP that follows from a recommendation of the IRTP Part B working group to address this issue as part of a possible review of the UDRP. An issue report on the current state of the UDRP also flagged this issue as a problem.

So as a result of that, the GNSO Council decided to initiate a policy development process on this specific item only for the time being. As currently there is, according to the policy, no requirement to actually lock a domain name in the period between the filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of proceedings.

In addition, the UDRP does not define what status quo means in relation to the locking of a domain name. So these are all issues this working group is looking at.

So as part of its charter, the working group has been asked to consider a number of questions such as whether there should be an outline of the process for the locking of a domain name which should be followed by the registrar.

Whether there should be a definition of what locks actually means. And, you know, meaning what changes can and cannot be made once a domain name is locked subject to UDRP proceedings? And whether there should be any additional safeguards to protect registrants as part of this process?

So following the adoption of the charter by the GNSO Council, a working group was formed. And the working group started its deliberations in April of this year.

And as (part of this) charter, one of the first half of the working group has been working on is to obtain further input in order to have a clear understanding of the exact nature and scope of the issues encountered with the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP.

So to this end, the working group has developed two surveys. One for registrars and one for UDRP providers in which the working group is asking for input on a range of questions to get further insight into the practices in relation to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings. But also trying to get further information on the issues encountered with that.

So following the completion of this survey, the working group is planning to open a public comment forum to get broader input on these issues. As well as reaching out to the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees to get their views as part of their discussions.

So if you're interested to hear more about this specific topic, the working group is organizing an open working group meeting in Prague. This one will

take place on the Thursday, the 28 of June from 9 to 10:30. And you're more than welcome to join that discussion.

And in addition, you might want to keep an eye open for the public comment forum, so when that opens you're able to submit your views and opinions as well.

And here you find a link to the common - to the working group workspace where you can find all the related information and the discussions that the working group is having at the moment.

So then the last topic on my list is related to fake renewal notices. So fake renewal notices are misleading notices that are sent to registrants from someone claiming to be or to represent the current registrar. With the intention of getting the domain name transferred to this entity.

This was an issue that was discussed as part of the registration of (views) policies working group, which recommended that the GNSO Council should consider initiating a PDP on this topic.

However, following further discussions on this issue, the council decided that it would be appropriate to actually first obtain further information on the specific type of abuse to help inform its deliberations on whether or not a PDP would be the right approach to take to address this issue.

So as a result of that the council formed a drafting team, which it tasked to develop a request for information for the registrar stakeholder group. And based on that feedback, report back accordingly.

So this drafting team got together. They developed a survey that outlined a number of questions relating to fake renewal notices. They tried to determine the size and scope of the issue.

So based on the feedback received as part of that survey, and as you can see here, responses were actually split between registrars either viewing this as a serious problem or no problem at all.

The drafting team produced a report for the council which provides an overview of the results of the survey. But it also includes a number of options GNSO Council may want to consider to address this issue.

So these include, amongst others, adding a section to the REA that would address business practices that are not allowed. Add it to one of the existing or future IRTP PDPs as the objective a fake renewal notice is most of the time to get the domain name transferred to another registrar.

Consider adding into the upcoming PDP on the REA, which will address issues that were not resolved as part of the REA negotiations. Consider asking assistance from the ALAC to develop educational materials. And then promote awareness amongst registrants of this type of abuse.

Consider raising the issues with the FDC, who has addressed this issue on an individual basis in the past. Consider initiating a PP on this specific issue only. Or, you know, decided not to do anything at this point and time.

So following the submission of the report, the GNSO Council decided to put it out for a public comment in order to obtain community input on the findings of the report. As well as the recommendations that were in there for next steps.

So as a result of the public comment forum, six contributions were received. And the GNSO Council has now asked the drafting team to review those comments to decide whether any changes should be made to the report based on the comments. And report back to the council accordingly.

Following that, the GNSO Council will consider how to proceed and which steps, if any, it will take. So the drafting team is expected to resume its meeting shortly to start the review of the comments and decide how to proceed.

And here you can find the link to the actual report and then the public forum - the public comment forum where you can view the submissions made and the report in public comment.

So that was all for me. And with that I hand it over to my colleague, Margie Milam.

Margie Milam: Hello everyone. I'm going to provide you an update of what's going on with RAA negotiations. This is the registrar accreditation agreement that is currently being negotiated.

As many of you may recall, in Dakar the board calls for the bilateral negotiations with the registrars to begin. And since Dakar, there has been two negotiating teams, one on the registrar side and one on the ICANN side that has been actively negotiating the various amendment topics that were recommended by the RAA drafting team convened by the GNSO and the At Large. As well as certain law enforcement recommendations that have been produced over this period.

And so there were extensive negotiations on approximately 19 meeting since then, many of them full-day negotiation sessions to try to work through all of these important amendment topics.

We have posted a community Wiki that provides the latest updates on this - on the negotiations. And if you look at that Wiki, you will find the - that there has been updates to some of the law enforcement recommendations that were provided since the Costa Rica meeting. Specifically with respect to who is validation issues and data retention issues.

And then just recently, prior to Prague, we had published draft documents that really provide the community with extensive information on what the issues are and how they're being proposed to be addressed.

The other aspect of this project is that the board in Dakar also indicated that should some of these amendment topics not be include in the negotiations, or in the ultimate format of RAA is produced during negotiations. That the GNSO Council should commence a PDP, a policy development process, on the remaining issues just to make sure that all of the issues are at least explored in some way.

And with respect to this part of the project, a final issue report was published. And the GNSO Council is currently awaiting the commencement of a PDP to take place after the negotiations conclude.

So on this slide I provide you with a little more information on what is in that - those information documents that were published just recently with respect to the negotiations.

We've actually published a full-amended RAA that includes ICANN's most recent request for amendments. But I want to clarify that this revised RAA is the draft, and is not a negotiated or approved document.

In other words, the registrar negotiation team has not agreed to tall of the aspects of that draft. But we thought it was useful to provide this information to the community so that the community could see how these issues are being proposed to be addressed.

As you look through this draft you'll find that there is significant amendments and changes to the way that the registrars deal with some of the registration issues. Such as there's a proposal for verification and validation of who is and registrant data.

There's also an enhanced data collection requirement that stems from some of the law enforcement recommendations that I mentioned earlier.

As you look through this draft you will also see enhanced reseller obligations. So that's one area where you'll find additional amendments that would deal specifically with some of the concerns that have come up with respect to the way resellers are dealt with.

There's also a proposal to create a proxy or privacy accreditation program. And that's a big issue as you look through some of the, for example the who is review team reports. You'll see that the issues related to privacy and proxy services needed further exploration. And the proposal is that. There would be an accreditation program that would accredit the providers of privacy and proxy services.

There's also a creation of an abuse point of contact where both law enforcement and the general public could send requests with respect to illegal activity involving domain names.

And so that's also a key area that would be important for dealing with malicious conduct involving domain name abuse.

And then they'll - there's also requirements to provide additional registrar information that should enhance information related to officers and directors, the principle place of business, their affiliates. So that ICANN has additional information related to registrars.

And as part of this effort, we've also included enhanced compliance-related obligations too at this, the compliance function in dealing with registrar obligations under the RAA.

And then finally, one of the other important topics is the prohibition of cybersquatting. There's specific language related to that.

So the goal of these documents was really to provide information to the community so that in Prague, at the RAA session that was mentioned earlier, we could get feedback on key issues.

And the goal of this consultation on June 25 is to inform the conclusion of the negotiations. In other words, ICANN and the registrar negotiation teams would take this information back after Prague to conclude the negotiations and to try to feed in the information that is received in this consultation. So this is an important process. And I encourage you all to participate.

Key questions, if you look at the documents you'll see that we posed some of the questions we'd like to explore in that session. They include things like if there is a verification or validation of who is, should that happen before or after the registration occurs?

As you can imagine, that is an issue of importance. And the registrar community would like to get information from the rest of the community on how they would react to verification that would take place after registration versus before.

There's also a request for phone verification requiring the return of the unique code. That is something that we'd like to receive additional information on.

And also, and this is in regards to who is. There's also a proposal for re-verification of who is information on an annual basis. And we'd like to get information on how problematic that might be, or whether that would be feasible.

There's also additional data retention requirements that came from the law enforcement requirement, law enforcement proposals. These aren't meant to be something that is published. But it's just something that registrars would be asked to maintain for a specific amount of time.

Information for example like related to financial transactions so that if the law enforcement community is trying to get information on some criminal activity, they could subpoena the registrars who have now this obligation to retain this information.

And finally, one of the issues that's important to the registrar community is the universal adoption of the RAA. In other words, once the enhanced obligations

are fed into the RAA and become part of the new form, the registrar community would like to see that these amendments are adopted at the same time. So that the registrars that aren't on the new agreement would not have competitive advantage over those that have these enhanced obligations.

And so I've provided a link to these specific questions. And I encourage you all to participate in the session in Prague.

Now with respect to the other projects that I mentioned, the PDP, we did issue a final issue report to the GNSO Council with the recommendation that the GNSO Council should initiate a PDP at the time that the RAA negotiations have concluded. Because at that point it will be clear which amendment topics have been incorporated in the new RAA and which ones haven't.

And then at that point, we're looking for board instruction to clarify which issues that the board believes the GNSO Council should proceed with the PDP on any of these proposed amendment topics.

And so as this process concludes, that will be an important additional work that will be underway with the GNSO Council to address some of these important topics that maybe didn't get negotiated in the RAA.

And so on this slide I provide you with links to where all this information is located. And including the announcement that - of these documents that were published prior to Prague. The Wiki that has all of the background and law enforcement recommendations that I mentioned earlier.

The issue report and also I provided the link to the Prague session. And hope to see you there to hear your response to some of these questions that we're seeking information on.

And with that I will pass it over to Liz who will provide you with an update on the who is studies.

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much Margie. And I think as most of you know, we do have several studies of who is going on. And although they will not be the specific topic of any sessions in Prague, we do try to update you regularly on these long-term studies. There are four of them. The misuse of who is public data. The study of Whois registrants and how they identify themselves in Whois.

Use a proxy and privacy services for abusive purposes and also a pre-study survey on proxy and privacy relay and reveal as well as a survey that is upcoming and that is now out for public comment on Whois service requirements.

So I'm going to take you just quickly through those topics. As most of you know Whois policy has been debated for many years.

And back in 2007 the GNSO Council decided that studies were needed to provide an objective kind of factual basis for future policymaking. And that's how these studies were defined.

And after going through a selection process we now have all four of the studies underway. So this first study on Whois misuse is being conducted by Carnegie Mellon University in the United States. We are expecting results initial results of this study in mid-2003.

There is this study of how registrants identify themselves in Whois particularly looking at various types of commercial entities, legal persons and those who use proxy and privacy services.

This is a study being conducted by Nork at the University of Chicago also in the United States. And we are expecting results late in 2012 on this study.

The third study is a proxy and privacy abuse study. This study took a while to finalize the contract. So we've just announced that the National Physical Lab NPL of the UK is conducting this study. And it has officially been launched. And we are expecting initial results in mid-2003.

There is also a Whois proxy and privacy relay and reveal survey. There had originally been a proposal to do a study of communication relay an identity revealed requests set for privacy and proxy register domains.

There were some concerns about the feasibility of this study especially the ability to obtain a sufficient data sample. So the council opted to conduct this pre-study to assess the feasibility first.

The initial results are actually just posted. These slides says expect it shortly but it was actually just posted last week.

The - we because of how close to the Prague meeting the preliminary results of this survey were released we're not planning to talk about the initial results of this study in Prague unless there's a strong desire to do so.

But we will be holding a Webinar much like this one probably two weeks following product to review the details of the draft report that's been conducted and solicit feedback from all of you. And the public comment period is also underway right now.

I'd like to quickly move to the Whois service requirements upcoming survey that's being developed by a working group at the GNSO, the Whois Service Requirements Survey Working Group that Barry Cobb, one of my colleagues and I are working on.

This survey actually picks up on a report that was done back in 2010 that inventoried potential technical requirements for Whois service that the GNSO had asked for that reflect not only deficiencies in the current service but also technical requirements that may be needed to support various policy initiatives in the future.

And after that report was released the GNSO Council decided that it would be a good idea to develop a survey to kind of estimate the level of agreement within the community among community members with the various quote requirements that had been identified. And again these are technical requirements not really policy requirements.

Here are some examples of what the survey will include or is intended to include. I won't read them today.

But the draft survey, the intent of the draft survey is to help estimate the level of agreement with these various requirements and give the community a chance to kind of weigh in as to the technical features of a future Whois system.

And again this survey is a technical inventory and is not intended to define or suggest specific policies or operational rules that should apply to Whois, just to make sure that the technical capabilities exist to provide technical features that might be required in the future.

So right now we have drafted a survey thanks to that working group that we posted on May 30 for public comment.

Webinars were held on June 1 to solicit input from various experts who are knowledgeable not only about the technical aspects of Whois but also about formulating service to make sure that the questions are formulated and a good way to elicit technical feedback.

So right now that draft survey is pending your comments. And once the comment period ends the Working Group will develop a final draft for GNSO review incorporating those comments.

And then actually conduct the survey for a period of time, analyze the results of that survey, publish a final report of course, and then submit that to the GNSO for their action.

So here are some key links to general information about the Whois studies including where you'll find a link to the new draft report on Whois proxy and privacy reveal that I mentioned and then also information about the Whois Technical Service Requirements Survey that is also pending your comments at the moment.

With that I'd like to turn it over to my colleague Steve Sheng to talk about the Whois IRD Working Group.

And if you have any questions about the Whois studies please feel free to put them in the Chat and I'd be glad to try to answer them. Thank you and please go ahead Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Liz and good day everyone. IRD stands for Internationalized Registration Data. This is a joint working group targeted by GNSO and ASAC in late 2009.

It's goal is to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and displacement specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data.

Now this is an important topic because supporting IRD is seen as important evolutionary step for the Whois service.

Traditionally the registration data in US ASCII or Latin and with the Internet become more internationalized there is a greater demand for registrants to provide data in their local language and scripts. So supporting IRD is important.

Although but today no vendors exist for submission in the space of the - this data. And also the current Whois implementations do not consistently support IRD and could lead to poor user experience interoperability issues. So those are the three key issues that why this is important.

The working group has recently published its final report. Here is a link that you can take a look.

In April the ASAC also revised and approved the final report. And currently the GNSO community is considering the report. Likely the council will debate on this in their next meeting in Prague.

In the final report the Working Group considered four sets of broad issues. The first issue is is it suitable to internationalized domain registration data?

That is is it suitable to have this data in local language and scripts? And the answer to that is yes.

And the second question the working group tackled is what data elements are suitable to be internationalized, you know, what are the requirements for internationalization?

And the Working Group systematically went over, you know, each set of data elements that are currently offered by Whois a make a determination.

The third question is is the current Whois system capable of handling query and display of the internationalized data? And the answer to that is no not consistently.

Finally the Working Group discussed specifications that are feasible to deal with the IRD.

With that the Working Group made four recommendations. The first recommendation is as the ICANN staff to develop in consultation with the community a data model that would support internationalized registration data. So there's no data model.

The second recommendation is the GNSO Council and ASAC request a common issues report on translation and transliteration of contact information.

The issue here is we have the data in local language and scripts. Whether there is a need to translate or transliterate them into English or Latin the working group could not make an agreement, reach an agreement.

And likely more discussion is needed. And this also require broader input. Therefore they recommend a PDP.

The third recommendation speaks to the protocol issue, when the ICANN staff to work with the community to identify a registration data access protocol that meets the needs of internationalization.

Other reports for example SAC latest ASAC paper on Whois also highlight the need for a protocol replacement that meets the needs of the internationalization.

And finally ICANN should take appropriate steps to require gTLD registries and registrars and persuade ccTLD registries, registries and registrars to support the following standards that are a set of standards agreed by the working group.

So those are the four key recommendations for working group.

The next steps is as I mentioned the final report is that the GNSO Council, once the council approve it a version of the report will be submitted to the board.

The GNSO Council could also choose to provide the board with its advice with regard to recommendations that may have policy implications. So that's a possible next step forward.

And with that I'll pass it on to my colleague Berry Cobb to talk about consumer metrics.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Steve. So consumer metrics and why they're important, in 2010 the ICANN board had requested advice from the SOs and the ACs to help establish definitions and measures for consumer trust, consumer choice and competition which are key terms that are defined in the affirmation of commitments.

And why it's most important is one year after the first TL - new gTLD is delegated a review team will be formed to finalize what the measures of success of the new gTLD program will be.

And you can think of the effort that's ongoing now as kind of some preliminary work to that.

Most recently I guess it's almost a year now, but back in 2011 the GNSO Council formed the Consumer Metrics Working Group based on the - at the request of the ICANN board to produce a letter of advice to the ICANN Board about consumer metrics.

In February of this year the Working Group posted their first draft advice letter and opened up a public forum which closed the middle of May.

And right now the working group is reviewing through all the public comments as well as the comments from the public session in Costa Rica to help formulate the final advice letter.

So what are the contents of the advice letter to this point? Essentially you can think of it in three sections. And each section contains the definition of one of the key terms as well as the metrics that will help complement that definition.

So there are a few takeaways here. I won't get into the actual definitions themselves but there is a reason for the order of these terms.

Consumer trust and consumer choice are very closely or have a considerable amount of overlap. But the key element here is the word consumer.

So the Working Group felt it was important to first define what a consumer is and then utilize that definition to help flush out what consumer trust and consumer choice are.

The other take away here is the key term of competition. And it should be understood that the scope around competition are only those industry participants that help the new gTLD program such as registry operators, registrars, et cetera.

And lastly I'll just point out that the Working Group working through the public comment these definitions will most likely be slightly modified based on that feedback that the working group is doing.

This slide is just a quick takeaway of some of the high level elements of the metrics that are being defined per each step of mission.

Certainly there's too many to review through here given our timeframe. And I invite you to go back to the public comment period and you can still pull up the most recent draft and find exact details about each one of these metrics.

The only other thing that I'll say here is that some of these metrics are subject to change as well given some of the feedback that we received from the community.

What are our next steps? As I've mentioned the Working Group is we're just about to complete the review of the public comments. I suspect that'll occur in the next couple of weeks.

With the Prague session the Working Group will be providing a briefing to the GNSO Council over the weekend. But we will not be holding a public session at this Prague meeting.

And then we had June 2012 here that the Working Group plans to submit the final advice letter. Given the quantity of comments that we received this is probably going to look to the beginning of July when the final advice letter is submitted to the council for consideration at which point other SOs and ACs will review the work of the GNSO and then they may or may not sign on in terms of the overall advice that will eventually be submitted to the ICANN Board.

Further information this is a link to the public comment period where you can find the draft advice letter that's out there and available now.

And certainly within the consumer metrics wiki there is most of the working documents that are in play at the moment.

And with that I'll turn that over to Julie Hedlund and she'll provide you a quick review of the cross community Working Groups. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Berry and hello to everyone. Very quickly moving along the cross community Working Groups are important because they address the areas of common interest between the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

They have been used in several cases but there have been some concerns about how they operate and how they coordinate between the various SOs and ACs.

The GNSO Council has developed some draft principles to bring clarity and predictability to the participants in these cross community Working Groups.

And this is just an example of a few of the recent groups. There's the SOAC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group, Geographic Regions Review Working Group, Internationalize Registration Data Working Group that Steve Sheng just mention, and the DNS security Stability Analysis Working Group that Bart Boswinkel mentioned briefly as well coming up.

And some recent developments, the GNSO Council approved the charter and formed a drafting team that put together some draft principles which was provided - they were provided to the council in January and the council approved them in March at which point the council sent them out to the supporting organizations and advisory committees for consideration.

These principles address the scope of cross community Working Groups and the operation of these groups.

The next steps are that the principles may be incorporated into the GNSO guidelines for establishing Working Groups.

We also are holding a public session on the cross community Working Group principles in Prague on Monday the 15th of June in the Roma room.

And the goal of this session is to raise awareness of the principles, answer questions, and discuss any issues or concerns.

I should note that a recent development is that the ccNSO has reviewed the principles and has noticed - has noted that there are some other areas for consideration and has proposed a cross community Working Group to address some possible other areas that could be included in the principles.

Now I would like to go ahead and turn things over to my colleague Brian Peck who will talk about the protection of Red Cross and IOC names. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you Julie and hello everyone. I'm going to provide a brief update on the issue of protecting special protections for the Red Cross and International Audit Committee names, provide a brief update since Costa Rica.

As you may be aware that after the Singapore meeting of a year ago the ICANN board placed a moratorium on the possible registration of IOC and Red Cross names at the top level of new gTLD allocations for the initial round only.

And so work has been undertaken since that point to decide whether indeed special protections would be provided beyond the first round made permanent.

After Costa Rica the GNSO Council did approve some recommendations that were compiled by a drafting team that was formed to work on this issue to basically protect the names of these organizations as reserved names at the top level of new TLDs for both the initial round and future rounds.

The ICANN board's new gTLD committee in April declined to adopt the GNSO recommendations to protect these names at that time mainly because of timing concerns given the late point in that application process at that time.

In addition during the Costa Rica meeting the ICANN board requested both the GAC and the GNSO council to provide policy advice on whether to protect international - inter-government organizational names at both the top and second levels of new TLDs.

In response to that request the GNSO has deferred any action stating its position that it would be the position of the GAC to provide any policy advice first and upon receipt of such advice and at the direction of the board the GNSO would take up that issue with regards to IGOs.

In addition the GNSO Council after the Costa Rica meeting requested an issue report of special protections for international organizations both their names and acronyms including the Red Cross, the RC and IGOs at both the top and second level for all new gTLDs.

The current status is that the temporary moratorium of the use of Red Cross and IOC names at the top level for new gTLDs will expire after the initial round of applications.

Of course as you know yesterday was the reveal day so we are past that point.

There are currently no special protections provided for the Red Cross and IOC names at the second level.

The GAC did submit a proposal last year in September proposing perimeter protection for both the IOC and Red Cross names at both the top and second levels.

On June 7 last week the GNSO Council responded with a letter providing an update of its drafting team that is continuing to evaluate possible options are

recommendations for the protection of these organization names at the second level.

Next steps a preliminary issue report that was requested by the GNSO Council which I mentioned a minute ago was published in open forum comment on June 4.

The basic staff recommendation is that the GNSO Council should consider whether or not to initiate a PDP as an approach to develop an additional policy advice in response to the two outstanding board requests, one for protection of the IOC and Red Cross names beyond the first round at the top level and then of course the recent request or the relatively recent request for the issue of the protection of IGO names.

The public comment forum will be ongoing during Prague. The current scheduled closing date for the initial period is June 25.

In addition we encourage the community as part of this public comment forum to comment whether there should be any protections focused on not only - or international organizations that are not for profit and for unique protections, international treaties or laws in multiple jurisdictions such as the IOC and Red Cross or whether all international government organizations should be covered.

And for further information the preliminary issue report can be found at the Web site provided on this slide. And of course we encourage you to participate in the preliminary issue public comment forum.

All right, and with that we will turn it over to our colleague Bart Boswinkel to cover policy issues related to the ccNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Brian. During this presentation I will cover most of you a bit how the ccNSO work - ccNSO works.

As say as on previous Webinars I've noted that most people who intend these Webinars are not associated with the ccNSO.

And so I thought it might be a good idea to at least give you a brief overview of how it's structured, its purpose, and how it's organizing its activities and go into detail in some of these Working Groups and study groups.

The structure of the ccNSO is consists - oh excuse me - say is the ccNSO membership. These are the ccTLD managers of currently.

Since Costa Rica six new members have joined the ccNSO. And to date 132 different ccTLDs are members of the ccNSO out of 256 in total. These are the (territories) listed on the ICL3166 list.

The second structure element of these ccNSO is the ccNSO council which consists of 80 councilors, three from five ICANN regions, and three appointed by the NonCom.

Also nonvoting participants on the council are the observers from the regional ccTLD organizations for in total. That is center for the European region, apTLD for the Asia-Pacific region, afTLD for the African region, and latTLD for the Latin American and Caribbean region.

There is no regional organization for North America and two liaisons one from ALAC and one from the GNSO.

The role of the council is mostly administrative. It is according to the bylaws and rules of the ccNSO. And its main task I would say is maintain work plan so in maintaining and ensuring that the activities move forward.

It also has a representational role. It has joint meetings with the GAC, the ccNSO and with the board. So that's a bit on the structure.

One of the main working groups of the ccNSO currently and will present - will be presenting at - during the Prague meeting is a study group on the use of country names as TLDs.

In this presentation I'll briefly go into the purpose and scope, the current status, and a little bit on the background.

The purpose is to provide an overview of the current and proposed policies for the allocation, delegation of gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs things associated with territories. So it's just listing the policies.

And second major activity should be to develop a type and categories of strings, so a typology and then assess issues arising out - of applying the proposed policies to the categories of names.

And after - only after identifying issues and only if appropriate the study group may advise on a course of further action.

For example launch a PDP or reserve some names, et cetera. But these recommendations will go to the ccNSO council and then will be discussed by the ccNSO and other SOs and ACs first before any further action is taken.

So the current status of the Working Group, the Working Group has developed an overview of potential policies related to country names so that's completed.

It has developed a typology. And this typology is used by UNESCO for a survey to test it. This - or the server will be launched just prior or just after the Prague meeting.

And in the meantime the working - or the study group has been working on identifying issues relating to the current policies and how country and territory names are dealt with under the different policies. And the recommendations will be discussed post Prague.

The background of this study group and - is as most of you know the user country names and territory names has been long been debated in the ICANN environment both within the CCTLDs and within the (unintelligible) and with (unintelligible). And as a result of all these discussions, they were exempted to be used as a - as a new GTO the - under the first round of the new GTO - the applications. And this decision - this poor decision is reflected in the applicant guide book.

Given, say the nature of these issues are only exclude for the first round. The study group is still assuming that it needs to deliver its final report to at least the (unintelligible) council. Just post the Toronto meeting in order to prepare for a review of the whole applicant guide book and the whole - and the new GTLD process.

The reason for creating this study group is that, say from the (unintelligible) prospective - the IDNCCPDP is too limited. It does not address all types on categories of views on (unintelligible).

For instance, Holland is - as I am in, say the Netherlands - Holland is excluded from the IDNCCPDP as an IDNCCTLD. Or excluded as an ID or as a CCTLD because it's not a two-letter code representations for the Netherlands.

So one of the issues the working group is addressing and - or not addressing but trying to identify is -- how is it dealt with - under the - all the existing policies and possibly future policies like the overall selection of IDNCCTLD strings.

And with that I go into - say the second major topic I wanted to discuss with you from a substantive level - at a substantive level is the current progress on the IDNC policy development process, the IDNCCPDP. IDNCCPDP is in fact - contains two major elements.

One is the overall policy for the selection of the IDNCCTLD strings and the second part and the second element of that policy development process is on the inclusion of IDNCCTLDs in the (unintelligible).

But we got to the overall policy - the working group dealing with this is still discussing issues arising out of the fast track process. And we - relating to the confusion of the similarity review. And hopefully at the Prague meeting the working group will reach some conclusion on how to move forward. And with that, the - say this - are important but the very difficult issue may be addressed.

There will be a place in the overall policy regarding the IDN variant management. So as soon as the variant issue project has concluded its work

and policy issues have been identified then probably this will reopen the policy again in order to address them for the future.

And the working group is also discussing an update of processes just to make sure the policy relating to the delegation and re-delegation of IDNCCTLDs is not included in this - in this policy development process. The current policy for the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of CCTLB is applicable. And this will not change as a result of the IDNPDP.

On the inclusion of IDNCCTLDs in the (unintelligible) there is still one contiguous issue and we hope to resolve in Prague that's regarding the voting. The main issue here is -- should the vote go for one vote per territory meaning that say all IDNCCTLDs and the CCTLB who are members of the (unintelligible) and from one country or territory count as one vote, or should there be one vote per member which will complete the change - the voting structure of the (unintelligible).

Moving forward - another example of how the way the (unintelligible) has organized their activity is strategic and operational planning working group. This is a (unintelligible) working group and it has been active since 2008. And has been all coordinating the missions of the (unintelligible) when ICANN strategic and operational and planning process.

The current, say to date - the last activity of this working group was the submission by the SOP on ICANN fiscal year 2013 operating plan and budget. This mission is available at and it will be again presented to the (unintelligible) and to other SO's and AC's as has been usual over the past few meetings.

What is good to consider or to take into account is that the SOP is not representing the (unintelligible) as a whole or an individual CCTLD.

The (unintelligible) agenda in Prague the main highlights or the highlights - there will be a panel discussion on how (unintelligible) can influence the outcome of the WCIT process in Dubai. This panel discussion is on Wednesday at 27 of June. And there will be an IDN session again where not just the policy development will be discussed. But also presentation IDN variant project - ICANNs variant project - the universal acceptance project and two presentations by IDNCCTLD managers. And there will be a security session on Tuesday from 2 to quarter past - quarter to three.

During this session one of the presenters will be one of the co-chairs of the DSSA. Although I haven't included slides on the DSSA, the DSSA will present it's - a progress report prior to Prague. And all the co-chairs will go to their respective SO's and AC's to provide an overview of what has been done to date and what will happen in the near future.

More on the (unintelligible) and the agenda you can find at these URLs. And now I want to hand it over to Heidi to inform you on the ALAC policy issues. Thank you very much.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you Bart. This is Heidi Ulrich. Hello everyone. This is the first time that ALAC activities have been included in this pre-policies seminar. And I am glad to give you a brief update on ALAC policy and process activities.

So in terms of the highlights of the policy issues being discussed within the ALAC -- the ALAC produced 15 statements in response to open public comments produced between January and the end of May of this year. In

addition they have recently approved two more statements and are either voting on or developing five more at the moment.

Of the statements submitted, ALAC would like to highlight two.

The first one is the ALAC statement on the ICANN board conflicts of interest review. The ALAC welcomed the creation of a board new to the program committee. However, they believe that across community commission including possibly outside of corporate government experts be set up to examine ICANN's conflict of interest at all levels.

Second statement they would like to highlight is the ALAC statement on the Whois review - sorry, the who-is policy team draft report. The ALAC extended its congratulations to the who-is review team for exhaustive process to meet inclusion and transparency goals in this report.

In their statement they recommend that these products need to be regularized and privacy registrations be accommodated as long as the product provider acts on the express actually authority of their registrants and that the products provider accepts liability for the registrants on whose behalf it acts.

In addition to preparing statements that analyze at large community members continue to work with members of the ICANN board the staff and board on applicant support issues.

A subset of the (unintelligible) group, both at large and (unintelligible) members have been occasionally meeting with the staff and select board members to work out the details of the applicant support program implementation. However, perhaps as important as the actual work they are doing, this process seems to be a good model for future collaborative efforts

where complex implementation issues can involve the community and that slowly begins by staff.

More information on all of the ALAC statements are available on the at-large correspondence webpage listed at the URL on the slide.

Turning to ALAC process issues, I'd like to highlight two process or program related program activities that are happening currently and will be meeting in Prague.

First is that the ALAC process for considering and making objections to new GTLD applications has been operationalised. And ICANN's new GTLD program - the ALAC has given the responsibility to consider and possibly file objections to new GTLD applications.

In March of this year the ALAC approved a processes that involved bottom-up development of potential objections and approval of possible objections. A 15 member new GTLD review group which was selected - the members were selected by the ALAC and the five (unintelligible) is now in place. It had two meetings recently to be trained on the process. And will meet again in Prague to discuss further details now that the applications have been revealed.

Those activity is the first of the at large communities' operational roles. And the ALAC process is available on the at large community wiki listed on the URL on the slide.

The second process or program activity is at the ALAC at large improvement project follow up report will be submitted to the SIC for a review in Prague. A little bit of background on this - in June 2009 the final report of the ALAC review working group on improvements was published. They have two

recommendations, which identify key areas that need improvements focusing on at large organization, effectiveness, participation in relationship to other ICANN entities.

The ALAC and representatives from the at large communities have been working on implementation - the 13 recommendations since August 2010 through both a number of globally diverse work teams and most recently the at large project task force.

The final report outlines how they have either fully completed the 13 recommendations and items develop of these 4 teams or given responsibility for ongoing activities to at large bodies and other groups.

And the task force also identified a set of criteria to be considered in the next ALAC review. Upon review of the following reports by the SIC and approval by the board the first review of the ALAC will be completed. And, again that final report is available on the at large community wiki at the URL listed on the slide.

And this third slide is - shows the at large communities' current organization including what is composed of a globally distributed member of at large structures, currently 144. They are arranged within 5 regional at large organizations that feed directly into the 15-member at large advisory committee.

The ALAC in its current form will be celebrating its 10 year anniversary during the Prague meeting. And on Monday the 25th of June between 1600 and 1900 they will be holding an ALAC anniversary event which will include a retrospective of the ALAC's achievements as well as its aims for the future.

And you are all very much invited to participate in this event as well as the 12 key other at large meetings being held in Prague.

This concludes the ALAC update and now I would like to hand the floor over to my good colleague (unintelligible) who will be providing an update on the ASL policy issues.

Thank you.

Man: Thank you so much Heidi and good afternoon to you all from sunny Brussels. It's time for numbers, which in a few minutes on numbers in the ICANN context that means IP addresses and autonomous system numbers and that's the arm of the activities of the address supporting organization, the ASO. Which is probably the least well known among the supporting organizations within ICANN. So it may deserve a little bit of a background.

Starting with the - a few acronyms RIR which is Regional Internet Registry. And if we look at the food chain of IP addresses it's the ICANN through the IANA function that allocates big chunks of IP addresses to the Regional Internet Registries of which there are five. And they in turn distribute these to the intern service providers within their territories. And who in turn provide you with an IP address so you can connect to the internet. Pretty useful.

The five regional internet registers are Afrinig for the African region. Apinic for Asia Pacific. Ren for North America. Laknik for Latin American Caribbean. And Rite which is for Europe. And they all cooperate through an organization called NRO - the Number Resource Organization.

With that background we can, perhaps, explain what the ASO is - the Address Supporting Organization. And it is actually set up through an memorandum of

understanding between ICANN and the NRO. And (unintelligible) to the RARs which appoints the NRO to fulfill the function of the Address Supporting Organization.

So with that clarified -- I hope we can see to what it do. And one of the major tasks of the ASO is to handle so-called global policy proposals. Prompts the question what is a global policy then. Well it sounds pretty impressive but it has a very specific meaning because the RARs develop many, many regional allocation policies - addressing policies for allocation of IP addresses and various numbers.

And very few of those affect the IANA distribution to the RARs and only those are really called global policies in this context. So it has a very, very narrow meaning in this respect. Though very few of those developed and they are developed in comparently within the regional internet (unintelligible) through a true (unintelligible) policy development process.

And there is one that has been in the pipeline for some quite time. Addressing recovered IPB4 address space hosts exortion as you're aware the IANA free pool of IPB4 and that address is - was exhausted already last year. So this is important for many reasons. And recycling is of course a very topical (unintelligible).

When the IANA free pool exhausted - well there is nothing more to hand out for the IANA but it may happen. But IPB4 addresses are returned to the IANA. And in that case the IANA must be able to handle those and also to allocate them in smaller chunks than previously. Which was on the size of blocks of 60 million addresses and such so called slash 8.

And this is what this policy enables IANA to do. It was a pretty rocky road to arrive at this proposal. This was the third proposal because they all called for being accepted by consensus by all the RARs before they can be forwarded as a global policy proposal. And this is the third attempt. And once they were - it was doctored by all the regional intern registries. It was then reviewed by the NRO executive council and the ASO address council which in turns out that review sends it to the ICANN board where it was ratified now very recently on the 6th of May.

So that means it's now forwarded to the IANA for the implementation of the processes. So they will be ready and willing and able to take care of any IPB4 address blocks returned to them.

And if you're at all interested in this number matters IP addresses, and autonom system numbers and such. It's a world of its own and it's very fascinating once you get into it. And if you want to participate, well the best way you can do that is to take part in the (unintelligible) policy development in any of the RARs. They are very, very open and they all conduct open meetings for policy proposal discussed. And they all have open mailing lists for such matters as well.

And you got the opportunity of a lifetime to get an overview of what's going on and what's cooking in all of the five RARs. And the ASO AC workshop during the Prague meeting takes place on Wednesday between 1 to 3 PM local time.

And with that little advertisement I hand over to Filiz Yilmaz for a more broader overview of participation and engagement. So Filiz please take it away.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thank you. Hello, Filiz here.

Highlights I will cover with in part station engagement area our new meeting structure and program, outreach discussion station, public comments, the PPC public consultation session and newcomers activities at ICANN 424.

You can find the full ICANN 424 schedule at (unintelligible) also on the slide. ICANN 424 is to close by Thursday and angle officially after the closing perception. This is new. Some very specific Monday sessions are now scheduled to increase interactive discussions on specific topics. These topics and sessions are organized based on community leaders' feedback. And we will have these on Monday throughout the day.

The other main change is the structure of the public forum. At ICANN 424 the session will have two major sections -- board reporting and an open mic. During Board reporting ICANN board will provide a briefing around what they heard during the week and what their plans and concentrations of the next steps about them will be.

During open mic there will be time for feedback on the board reporting as well as the usual specific agenda topic. These specific topics, are again, crafted with input from community leaders. And I am currently working on such a detailed version that - and we will publish it in a couple of days again quite in advance for the community review before the session takes place on 28th of June.

While outreach has been a highlight, as seen in the recent meetings, you may have been following that, framework that is worked out by the ICANN established shared with the community at ICANN 423. Now continuing on this we will have another session. In this aim is to find common teams to be

able to work together better with the community in a more coordinated manner.

We will mainly focus on community building, increasing number of (unintelligible), and the level of engagement. And discuss ways of working together with the community to better coordinate the efforts, obviously using the limited shared resources of ICANN.

You may remember as of the 1st of January 2012 we launched a new public comment system. This system was implemented fundamentally in accordance to the ATRT recommendations and then collecting more specific community feedback on the implementation details.

It turns out as the system gets used in the last five or six months now the commended structure maybe is not really serving to the intended goal as such. The five periods do not need to be used by most groups. And the whole focus is still during the comment period. And the minimum 21 days timing seems to be maybe found short by some groups.

ICANN board's public participation committee, PPC, oversees public comments, processes and they will have a consultation session with the community on Thursday. And this will be discussed there again the public comment processes.

The other agenda point of this meeting will be on language services.

The new commerce activities are taking place in Prague too. Launch will serve from Saturday to Wednesday -- following the opening hours of the registration desk. It is staffed with ICANN staff and the fellowship alumni. So this is a very good example of ICANN staff plus community effort actually.

And it is now also turning into an ICANN information point for everyone - not only for newcomers. And is getting quite popular. So we try to have all sorts of fact sheets produced internally as well as those from the community groups. And we will also use social media a bit more focus this time for the newcomers during ICANN 424. And newcomers will be wearing green badges as usual. If you see one, please talk to them and help welcome them into the ICANN community.

The other pillar of the newcomers program is the (unintelligible). They are also getting quite popular and we get not only the first timers now but also the old timers who attempt to get a refresher. New comers Sunday will start at 10:30 with a welcome session in Prague. Including an introduction to ICANN, the ICANN community, the mass stakeholder model and then will continue with sessions on ICANN engagement tools. Policy update, investment roles, registries and registrars, recent developed domain name space and we will conclude with contractual compliance.

But if you know new participants to ICANN, especially at ICANN 424, you may want to advise them to attend these sessions and also to drop by the newcomers launch. That will be a great help.

Finally, not on my slides, but I would like to mention that we are again broadcasting all public sessions of the meeting and allowing (unintelligible) station to the meeting. And we have reached a record number of remote connections in Costa Rica and the user experience was reported to be very pleasant. We hope to keep this high quality of service in Prague too and if you are not going to be in the physical meeting you may want to make use of these services.

Thank you. And I will now hand it over to David, I believe.

David: Yes thank you very much Filiz and all my colleagues and the participants on this call. I would just like to now provide some slides to tell you how to stay updated in the most important document, I think, is the monthly update. With that I wanted to say we have a lot of information we have presented to you today. And the slides and the recording of this presentation will be made available so you can also view it at a later time.

At this stage I would really like to open it up to any questions you may have at this point and would be happy to answer them. If not, of course, you can always send us questions at this - email us at this policy-staff@icann.org. And with that if there are any questions please raise your hand or type in the chat room and we will try to answer them.

It's opened up to the floor now for our guests.

There's a question in the chat. Can you share the presentation with the participants?

Yes indeed we will make that available.

Seeing no other hands raised or questions we would like to, again, thank you for attending our policy updates webinar. We look forward to seeing many of you in Prague for the ICANN meeting or online if you participate remotely.

We thank you for your support of ICANN and for our opportunity to share with you the policy development activities expected in Prague and in the next several months.

With that I would like to thank all of you and wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be.

Thank you so much.

END