

TRANSCRIPT
Pre-Durban Policy Update Webinar
Thursday 27 June 2013 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Pre-Durban Policy Update Webinar call on the Thursday 27 June 2013 at 1900 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-1900-20130627-en.mp3>
the Adobe Connect recording at:

<http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p7xe6fvetl6/>

And the presentation at :

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/presentation-policy-update-webinar-1900-27jun13-en.pdf>

All on page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jun>

David Olive: Welcome to everyone. This is our Policy Update Webinar, today the 27th of June. My name is David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN. And we're pleased to present to you today some summaries of the policy development issues and activities that will be taking place at our ICANN meeting in Durban South Africa.

At this stage we also would like to welcome our African participants and we hope to see them in Durban in person or participation through remote participation at our ICANN meeting there in the middle of July. So we look forward to that opportunity.

Just a few housekeeping notes as we begin. We're going to continue with a format that we established last meeting just before the Beijing ICANN meeting that is we'll pause between each of the sections of the GNSO or the ccNSO to allow our participants to ask questions.

Of course you can put questions in the Chat and we'll be happy to answer them at that time as well and then again at the end of the session we'll have time available for additional questions should you desire to do that. Again, we thank you for that. And we will unmute the lines at that time to allow you to ask questions.

Also to remind you that the slides, the transcripts and the audio recording will be made available after this session. And we will post the URL that will allow you to access that at your leisure and for further reference before our ICANN meeting in Durban.

Policy development at ICANN is formed through our ICANN community working through supporting organizations and with advice also from our advisory councils, the Generic Name group, the country code names and the addressing supporting organizations all develop policy recommendations to our Board of Directors.

And advice on those recommendations come from our committees such as the At Large the Security and Stability Advisory Group, the Root Server Advisory Group and of course our Governmental Advisory Committee.

Of course these recommendations are made through our ICANN stakeholders in our volunteers and various working groups and committees of the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

And they include the companies that offer domain names, companies that operate the registries, Internet service providers, the intellectual property interests, business users, noncommercial users, individual Internet users and of course governments all form part of our ICANN stakeholders who contribute to our policy development process.

I like to show this graphic that is also on our ICANN Website to indicate in a picture form the involvement of various stakeholders in the policy process and also other aspects of ICANN such as coordination, compliance and operations.

We have this Webinar update just before each ICANN meeting and we're pleased to do it again for you for the Durban meeting. The goals here are to give you current policy work and encourage you to participate in that effort, a review of the issues that will be discussed in Durban, provide more information on upcoming events and again solicit your comments or inputs and to be able to answer any questions that you may have after each of the updates of the supporting organization or advisory committees.

The topics covered on this session are illustrated on this slide for the Generic Name Supporting Organization, we call it GNSO. And our subject matter experts from the policy team will be providing more details on these topics.

Also involved will be the issues and activities of the Country Code Supporting Organization, again the ccNSO, and we will also be having presentations from the At Large Advisory Committee and the Root Server Advisory Committee, the staffs that support those groups.

With that I'll turn it over to Marika Konings who heads our Policy Team as Senior Policy Director for the activities and work of the GNSO. Marika, the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. So in this section of the presentation we'll be focusing on some of the GNSO policy issues that are currently under consideration.

We've basically divided our presentation first of all focusing on some of the issues that either there's a decision imminent, an opportunity to provide input or where we actually have a call for volunteers open at the moment. And this may be as well a little reminder that actually all GNSO working groups are open for anyone interested to participate.

And at the end of this section we'll also cover some of the other topics of which are currently just ongoing and we don't have any immediate milestones that we expect to take place in Durban.

So first of all looking at the Thick Whois Policy Development Process, so as a little bit background to this Whois requirements are currently specified in the Registry and Registrar Agreements that ICANN has with its contracted parties.

There are currently two models that are being used by gTLD registries to meet these requirements. The one is known as thin Whois. In this

model registries only collect the information that's associated with the domain name such as the sponsoring registrar, the status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration and name server data, the last time the record was updated in the registry database as well as the URL for the registrar's Whois service.

In the thin model it's the registrars that maintain the data that's associated with the registrant of the domain name and they provide it via their own Whois services. Currently there are three gTLDs that operate under a thin model and those are DotJobs, DotCom and DotNet.

The other model is known as thick Whois. And this model is the registry actually collects both sets of data the domain - the data associated with the domain name as well as the data associated with the registrant. They collect that from the registrar and then in turn publish that via their Whois.

So from some of the other discussions that have been taking place within the GNSO it became quite obvious that, you know, for example from a transfer perspective a thick Whois would have a lot of advantages as the identity of the registrant would be known by both the registry as well as the registrar.

But that the same time there was also a realization that there may be other factors that would need to be considered in order to be able to determine whether thick Whois should be required for all gTLDs. So as a result the GNSO Council initiated a policy development process on this topic in March of 2012.

And so where do things currently stand? So the working group has now published its report for public comment. And as a preliminary recommendation the working group recommends that thick Whois should become a requirement for all gTLDs.

So how has the group come to that conclusion? The working group charter outlined a number of issues that would need to be considered in order to determine whether a requirement for thick Whois would be beneficial or not.

So as such the working group considered a lot of different issues such as data protection and privacy, stability, data escrow, accessibility, cost implications, synchronization and a number of other topics.

And based on their analysis of these topics on balance the working group concludes that there are more benefits than disadvantages to requiring thick Whois for all gTLD registries.

The working group does recognize that this would mean the transition of over 120 million domain name registrations from existing thin registries to a thick model and as such they do recommend that due consideration will need to be given to house such a transition as prepared and eventually implement it.

So as said the working group has published this report for public comment and is looking for your input on the findings and recommendations contained in the report. Comments may be submitted until the 14th of July and then followed by a reply period.

However, due to the closeness of the Durban meeting the working group has agreed to also accept any, you know, regular comments that are received during the reply period and consider those as if received during the initial period and the reply period will remain open until the 4th of August.

In addition to that the working group is also hosting a session in Durban on the Wednesday the 17th of July between 1230 and 1400 local time. During this session they'll provide an overview of the report and it will provide an opportunity to ask questions, clarifications as well as providing input on the issues outlined in the report.

Following that the working group will review the comments received and revise the report accordingly for submission to the GNSO Council.

Here you can find some further information on where you can find the initial report as well as the working group workspace where you can find all of the background information and the conversations that have taken place that led to the initial report as well as a link to the public comment forum where you can submit your contributions.

So the next subject I'll be looking at is the Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings Policy Development Process. So currently there is no requirement to lock a domain name in the period between the filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of the proceedings.

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

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

So following the issue report on the current state of the UDRP the GNSO Council decided to initiate a PDP on this specific item only at this time as a more extensive review of the overall UDRP is scheduled for a later point in time.

So some of you may remember the working group actually published its initial report prior to the ICANN meeting in Beijing for public comments. As a result five community contributions were received. Most of these comments were in support of the recommendations or raised minor issues but there were also two more substantive issues that were raised as part of the public comments.

One of those related to the loss of informal response time for a respondent as a result of changing the requirement for the complainant to notify the respondent at the time of filing of the complaint. And the other issue related to the process that should be followed in the case of a settlement.

The working group has been working hard since Beijing to review all the comments and respond to each of them accordingly and are now in the process of finalizing that report and they actually hope to submit it in time for the Durban meeting to allow the GNSO Council to review and consider the report and its recommendations.

So what is the final report expected to say? And just as a disclaimer this is still in draft form, as said, the working group is working on finalizing these recommendations so there may be some changes but overall I think you can expect to see a lot of what's on the screen here.

Overall most of the recommendations are expected to be identical to those that were put forward in the initial report apart from some minor tweaks here and there. But there are two new recommendations that have been added to address the comments received.

One of them is to address the issue of the loss of informal response time. The recommendation that the working group is putting forward or is considering putting forward allows for an automatic extension upon request by the respondent of four days.

And furthermore the working group is expected to put forward a proposed process for dealing with the settlements that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the different parties involved.

I think overall it's important to point out that the overall objective of all these recommendations is really intended to clarify and standardize the process for a locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings so all parties involved know what to expect and know what their responsibilities are.

So following, as said, the working group is working on finalizing its report and hopes to submit it in time for GNSO Council consideration which means they would need to submit it by the 7th of July.

Following that the GNSO Council is expected to consider the report and decide whether or not to approve the recommendations which would then move on to the next stage which is basically a submission to the ICANN Board of Directors for consideration.

So again here you can find some further information on the initial report, the public comment forum that was held and the working group workspace where you can find some of the latest versions of the report on the consideration.

So with that I'll hand it over to my colleague Brian Peck who will speak to you about the protection of Red Cross, IOC and IGO and INGO names policy development process.

Brian Peck: Thank you, Marika. Hello everyone and welcome. My name is Brian Peck, a Policy Director at ICANN. And as Marika mentioned we'll be giving a brief update on the work being done related to the protection of the Red Cross, International Olympic Committee, International Government Organization and International Nongovernmental Organization names in new gTLDs.

Currently as the result of some Board-adopted resolutions the Red Cross Red Crescent and IOC names are on the reserve names list which basically prohibits the registration at the second level in new gTLDs of these organization's relevant names. This is being implemented through Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement for all new gTLDs.

In addition the ICANN Board is currently in discussions with the Government Advisory Committee, or GAC, in identifying or deciding -

determining which IGO identifiers could also qualify for this reserve names list after which they would receive the same protections at the second level, i.e. in terms of preventing the registration of such names in the second level of all new gTLDs.

In addition the GNSO Council and GNSO has initiated a policy development process. It was initiated in the fall of last year. And the working group has been working since that time in determining first both the evaluation of the need of and if so determining, as said, of policy recommendations for any additional permanent special protections currently extended to the Red Cross and IOC to other IGOs as well as INGOs at both the top and second level in both all existing new - excuse me, all existing gTLDs as well as new TLDs.

The working group has published its initial report earlier this month on the 14th of June. The public comment period closes on the 17th of July and the reply period closes on the 7th of August.

The initial report includes several policy recommendation options which the working group is currently considering. These policy recommendation options are not representative of consensus but rather the initial report is designed to solicit feedback and comments from the community in order to help the working group move forward in its deliberations in coming to hopefully, with the view of the consensus call, reaching a set of policy recommendations to forward to the GNSO Council for approval.

In terms of next steps during the Durban meeting there will be a couple of public sessions. The working group itself will have a session face to face meeting in Durban on Monday the 15th of July, local time, 1500-

1700. It is a public session and so if you're interested in seeing the working group in action you're welcome to attend the meeting.

In addition there will be a public panel discussion on the issues related to the protection of these organization names taking place on Wednesday in Durban from 1100-1230 local time.

And this will be a discussion by members involved in the discussions and deliberations on these issues but mainly designed to provide an increased awareness of the community of the importance of this issue to the DNS system as well as to help hopefully solicit and encourage comment and feedback from the community to help the working group move forward in its deliberations.

As mentioned there is an initial report currently open for public comment. Once that public comment period is closed the working group will review the input, again, with the view of hopefully reaching consensus on a set of policy recommendations. And then of course will be the publication of a draft final report that will also be open to public comment prior to sending a final report to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Some links for further information. The initial report, again, is open for public comment along with the public comment box. Additional information on the working group deliberations and activities can be found in the link here on the slide. And we certainly encourage members of the community to participate in the public comment and provide their feedback on these related issues and make policy recommendation options that are included in the report.

And with that I'd like to turn it over to my colleagues Julie Hedlund and Steve Sheng to talk about translation and transliteration process.

Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund and with my colleague Steve Sheng. We are going to describe briefly the policy development process that has been initiated by the Council on the transliteration and translation of contact information.

And before we get into the issues it's helpful for you to understand what we mean when we say transliteration and translation. Translation is the translation of text into another language. Transliteration is writing letters using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet.

An example would be the spelling in Cyrillic of Moscow, Москва, the translation into English is Moscow and other languages translate that city differently. The transliteration of Москва into the Latin script is Mockva.

And another point that's important to bring to your attention is what we mean when we say contact information. Contact information with respect to this issue is a subset of domain name registration data. It is the information that enables someone using a domain name registration data directory service, such as Whois, to contact the domain name registration holder.

There are two issues that are being considered under this PDP. The first is should local contact information be translated into one language, such as English? Or transliterated into one script such as Latin?

The second is who should decide who should bear the burden to either translate or transliterate contact information?

Recent developments are that there has been issued, just last week, a call for volunteers for a drafting team to develop a charter for the PDP working group. And those that are interested should send an email to the GNSO Secretariat at the address on the slide by Monday the 1st of July.

There are a couple of related issues to this PDP. The first is that the staff will commission a commercial feasibility study on translation and transliteration of contact information to help inform the PDP working group.

In addition there will be a forthcoming working group that will determine the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements including relevant outcomes from this PDP.

Next steps are, as we mentioned, the formation of the drafting team that will produce a working group charter. The Council will consider and approve the charter at which point the staff will issue a call for volunteers and the PDP working group will be formed. The working group will then consider relevant issues and consult with the community and produce an initial report.

For further information you may want to reference the Council motion, the final issue report on translation and transliteration of contact information and the final report of the internationalized registration data working group.

Thank you very much and at this point I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Berry Cobb, who will talk about the Whois Survey Working Group. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Julie. Yeah, my name is Berry Cobb and I assist the GNSO Policy Team with their activities. I'll actually be presenting two smaller efforts for you today. The first, as Julie mentioned, the Whois Survey Working Group, which is an existing effort that is approaching conclusion in the near term. And the second will be on GNSO metrics and reporting that is just getting started and I'll get into some of the details in a few minutes.

So first is the Whois Survey Working Group, In 2012 this group was chartered by the Council to create a survey based upon a staff report about 11 possible technical requirements of the new Whois system if one were to be designed.

In that timeframe, after the Council approved the effort, the working group developed a draft of the survey. They conducted a public comment on that draft to solicit feedback from the community to help improve some of the questions and structure of the survey itself.

Upon making those changes the working group deployed the final version of the survey out to the community in September of 2012. The survey is important because it mostly gives - allow the opportunity for community to provide input on such technical requirements and to gain - to gauge acceptance or adoption - possible adoption of some of these technical requirements. Up front we recognize that the results could be useful to many other efforts that are occurring regarding Whois.

One thing of note is that any of this effort and the contents of this survey were purely technical requirements of a future Whois system and in no way were intended to define or suggest any policy ramifications based on the technical requirements themselves.

So the survey competed at the end of October of last year. And since then the working group and staff have been analyzing the results. Essentially we received well over 200 initial responses but we only actually received 67 that were formally submitted via our survey tool and is pretty much the baseline for the premise behind the results that you'll eventually see in the report.

We should take note that this survey was not an easy survey by typical standards. First and foremost it was highly technical in nature and many of the questions that were very detailed in that regard that would require a specific skill set to complete.

And after conducting the analysis we suspect that a large amount of these responses, the reason for them not being submitted was due to the technical nature of the survey itself.

The draft final report is approximately 57 pages with near 50 of those being a summary of the analysis. As I mentioned it was a fairly lengthy survey and in terms of the raw data that was extracted from the survey tool that started well beyond 100 pages but we tried to consolidate and summarize to make it much more digestible in terms of understanding the results.

There are a few initial proposed recommendations in the draft report. I won't go into the details of those. But the working group will be reconvening to review not only the final results but also the recommendations and potentially add any other recommendations to complete the report.

So basically our next steps, as I mentioned, the working group will help complete the final report. As we formalize the final recommendations the working group will also make a determination as to whether a public comment period will be necessary based on the outcome of the final report. And lastly, the report will be submitted to the GNSO Council once those items are complete for their consideration.

You can find more information first on the wiki page for the WSWG. There you can find the raw results of the survey as divided by requirements as well as you can also view the Whois Survey Working Group page that provides kind of a timeline of the key milestones that were accomplished for this effort.

Next I'll be moving over to brief you on a new effort which is the GNSO metrics and reporting drafting team. This is basically a new group that's formed and they'll be tasked with developing a charter to collaborate with the GNSO community and other areas for registrant type of complaint and abuse data with respect to registration of domain names that maybe useful to aid in the GNSO policy development process as issues are addressed by the GNSO as a whole.

Additionally the working group is likely to review current process documentation on policy development and possibly make any recommendations that may enhance that documentation for how

metrics and reporting can be requested, retrieved and consumed by not only the working group but the GNSO community as a whole.

So recent developments, I think for those that are kind of veterans to the GNSO I'll remind you that this original recommendation was brought out from a previous working group that was analyzing the abuse of domain name registration that was titled as the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group.

And during that effort, which was 2009 to 2010 the working group recognized that access to certain types of data to help facilitate the working group's efforts was limited and thus did not provide accurate details in terms of some of the abuses that were being analyzed.

As such that working group created the recommendation that eventually resulted in staff creating an issue report outlining what has been performed to date that addressed that issue.

The issue report itself was sent to the GNSO Council in May of this year with a few of the recommendations being approved by the Council. First, the GNSO Council approved that they await any further action with regard to this issue until the ICANN contractual compliance team complete this three-year plan.

Essentially this plan was initiated several years ago and they're coming to a conclusion at the end of this year for their three-year plan. But in the meantime they've made considerable accomplishments with respect to reporting about many of the issues that the GNSO deals with respect to registration of domain names, transfers, etcetera.

At the same time the Council also approved a second recommendation which is the formation of the working group which is the reason for this presentation now to determine if there are other opportunities to help improve fact-based data collection to not only help validate possible recommendations created by the working group but also to help better inform the GNSO and the GNSO Council with respect to some of these issues. And essentially we're just now getting started.

As such a call for volunteers has been out for a couple of weeks. As of today we only have four volunteers so far and thus we'll be seeking additional help from the community for those that may be interested in this topic.

Originally we did have a session scheduled in Durban, I believe on Thursday. Given the light participation so far that's likely to be cancelled. But I suspect at the very least we'll be briefing the GNSO Council either at its weekend session or bring it up during its Wednesday public session.

So in terms of next steps essentially is definitely form the drafting team that'll help develop the charter for the future working group. Once that charter is approved by the Council then we'll look to form a working group to execute against that charter.

And like the other efforts, you can find more information such as the final issue report and other previous milestones that were achieved that got us to this point out on the GNSO Website as well as the second bullet will give you a link to the call for volunteers that can give you information to sign up if you choose to do so.

So with that I'm going to turn that over to my colleague, Lars, and he'll brief you on some other projects within the GNSO. Thank you.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you, Berry. My name is Lars Hoffman and I'm working as a Policy Analyst supporting the GNSO in the ICANN Brussels office. And as you can see from this slide I'm going to introduce briefly the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D PDP which is, in fact, the final policy development process in a series of IRTP reviews that started back originally in 2008 already.

The IRTP Part D Working Group had its inaugural session the 25th of February this year. And since then the group has sought community input on its six charter questions and has identified the efficiency and the effectiveness of the existing Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, the TDRP, as one of its key issues that may require attention.

In this context the group has also reached out to dispute resolution providers already as well as registrars and registries and also ICANN Compliance in order to get a better overview of the areas where the exiting TDRP works well and those where it is less so.

As part of this analysis of the community input as well as the detailed information received on the TDRP that I just mentioned the group has successfully reviewed the charter questions so far and it is currently in the process of formulating its first recommendations on those questions that appear to be least controversial.

As far as the Durban meeting is concerned the group will meet for a face to face working session on Wednesday the 17th of July at a very convenient 7:30 am meeting.

And those of you that will attend the Durban meeting are very welcome to join the session in person. There will be breakfast served apparently. Otherwise to join us on the audio bridge and your contributions to the group's discussions are very welcome either way.

The agenda and all other information for the Durban meeting can be found on the master calendar on the ICANN site or on the group's wiki page as well. There's the link on the Adobe Connect room on the slide that's up there.

And I would like to end noting that the group expects to produce its initial report in August and hopes to conclude its work in time for the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires in November later this year.

And this is it for me. I'm passing you back on to Marika. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Lars. So I'll just be briefly covering two other topics that are currently under discussion the first of which is policy and implementation. I think as many of you know this has been a topic that has gathered a lot of interest from all sides of the ICANN community.

And also the GNSO has looked into this and they've now decided to actually look further into the issue that specifically affects the GNSO. So to this end they have now created a drafting team that's working on developing a charter for a working group that would look at addressing the issues that have been raised in this context and, as said, that specifically affect the GNSO.

So the drafting team was recently formed and started discussions earlier this month. And they're currently working on the charter and identifying the issues to be addressed. From the discussions at the moment it stands they're looking at, you know, questions such as they're tasking the working group to develop a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions.

Recommendations on a process for providing GNSO policy guidance, looking at developing a framework for implementation related discussions related to GNSO policy recommendations, possible guidance of when something is considered a policy and when it should be considered implementation and looking at how further guidance can be developed on how GNSO implementation review teams are expected to function and operate.

The drafting team is working really hard to try to finalize its charter for submission to the GNSO Council by Durban which means they need to deliver it by the 7th of July so they have a couple of additional meetings scheduled this week or next week, I should say, in the hope of making that deadline.

So I think this is an item where I should probably say, stay tuned, because following submission to the - submission of the charter the GNSO Council will consider it for adoption and as soon as the charter is adopted a call for volunteers will go out, again, to anyone interested to join this effort and work together on addressing some of these questions.

The last item I wanted to mention in this section is the purpose of gTLD Registration Data Policy Development Process, which is one of the projects that's currently been in a holding pattern, the Board requested an issue report on this topic, more specifically the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data as well as solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data at the same time as they created the Expert Working Group.

And those of you that may be familiar with the Expert Working Group you may know that they've actually just published their initial report for public comment. So as the two efforts are closely related and the idea is that the recommendations of the Expert Working Group will actually feed into this policy development process.

We started already off by developing the preliminary issue report which was published for public comment a while ago. But we're now waiting for the recommendations to be finalized so that those can feed into the final issue report which will then kick off the policy development process.

So we're basically waiting for that to happen. And if you're interested in this topic I think there will be a lot of conversation and discussion about the Expert Working Group recommendations taking place in Durban and I believe they're also having a number of Webinars that are taking place over the next couple of weeks.

So again if you're interested in that topic, you know, have a look at the ICANN Website. And as said, when they finalize their recommendations this will come back to the GNSO and feed into the

Policy Development Process which will then kick off with a working group.

So with that I've reached the end of the GNSO section so I'll now give everyone a couple of seconds to formulate their questions, raise their hands and put forward any questions you may have in relation to the topics we presented here.

Maybe just a reminder as well more detailed updates on most of these items will also be provided during the Durban meeting especially over the weekend session. The GNSO has its working sessions on Saturday and Sunday and most of the efforts presented here will also provide updates there to the GNSO Council.

In addition, as also pointed out, in a number of the slides there are dedicated workshops or face to face meetings taking place throughout the week and all of these meetings are always open to anyone interested and to raise your questions or provide your input.

I'll give you a couple of seconds more to raise your hands or write in the Chat. We'll all remain available on the call so if any questions may come up as we continue the presentation please feel free to type them in the Chat and we'll do our best to answer them. But I think with that I'll just hand it over to my colleague, Bart Boswinkel, who will tell you about the issues that are on the agenda for the ccNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: Good day, everybody. I just want to touch upon a couple of topics. Three of them are major long-standing initiatives which will reach their conclusion at or just after the Durban meeting so that's the ccTLD financial contribution discussions, the study group on the use of

country and territory names as top level domains and the IDN country code process development process and some other topics including the 10th anniversary of the ccNSO.

Let me start with the financial distribution or contributions discussion. This was a very contentious topic around the 2010 and 2011 era. And it has moved away from this contention over the years.

The ccNSO has mandated a finance working group to explore the allocation of ICANN expenses to the ccTLDs and understand and come to agreement on a model and mechanism for the allocation and as a second part of the mandate to propose a distribution model of these expenses across the ccTLD community.

The goal was to find a sustainable predictable and agreed upon model based on the voluntary contribution as is currently used for the ccTLD community. One of the major issues was the model that has been used from the start, the expense area grouping, which was also included in the ICANN budget and ops plan up until fiscal year 2011, was abandoned at the Prague meeting.

So the Finance Working Group and ICANN staff had to find a new approach which was a value-based exchange approach. I'll briefly touch upon this one. The conceptual ideas behind it were that there were some specific costs value and that was benefitting exclusively the ccTLDs.

ICANN was also - and the CCs - were having a shared value and you have to think about meetings, etcetera where both ICANN and the ccTLD community spent money and expenses to organize these

meetings and which is not just for the benefit of the ccTLD community but for the broader audience as well. And then there is the global exchange of value to support the Internet ecosystem etcetera.

Now this model has been agreed upon at the Beijing meeting by the community. And ICANN and the ccNSO Finance Working Group are now looking into monetization of this model.

Again, as this is just a conceptual model, be aware there are no real clear cut boundaries between say the different categories of value, for example, IANA function, a local presence as well as a global and a shared aspect to it.

Now where we are currently is, as I said, the allocation model has been agreed upon and we're finalizing the monetization and the ccTLD community is discussing a distribution model across for the ccTLD community itself.

And the Finance Working Group hopes to find consensus with the community in - at the Durban meeting and then will prepare a guideline to replace the 2007 guideline. So this, if you look at the ccNSO agenda, this will take up major portion of the Tuesday discussion.

A second topic which has been ongoing for quite some time is the study group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs. Again I will not touch upon the mandate, etcetera.

The working group or the study group will publish its draft final report shortly before the Durban meeting. And it has made some main

observations which will not come as a surprise. It is a complex area especially in light of the multitude of languages and scripts.

And what is probably more important if you will - if I touch upon the recommendations is there is no consistent treatment of country and territory names across the ccNSO and GNSO policies.

Based on these observations the recommendations to the ccNSO Council will be to set up a cross community working group to review the current definitions of country and territory names under the different policies and propose a consistent framework across the different policies in order to harmonize the treatment under the different policies of country and territory names.

And at the same time it is suggested that the Council request the Board to extend the current rule under the Applicant Guidebook to exclude the country and territory names as new gTLDs until such time that this cross community working group comes up with a recommendation.

The third major topic I wanted to touch upon, but this is more a procedural point, is the IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process. At the Beijing meeting the Council adopted the main recommendations of all the working groups and it's now up to the members to vote upon the Council recommendation itself.

To date we have a first round of voting. And unfortunately we did not meet the quorum rule; only 65 of ccTLD managers or members voted and we needed at least 68 votes so therefore the vote itself will not be employed. At the Durban meeting we will discuss what has happened

and how we can improve the process. And post Durban there will be a second and final round of voting.

More of a festive event and happening at the Durban meeting is the 10th anniversary of the ccNSO. In June 2003 the ccNSO was created by the adoption of the Article 9 of the Bylaws. And the ccTLD community has established - or the ccNSO Council has established a celebration committee.

And the more serious part of the celebrations will be a panel discussion on the achievements and added value of the ccTLDs to ICANN and other stakeholders. And the more festive part will be a ccNSO cocktail for the all the ccTLD community and invited guests on Tuesday evening.

Other events and working groups at the ccNSO meeting in Durban, which are worth mentioning, is that the joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group has published its draft final report on universal acceptance and is open for public comment.

As always there will be a tech day on Monday the 15th of July and the ccNSO meetings on the 16th and 17th of July will, as always, be open for everybody and we foresee a panel discussion on the cross regional capacity building in - to strengthen ICANN's regional initiatives. It will be a security session and a ccTLD news session as always.

And finally the ccNSO Council will elect a new chair for the ccNSO as Leslie Cowley will step down at the Durban meeting.

Some background material - and, again, if you have any questions please use this opportunity. I see one hand and I don't know if we open the lines now. And if not the next presentation will be by Barbara Roseman on the ASO and RSSAC.

Barbara Roseman: Okay, it looks like Evan has put down his hand. Are there any other questions?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bart, Cheryl here. I just noted a question from (Dave Eddinton) regarding the uses of different names of territories between the ACs and the SOs. That probably is worthwhile mentioning. There's no mandate but there should be good practice I would have thought.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Barbara Roseman: All right, I'm going to move onto the ASO policy issues. This is Barbara Roseman and I'm staff support for the - excuse me Address Supporting Organization and the Root Service System Advisory Committee.

The ASO will not be holding a meeting at the Durban meeting. They did at the Beijing meeting. And they will have several participants, several ASO members on site in Durban. They ask that you feel free to come up to them and ask them questions. I'm sure they'll identify themselves in some significant way.

The ASO recently reappointed Kuo Wei Wu to Seat 10 of the ICANN Board. His current seat will end at the end of the annual general

meeting in Buenos Aires and his next position will take up from that point and it's a three-year term.

They are working on identifying IPv4 transfer issues between RIR regions. Each of the regions right now have specific guidelines for - or rules for transferring IPv4 from one party to another. And with the run out of the four in the free pool they are now looking to see if there are complications of managing transfers between the RIRs. And this has not yet turned into a global policy but it may over the next year.

They're also working on redefining their operating procedures for the Address Council. This is something that they do periodically and it's mean to improve their processes and ensure that people who have joined the Address Council more recently are very familiar with what the processes are.

As I said they will have five ASO members on site in Durban. There's going to be an IPv6 session on Wednesday afternoon and an open session with the Board and the ASO on Wednesday morning.

Moving on to the RSSAC, the RSSAC has been going through a progressive change based on the review that they received a couple years ago. And they've now formed their Executive Committee. There's 12 root server operators represented along with the groups that manage and maintain the root zones. So that's VeriSign is the root zone publisher, NTIA as the IANA oversight manager and ICANN IANA as the root zone maintainer.

They are currently working on several documents, operating procedures and some guidelines for how they want to involve - excuse

me, liaisons from other groups within ICANN and some from outside of ICANN.

And they're forming a caucus to be a large community of DNS experts to work in working groups and on other RSSAC work. The intent is that the Executive Committee will be in a more administrative role than a working area once we get past these operating procedures rules.

They are holding their next face to face meeting at the IETF in Berlin. And following the end of this year they are going to meet at least twice a year at ICANN meetings. They are going to hold their first meeting at an ICANN meeting at the Buenos Aires meeting in November.

And please, if there are any questions. If not I'll be passing this on to Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Barbara. Hello, everyone. My name is Heidi Ullrich. I'm the Director for At Large. And I'm very delighted to give you a brief update on the ALAC policy issues and regional At Large organization activities between the Beijing and Durban meetings as well as provide a preview of At Large activities in Durban.

So first turning to the policy activities of the ALAC, the ALAC produced 11 policy advice statements in response to open public comments between the ICANN meeting in Beijing in late June of this year.

The five more recent policy advice statements consist of the following: a fiscal year draft - fiscal year '14 draft operating plan and budget, a new gTLD Board committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice statements, ALAC statement on the proposed final 2013 RAA, an

ALAC statement to the Board regarding security and stability implications of the new gTLDs and the ALAC - an ALAC statement on the trademark clearinghouse and IDN variants.

The policy advice development process that the ALAC uses including close collaboration with the five At Large regional At Large organizations and over 16 active working groups ensures that the ALAC statements reflect the views (of some of the agents) of the At Large communities. More information on all of the ALAC statements is available on the At Large Correspondence Webpage and in the monthly policy update.

Turning to ALAC and EURALO activity since Beijing there have been four I'd like to highlight. The first is the preparation of the new Beginner's Guide on ALAC policy. This guide, which will be presented in basically finished version in Durban lists the end user perspective on six key policy issues consisting of Whois, the RAA, IDNs, ICANN Strategic and Operating Plan, the new gTLDs and public interests.

And this Beginner's Guide is the fifth in a series of guides on topics requested by the ICANN community most of which have been requested by the At Large community.

The second is the ALAC regional officer and ALAC voting delegates for the NomComm selection process. All five of the regional At Large organizations have either recently completed or are currently undergoing their selection process for various At Large leadership positions including ALAC representatives, regional officers and ALAC voting delegates to the NomComm. The aim was to sync all of the

selection processes to have them completed by the Durban meeting and we're on track to complete that.

The third is a series of eight AFRALO capacity building Webinars. AFRALO developed a series of three capacity building Webinars for their At Large structures based on activities that took place during the Dakar meeting in 2011 - in October 2011 - when they held a series of capacity building sessions for their members.

These three Webinars with presentations by senior ICANN staff and community leaders are on the following topics. The first is ICANN mission structure and constituencies. The second was on ICANN's role in the infrastructure of the Internet and ICANN's public participation and communication. And the third, which is going to be held this next week, is how you can help shape the future on the Internet - of the Internet it should be.

And all of these are going to be available - or they are available on the At Large wiki pages. And the fourth is the EURALO General Assembly which took place on the 19th of June on the sidelines of the EuroDIG conference. This general assembly brought together over 80 of the EURALO At Large structure representatives to discuss how to improve EURALO's in region member involvement and define their priorities.

And as you can see by the photo on the slide ICANN President and CEO, Fadi Chehade, spoke with the members of EURALO during the General Assembly as well as was the keynote speaker at an outreach reception.

Turning to At Large activities in Durban. At Large members will be holding 21 formal meetings as well as interact with other members of the community during numerous other public meetings and they'll also be holding informal meetings.

The ALAC will be meeting with the Board, the GAC, the ASO and the ATRT2 during Durban. Following on the success of the policy roundtable - multistakeholder policy roundtable held in Beijing the At Large community is going to be holding another one this time on the theme of new gTLDs addressing consumer and public interest concerns. That meeting is going to be held on Monday the 15th of July between 1400 and 1600. And you're all very welcome to attend any of the At Large meetings.

And finally, there's going to be an AFRALO reception and showcase held on Monday the 15th of July between 1800 and 1930. This - the theme this time is going to be AFRALO: Getting Closer to the Local African End User Community. And it's going to be a little bit different this time including having members from the local Durban community speak on their views of ICANN and what their future of the Internet is.

And this will include Fadi Chehade as guest speaker as well as other senior staff members and community members and you're all very warmly invited to attend this event.

And that concludes the ALAC update. And I'm going to turn it over to David for questions. Thank you.

David Olive: Thank you very much, Heidi. And, again, we still have some time for additional questions on any of the sections that were presented today,

the GNSO, ccNSO and others on the Advisory Side. And I would open up for questions; either raise your hand or we'll unmute the phones at the moment so people can ask questions.

Well there has been a lively discussion in the Chat which I hope other people have been following as well. Are there any other questions on the presentations made? The lines are open according to Nathalie. I thank you for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Plenty of people talking.

David Olive: On the Chat, of course. Well, Cheryl, would you like to make a comment or a question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, I didn't have a question actually. Thanks for the offer, David. I was just noting that there was plenty of people typing and I wanted to make sure that the call stayed on and open long enough for those Chat questions. And as Avri points out there was some questions gone through on the Chat previously that perhaps staff should scroll back and double check on before you close off.

But one thing that just struck me and a conversation I was having with one of the participants here - and I know I've said it before, David, but how useful these briefings are. And I've been chatting with a representative from the Pacific Islands and we were talking about how useful this information is even if you're not attending these major ICANN meetings.

I know these are archived and people could access them. But Maureen Hillard and I were discussing the benefits of having them somehow

sliced up with a short synopsis for ready access by topic even so that, for example, the 30-odd countries and (ALS) members and people in government and decision making could bring themselves up to speed on a topic by topic base.

I just thought I'd throw that out there as a possibility. And I'll obviously be bringing it up other fora because I think it's a damn good concept and I want to thank (Maureen) and recognize her for that idea. Thanks, Berry.

David Olive: Well thank you, Cheryl. We appreciate those comments. Any other questions? I know we're answering some of the ones in the Chat for you right now and that could be a way of doing that. And multiple people are typing and so with that we will continue to allow that to happen. I will just go through some of the final parts of our presentation of how to stay updated and then we can always go back to that in the Chat.

Again our suggested way is to follow this on the monthly policy update. This is a very good summary of the policy issues and activities of the various supporting organizations and advisory committees. It is published, again, each month. And you can read it online at the URL that's stated here on the slide as well as subscribe to it so it's emailed to you. It is also available at My ICANN so through that linkage you can receive further updates on the policy team issues.

With slight delay, of course, we also have the policy update available in other languages, as you see here, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish for those to refer to in their native languages.

The Policy Development Support Team is listed here. Many of those members have presented today and you may know them. And most of us will be in Durban so that we will be supporting the work of the SOs and the ACs. And of course we ask and appreciate you saying hello to us or asking us questions directly when we're there.

At this stage I would just like to announce two new additions to the policy team. One is Olof Nordling. He'll be joining - or coming back to the policy team in many respects - as the Senior Director for GAC Relations. As you know the policy team does support the GAC in its advisory committee role.

And also beginning July 1 we're filling the Senior Policy Director with special reference to the GNSO work with Mary Wong, a member of our community. And she'll be at Durban as will Olof working on the GAC and GNSO activities respectively.

So with that we will take any other final questions. We've been answering some of them in the Chat. And we hope that is also a good way for you to get the information as well as some of our responses. We will also now remind you that the slides will be posted and the recordings and transcripts are available on the GNSO calendar, the URLs are there, and also on the ICANN Website so people can refer back to them. We thank Cheryl for also mentioning that in her comments and remarks.

If there are no other questions, and I think we've been answering most of them, we would like to thank the participants of this Webinar for taking time out of their busy schedule to be with us, to allow us to

share some of the highlights of what we will see discussed on policy matters in Durban.

And we look forward to further discussions and continuation of our discussions in Durban either to see everyone in person or participating remotely. We welcome that and we hope to see all of you soon in Durban. With that I would like respond and say we thank you again for the time and attention and I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, David. Thanks.

END