

**ICANN Policy Update  
WEBINAR  
22 November 2010 at 20:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 22 November 2010 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-update-webinar-2-20101122-en.mp3>

on page:

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

David Olive: Thank you to all for joining on the ICANN policy update webinar today the 22nd of November 2010. Let me welcome you, my name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development support at ICANN and the rest of the team for creating this webinar for you.

As you may know we have been doing this with the beginning of the Nairobi ICANN meeting to have an event just prior to the meeting to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help prepare and focus your efforts and our efforts in the meetings coming forward.

I would like to say that there's going to be a lot of information contained in this presentation, the slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everybody has an opportunity to review the information at their leisure.

In addition we will be sending out to you a short survey via email in the next few days and we would ask for your feedback on this webinar going forward. In addition also we will have the slides translated into Spanish and Portuguese in preparation for our Cartagena event.

Let me do a few housekeeping items before we begin, to reduce interference please mute your phones.

There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of this section, at this point you can unmute that line.

This is an Adobe Connect room for this session in which the slides can be viewed and questions posted. The link to this room has been included in the email you received on the meeting details.

During the session you can submit your questions in the chat box at the bottom of the Adobe Connect window. Our policy staff will do their best to answer your questions in real time in case questions arise after the meeting or you want to follow up on other issues discussed in the webinar.

Please feel free to contact the policy staff at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org). Please do not use the call me button in Adobe Connect, it is solely there to facilitate the recording of this session. At the end of the meeting if you want to ask a question you can either state your name to be added to the queue or raise your hand in the Adobe Connect.

And there is the icon you use in the lower left hand side for that purpose. The goals of our session today are to update you on the policy work, review the issues coming forward at Cartagena, inform you of other activities and opportunities for further input and answer any questions you may have.

Many of you are planning to participate in the Cartagena meeting either in person or remotely and we encourage you and welcome you to do that.

Indeed the remote participation tools have been put in place and they're available for you if you cannot come in person. Further details on the remote

services provided are available at the Cartagena website as well as the general program for Cartagena.

In addition to a number of policy related activities that will be highlighted throughout this presentation, there are a number of other important sessions taking place in Cartagena such as the new gTLD sessions, discussions on security and stability of the DNS, abuse of the DNS forum and also public participation committee will talk about some of their directions as well in Cartagena.

So further information can be found at the site listed on our slide here. The focus of this presentation is on policy development at ICANN and as most of you will be aware the following bodies are responsible for such policy development activity; the Generic Names Supporting Organization develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domains.

The Country Code Supporting Organization has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to country code top level domains. And the Address Support Organization reviews and develops recommendations on internet protocol IP address policy.

In addition to these supporting organizations that have the capability to develop policy recommendations, there are a number of advisory committees that provide advice to the ICANN board such as the at large advisory committee, the security, stability and advisory committee, the root server advisory committee and of course the governmental advisory committee, the GAC.

Today we will cover the following highlights. I've talked to you a little bit about the Cartagena meeting highlights. We will have GNSO improvements discussed by Rob Hoggarth of the policy staff, registrar accreditation agreement and vertical integration PDP as well as morality and public order issues will be discussed by Margie Milam.

Internationalized registration data will be discussed by Steve Cheng, registration abuse policy by Marika Konings and we will have a focus on the country code supporting organization, Bart Boswinkle will talk about the IDN ccTLD work as well as the delegation and re-delegation working group.

And we'll be joined by Olof Nordling talking about the global policy on autonomous system numbers and the global policy on IPV 4 as part of the address support organization briefing.

I now would like to turn the session over to Rob Hoggarth to focus on GNSO policy issues. Rob it's yours.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you David, good day everybody. We're leading off with the GNSO today because it has a central role in policy development in ICANN and it seems like most GNSO actions have a direct or an indirect impact on the other communities in some way.

So this seemed to be a great place for us to start. You'll see on the list of Slide 9 a number of issues that we're going to be reviewing today. David just noticed a number of them.

The important critical element I think of this list is that the number of the issues that are truly cross community issues continue to grow, and so that a number of the issues that the GNSO is now addressing in any semblance of ways are really issues that are important to other communities.

And so the GNSO finds itself working more and more with members of the at large community, the CCSO community, and members of other advisory committees like ALAC as well.

So we'll go over the full list of these issues with the caveat that there are currently around another 20 working groups and work teams underway in one

way, shape or form that we may not be able to get to in the formal presentation.

But we welcome your questions, observations or comments about any of those other groups that you may be aware of. We start off with GNSO improvements because it has such a critical role in some of the activities that are taking place within the GNSO.

A number of folks have observed particularly over the last couple of years that sometimes how policy is developed is as important as some of the decisions themselves.

And the board recognized this as part of its review process looking at the GNSO that started actually all the way back in 2007.

Those of you who are participating who are in the at large community or in the CCNSO may look at this and go my goodness this seems to be a constant and never ending improvement process.

We've had much more straight forward approaches to our reviews and to the improvements processes in our organizations, and you'd be right about that.

The major difference I think terms of the GNSO review was the degree of complexity, how comprehensive it was. I think even the GNSO council members, a lot of members of the work teams themselves are realizing how many interdependencies there are.

And that truly the challenge in a lot of the GNSO improvements efforts has really been in the details. But let's just talk very quickly about the overall scope and coordinated effort.

We're three primary objectives for the GNSO improvements effort. They were first and foremost to maximize (stable) participation, secondly to look at how

policy development process could be improved to ensure that at least for research, clear cut objectives and operate in a predictable manner that members of the community can be comfortable (unintelligible) the issue from process to process.

And then finally the really important aspect as well within the GNSO, between the GNSO and other bodies that the need to improve communications and work at beefing up administrative support.

So the board's recommendations and the work that the GNSO has been doing over the past couple of years really focused in five main areas. They were to restructure the GNSO council, converting that group from a legislative bodies more of a strategic manager policy development.

To enhance the constituency operations of the various stakeholders who participate in this GNSO by ensuring that they operate on a level playing field to look at revising the policy development process to fulfill the goals that is mentioned on the previous slide, that is to develop some true consistency and confirm that the timelines and the processes are practical as well as the tactical.

To improve the communications as I noted not only within the GNSO from constituency to stakeholder group between constituencies, between the GNSO and other groups but also between the GNSO and the board and the GNSO and the general internet community.

And then finally if you accept the presumption that the GNSO council needs to change then you need to develop a new working group model of policy development where the real engine of policy development will be in the coming years for the GNSO.

And that is in a robust strong working group model. You'll note that I've put a couple of checks to denote some substantial progress or critical benchmarks

that have been reached so far with respect to the GNSO council restructuring, the new council was seated back in the Seoul Korea meeting about a year ago exactly at this time.

And the group is going through a new leadership transition with the upcoming Cartagena meeting and I've also placed this check next to existing constituencies because back in August the GNSO council moved forward with some substantial decisions with respect to new operating procedures that affect stakeholder group and constituencies.

And we've been able to move forward as a staff in presenting leaders of the community with implementation plans for a new tool of administrative services.

The next slide is one that is - we were getting to some amount of detail. We could probably spend two hours on it, suffice it to say that this slide denotes the current structure of the GNSO, particularly how the GNSO council is made up of two houses, contracted parties who are registries and registrars and the non-contracted parties who are currently made up of four separate constituencies and a number of other individuals who come into the ICANN tent as well.

The most significant aspect of the GNSO restructuring that took place was a realignment within that contracted parties house where the board moved to achieve a much more consistent balance between representation from the commercial constituencies and members of the non-commercial stakeholders within ICANN.

So now you see more of a balance in that right hand house of six commercial interests, and six individuals representing non-commercial interests.

Prior to that there was three more people on the commercial side and literally on three individuals on the non-commercial side, so we see much more of a balance that exists in the structure today.

Now in terms of development and things that have taken place, as I mentioned the GNSO council has moved forward with recommendations essentially called operating principles and participation guidelines for stakeholder groups and constituency operations.

The staff has been sharing with those leadership groups and I and a number of my colleagues have been interfacing with various constituency leadership teams to help them update some of their organizational documents to reflect some of those new practices.

There's also been changes that are taking place at the stakeholder group level where in particular the commercial stakeholders group, the CSG on this slide and the non-commercial stakeholders group, the NCSG on this slide have both been working on permanent charter proposals.

A year ago the ICANN board approved transitional charters for both these stakeholder groups and they've both been working very hard over the last several months to develop proposals for their formal permanent charters.

Well shortly as you'll see on the next slide the anticipating some public comment forums for folks to have an opportunity to look at those documents.

And of course there has also been recently a petition from a new constituency group of proponents purporting to represent the non-profit organizations constituency.

And so that also will shortly be going on public comment forum. As we move forward into the Cartagena meeting there's going to be some continued effort on the part of a number of work teams with respect to revising the policy



development process, bringing some closure to the guidelines for the working group model of policy development.

That's approaching the finish line. We also hope in Cartagena to have some discussion collectively with the GNSO council and then individually with various groups to talk about the implementation plan for a tool kit of administrative support services that the GNSO council approved last year that we've been rolling out to members of the community.

And that's part of the leveling of the playing field that I referenced earlier, to ensure that constituencies and stakeholder groups have the fundamental tool that they need to conduct their discussions and do their work.

Also as I mentioned we're now moving into the first transition for the new GNSO council and I believe right now the election is going on for GNSO council chair for the next year.

Finally there's an opportunity for all of you and other members of the community to see a report on the new and improved GNSO website that's going to be debuting in Cartagena. Hope to be able to show you some slides and pictures of the new look and feel of that site.

Hope to have some dialogue to help improve what we hope is going to be a sort of real face lift for that site with tremendously improved collaboration tools and ways to access information.

In terms of next steps, there is an infrastructure that the GNSO council developed to do a lot of the implementation work. It involves a number of work teams and steering committees and at least for another several months the council is going to have to renew the charter and the steering committees that govern a lot of that implementation work.

We also anticipate that there will be upcoming comment forums for the new constituency which is the not for profit organizations constituency, the CSG and NCSG charters as those wend their way forward.

There have also been discussions about potential new constituency process with a much more objective approach that members of the board are looking at. It's not clear to us though whether that will move forward in time for Cartagena but at whatever time the board moves forward with that there's likely to be a public comment forum for community comments on that.

And then collectively we anticipate that it won't be until the March time frame before we see substantial board decisions on some of these new processes or in approving some of the charters.

It would be great (unintelligible) a realistic time frame for some final decisions over these proceedings. A lot of work continues to go on, the GNSO council continues to look at even some of the new processes and procedures and fine tune those, so there are a number of ways to get involved.

And I know that there will be a number of upcoming public comment forums, so please keep an eye on the ICANN public comment forum page for those coming up and I'm sure your individual stakeholder groups, your supporting organizations (unintelligible) when some of these get posted on the ICANN website.

There are also particularly in the contracted party house for both the commercial stakeholders and members of non-commercial community very interested in additional folks coming to the table and participating that way.

And so please reach out to those groups if you're interested in participating. And then finally a standard resource that we've worked hard to keep updated on a continual basis, the GNSO improvements implementation page.

That link is on Slide 17 at the bottom there for you to consult. That includes something recently added by the structural improvements committee, a dashboard and a timeline that can give you a pretty quick screen shot, a photo snapshot of what the current status is of a variety of projects.

I'm going to stop there, pause, and we're going to turn to some more substantive issues from a number of my colleagues. I'll be returning at the end of the session to do some questions and answers.

We'll be collecting those in the chat box at the bottom of the page as well as fielding your verbal questions for those of you who have joined us on the telephone line.

So let me now step back and turn things over to Margie Milam to talk about vertical integration between registries and registrars. It's yours Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you Rob and hello everybody. I'm going to spend some time talking about the issue of vertical integration between the registries and registrars. And this is primarily related to the new gTLD program although it also has implications with respect to (unintelligible) gTLDs.

And this issue really relates to whether there should be restrictions on ownership between registries and registrars and if there are restrictions whether there should be additional rules that apply.

So the reason this is important is that the new gTLD program implementation details are being worked on and there's a lot of new models of distribution that are expected for the new gTLD program.

Up until this point there have been no GNSO policy recommendation on vertical integration. The rules have largely varied based on contracts and have been no uniform approach or understanding with respect to this issue.

So the GNSO council took a look at this and decided to implement a policy development process, a PDP as we call it in February of this year with a goal of trying to come up with policy recommendations in time for the launch of the new gTLD program, specifically with respect to the first round of applications.

And the working group was very large, it was about 70 members worked diligently over the last six months to try to come up with recommendations.

The PDP was intended to focus not just on new gTLDs but also existing gTLDs with the idea being that if the rules were created that they could also apply to the existing dot com, dot net, dot info.

So recently there's been a lot of activity with respect to this issue. The vertical integration PDP group spent a lot of time working and trying to identify different solutions or different models for vertical integration in the new gTLD program.

Unfortunately it was unable to reach consensus recommendations for what they call the first phase of work meaning that they were trying to come up with recommendations that would apply to the first round of applications for the new gTLD program.

And so they sent a notice to the GNSO council who then informed the ICANN board that there were no recommendations coming from the GNSO with respect to the issue of vertical integration.

In light of that the board has recently taken action and as we review the final applicant guidebook or the post-final applicant guidebook you'll see that the guidebook has eliminated most restrictions on registrar cross ownership, essentially there are no rules that prevent a registry from owning a registrar or vice versa.

The materials I'd note that there is a registry agreement that will include a registry code of conduct that would address perhaps some of the possible problems that might arise with respect to vertical integration.

And there's also a notion in the document that ICANN would be receiving notice if a registry owns a registrar and an opportunity to defer that to the competition authorities.

And so in light of these recent developments the GNSO council is now considering whether or not to continue the PDP at this time or to actually terminate it and allow the new gTLDs to be launched and perhaps address the issue at a later time.

So that is something that is currently being considered. If you'd like to participate in this issue, there's lots of ways to get up to speed and to participate either through the Cartagena session or to actually post comments in the public comment forum.

I've provided a link on this slide to the information and the public comment forum will be open until December 10 and so we invite you to do that or to attend the new gTLD session which will take place on Monday in Cartagena.

The next issue I'd like to talk to you about is the issue related to the registrar accreditation agreement and for those of you that may not know, ICANN has a standard agreement that it signs with the registrars and that form of agreement is updated rarely.

The last time it was updated was 2009 and in 2009 the agreement that was adopted by the ICANN board came out of a process that originated with the registrar (unintelligible) took place in 2007 and essentially the community was consulted and a form of RAA was proposed in 2009 and presented to the GNSO council.

The GNSO council at that time approved the need form of the RAA but felt that additional work should be done to identify additional areas of amendments to the RAA because the RAA includes obligations that a registrar may have for registrants.

And it was felt that it could be enhanced to include perhaps better tools to obtain registrar compliance or additional protections for registrants. And there was also a notion that more security requirements could have to be included in to the RAA.

So at the time that the last forum was approved the GNSO council formed a joint working group with the at large community to come up with additional improvements for the RAA.

That has produced a final report and I'm providing the link on the slide. The report includes a number of areas where the RAA could be improved and it also - the report also includes something called the registrant right to responsibility charter.

And that is a document that was originated with the at large community. Essentially the idea was that this document could describe the types of obligations that registrars have to registrants under the RAA.

And so this document has been put together using simple language to be able to be a resource for registrants. The language is included in the final report and you can glance through the report and take a look at it.

The other thing that the report includes are topics for additional amendments to the RAA. The working group actually has been a member for months, so we're submitting input for ways in which the RAA could be improved. And it includes a number of topics that can be explored for additional amendments to the RAA, and I invite you to take a look at that report.

It highlights amendment topics that have been submitted from various parts of the community including the law enforcement community, the intellectual property constituency and the ICANN staff also included suggestions for amendment topics.

It's interesting to note that in Brussels the gap in their communiqué endorsed the law enforcement proposals as these proposals are seen as something that could help facilitate law enforcement activity with respect to registrars and registrants.

So where we are with respect to this report, the GNSO Council is to consider the next step in Cartagena. There is - in a weekend session leading up to Cartagena on Sunday, there'll be an hour long session that will address the report and the next steps for taking these amendment topics and perhaps producing the new form of RAA. And this also may be a topic of the GNSO Council moving on the Wednesday meeting in Cartagena.

I'm also going to address issues related to morality and public order. And this is specific to the (new) gTLD's program. This is an issue that arose out of the implementation - the proposed implementation of Recommendation 6. Recommendation 6 came from the GNSO Council. This is a recommendation that dealt with issues related to the new gTLD program and I've provided on this slide the language of Recommendation 6.

Specifically that a string should not be contrary to generally accepted (legal) norms related to morality and public order that are recognized under international principals of law.

And as the implementation was published to various Draft Applicant Guidebook, a number of concerns arose in the community with respect to the implementation. And so a Cross-Community Group, a CWG as we refer to it, involving members of the GAC, GNSO and ALAC came together to put

together a report. And essentially the report identifies a consensus that the implementation model for Recommendation 6 was flawed.

If you refer to the CWG report it talks about the areas where the working group felt recommendations could improve the implementation of Recommendation 6. Specifically there were recommendations related to the Board role with respect to issues of morality and public order.

There were suggestions that the name of the Recommendation be changed from Morality and Public Order to something else. And as you see, if you look through the Applicant Guide Book you'll see that recommendations for the name to be changed to Limited Public Order Objection has been made in the Applicant Guide Books.

There's also a notion that expert advice be sought with respect to these issues, but that those Boards should be responsible for decisions related to issues of morality and public order.

There's also recommendations in the report related to the role of the Independent Objector. ICANN staff has proposed in its documents a creation of an Independent Objector, and the working group suggested that changes be made to the Independent Objector office to allow organizations such as the At-Large community and the GAC to make objections through the Independent Objector.

There was also recommendations related to the general process, and the type of vote that would be required to deny a string based on issues of morality and public order. The working group made the recommendation that a supermajority vote be used if the Board were to reject a string based upon this objection process.

So the recent developments with respect to this issue, the Board has taken some action over the last few meetings related to the issue of morality and



public order and it was essentially resolved that ultimate responsibility for the new gTLD program rests with the Board.

The Board noted that it wishes to rely on expert determination, and so it wanted to point out that it would like to rely on recommendations from experts with respect to this issue. And then the Board also noted that the recommendations from the working group that are not inconsistent with the existing process should be accepted.

So staff has commenced consultation with the working group to explore whether additional recommendations that are published in the CWG report can be incorporated into the AG study process.

And I've provided here links to the various materials. There's an explanatory memorandum if you'd like to learn more about this topic and the recent changes in the proposed Final Applicant Guidebook.

You can also provide your comments through the public comments forum until December 10th, and I've provided the link there. And finally, there will be a Cartagena consultation on this topic in - on Wednesday in Cartagena if you'd like to participate or share your concerns or views with respect to this topic.

And that's all I have with that topic and I will now turn it over to my colleague, Steve Shang who will talk to you about internationalized registration data.  
Steve?

Steve Shang: Thank you, Margie, and hello everyone. I'm going to spend some time talking about some work down at the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group.

This working group was formed at the board request to GNSO and AFSAC. That the Security and Stability Advisory committee. And the goal is to - the

objective is to study the feasibility and suitability of this plain IRD for services that provide domain name registration information, also known as the WHOIS service.

So the RD working group discussed two important questions. So the first question is the suitability issue. That refers to the question if and how to internationalize domain registration data.

Previously, almost all of the data, these data, is in U.S., ASCII or some form of English. In the new era of internationalized domains, the question is, do we want to continue to limit them to U.S. ASCII or is it desirable to include additional scripts and languages?

How can we do so in a way to avoid the so-called Tower of Babel effect for the domain registration data? So that's the first question. The second question is the feasibility issue. It refers to how to specify how to internationalize the WHOIS protocol.

The original WHOIS protocol has not been internationalized in a standard or uniform manner. Therefore, supporting information in scripts and languages other than U.S. ASCII and English is very challenging.

So why is this important? Well, culminating this omission and display of IRD is important evolutionary step for WHOIS services. With the increasing use of the Internet in all geographic regions and by diverse linguistic groups of the world, the demand for multilingual Internet has become more intense and that the introduction of IDN at the top level (culminates) a global effort to fully internationalize domain names.

However, currently there's no standard or guidelines defined how WHOIS data are composed and displayed in this new era, so that's why it's important to address this issue.

There are a couple of ways you can get involved. The IRD working group has been working for about the past nine months and they just published a internal report. And in that report, we would love to see the community's feedback on several models we propose on how to internationalize the domain registration data. So feedback through public comment is very welcome.

There's also going to be a public session in Cartagena on Thursday, December 9th. I think it's from 9:30 to 11:00, or - and there's more information there, so we welcome you to participate either in person or remotely.

And finally, if you have expertise in this area, we would welcome you to join the IRD working group. So that's all. I'm going to pass to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Steve. This is Marika Konings and I'll be talking to you about the work that GNSO was doing in relation to registration of used policies. So GNSO created a Registration of Use Policies Working Group, or also known as the RAP Working Group in 2009 to address the issue of registration abuse.

It was noted that registries and registrars seemed to lack uniform approaches to deal with registration abuse. The question was asked the same time, "Does that really matter?"

Another question that the group was tasked to look at was to determine what the role ICANN has in addressing registration abuse and what issues, if any, fall within the scope of GNSO policy development.

And there's no here - the working group itself was not a policy development process working group, but it was actually tasked to determine which issues, if any, would be suitable for policy development.

So the working group delivered its final report to the GNSO Council on the 29th of May, 2010 and the report itself consist of around 125 pages, which detail the deliberations and findings of the working group on the different questions in the charter as well as an overview and description of the different types of abuses the working group was able to identify.

That information served as a backdrop to the focal point of the report, which are the 14 recommendations that have been put forward to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

So recommendations addressed included, amongst others, issues such as the Cyber Squatting, while a recommendation was made to initiate a PDP to review the Uniform Dispute Resolution process, also known as a UDRP.

WHOIS access, a (unintelligible) recommendation was made to request further information from ICANN compliance staff, administer issues of domain names where the development of best practices has been recommended and other topics such as fake renewal notices, uniformity of contracts and capture and dissemination of best practices.

So almost all of these recommendations require additional work and not all of them were adopted by unanimous consensus of the working group. And GNSO Council decided to task an implementation drafting team to actually develop a recommended approach for the GNSO Council to consider on (unintelligible). Sorry for that. On how to deal with a list of recommendations.

So this implementation drafting team gathered ad reviewed the recommendations contained in the final report and they organized them based on the consensus level achieved by the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group and the expected workload and scope of the work involved, possible dependency with other efforts ongoing, the perceived priority of the issue and they also identified possible next steps for the GNSO Council to consider.

So the result of the drafting teams' work were submitted to the GNSO Council on the 15th of November in time for the Cartagena publication deadline.

So the recommended approach identifies two recommendations. A so called low-hanging fruits, which are deemed to require little to no resources and could therefore be implemented straightaway without too many problems.

And the other recommendations have been ranked from number 1 to 14 with the top four being, first of all, the creation of non-binding best practices to address the misuse issues of domain names and then determining which additional efforts are needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible, followed by the review of the UDRP and the uniformity of contract simulation through registration abuse provisions.

So the GNSO Council will now review and discuss this recommended approach in further detail at its session over the weekend in Cartagena and the session has been scheduled for Saturday, 4th of December from 4:45 to 5:45 for those of you interested. And the session is open to the public and remote participation will be provided, so you can find further details about that on the Cartagena schedule.

So this is just a link here to the actual letter that the drafting team sent to the Council, which outlines the approach and contains all the recommendations and accompanying information.

So in addition to the issues covered so far, there are other initiatives ongoing in the GNSO, and as Rob mentioned earlier, we have around 20 working groups, work teams, drafting teams, that are in some shape or form undertaking activities, but at that as well, unfortunately, it's not possible to cover everything in this Webinar, but we just want to briefly highlight the following few.

The other two policy development processes that are ongoing in the GNSO in addition to the vertical integration PDP that Margie spoke about a little bit earlier are the (international) transfer policy, part DPDP, also known as IRTP and the post-exploration domain recovery PDP, also known as the PEDNR.

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

The PEDNR working group will be having an open working group session in Cartagena that's open to the public. So for those of you interested, you'll find the link here to that meeting.

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

Liz Gasster: Thank you, Marika. And good day, everyone, it's Liz. I'm just going to touch on some additional activities - oh, I'm really sorry. Hang on, I can hear that. I'm sorry. It's Liz. Hopefully that's better.

I'm just going to touch on some additional activities that are quit important but that was have only a limited time to cover today. The first on WHOIS studies, I did give an extensive update on those studies at a recent October 18th call to the GNSO Council and you can see the link there to that presentation and nothing much to update beyond what's there.

Also want to bring your attention to a workshop that Steve Shang and others will be conducting in Cartagena on the evolution of WHOIS on really focusing on concerns such as protocol, how it doesn't reach the community's current

and future needs and this workshop will present some analysis of some of the technical shortcomings of WHOIS and discuss some potential options that might be useful to consider to address these deficiencies from a technical (unintelligible).

Excuse me. Can everyone hear me? I'll continue. The second workshop I wanted to bring to your attention is assisting new gTLD applicants which will be Thursday at 9 a.m. where members of the joint SONAC new gTLD application support working group will present highlights of the recently published report that considers the sustainable approach of providing support to applicants who require assistance in applying for and operating new gTLD registry questions, such as, who should receive support and what kind of support should be given?

So you should plan on attending that topic if you have the time. Thank you, and those are the issues from me and I'd like to turn it over to Bart Boswinkel. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Good day, this is Bart Boswinkel. I want to brief you on two main policy related activities within the GNSO. One is the IDN ccPDP on the introduction and inclusion of IDN'd ccTLDs, the ccNSO. And the second one is the delegation - (we) delegation retirement working group.

This working group is - was established to advise the ccNSO Council whether or not to launch a PDP, so it's very much focused on policy and policy development process.

So why is the IDN ccPDP important? As most of you all know, currently there is the fast track process for the selection and introduction of IDN ccTLDs, so why need an IDN ccPDP?

One - the main reason is probably one of the main reasons are, the fast track process is just exemplary. It was developed by the (SO)s a (HC)s outside of the existing policy development processes, so it was very, you know, invasive

in that sense for policy development and it's the final reason is, the IDN PDP on the fast track process is limited in scope.

So that's the first bit why is the IDN PDP on the selection and introduction of IDN ccTLD is important. The second reason is - on the second part of that PDP the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

Currently, the bylaws of the ccNSO do not allow IDN ccTLDs to become members. The rules itself, are now - were not established and the ccNSO was not created with IDN ccTLDs in mind, so that needs to be adjusted in order to allow IDN ccTLDs to become members.

So where are we with the IDN PDP? So with regard to the overall policy of the selection of IDN ccTLDs, since the Brussels meeting the working group decided to follow a different route that is, first of all, based on a separation of criterion requirements for the selection of IDN ccTLD string.

And secondly, focus on process and procedure for the selection of IDN ccTLD. The working group currently has reached basic consensus on the criterion requirements for the selection and that includes the IDN ccTLD string at least needs to contain one ASCII character, though this is broader than the fast track process, it needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of the territory.

So the IDN ccTLD string data is still similar to the fast track process and it has been agreed to change the official language criteria or official language tied to into designated language.

It's still the similar criteria and the same criteria as under the fast track, but designated language is introduced to avoid confusion in some countries regarding the language.



The best example is probably Sweden, but there is a whole mechanism to designate languages for (administrative use), but they're not considered official language within Sweden itself. So that's one of the reasons for changes.

On inclusion that's another working group working - focusing on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs. This working group has identified the main issues currently in the Article 9 of the ICANN bylaws and the Annexes B and C. The main issues are membership definition, the definition of the implied scope of membership, and voting mechanisms in Article 9 and especially in the policy development process.

Voting process was when the ccNSO was created was more - was based on the assumption of one vote per member. However, with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs. Some countries, some territories, may have two or more ccTLDs and this would possibly have an impact on the outcome of voting and the balance of power within the ccNSO itself.

There has - the working group has also identified potential solutions and especially for the voting, and the suggestion is to change one vote per member to one vote per territory and some mechanisms I'll propose to achieve this proposal as well.

Next up is the Working Group 2 has just published its interim report on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs and the - and the issues and proposals. The Working Group 1, so the one dealing with the overall policy will publish a progress report at the end of this week for discussion in Cartagena and solicit comments on the process report - progress report, especially on the criteria and requirements.

After the Cartagena meeting the working group will start focusing on the policy aspect of (varied) management, probably in conjunction with the joint

IDN working group and we'll probably also heavily borrow from that working group.

The working group has already initiated discussion on process and procedures and it will also include after the Cartagena meeting the outcome of the (fast track) review process.

Moving forward, how can you get involved in the IDN policy development process and all the working groups and all the continuing work? You can participate - there is a ccNSO meeting in Cartagena which is on Tuesday, 7 December, local time end of the afternoon. There is room for remote participation and, of course, you can always write your - always provide your comments to the public forum.

Moving forward to the delegation, redelegation, retirement working group and its activities. Why is this so important for the ccNSO community and ccTLD community in general and other stakeholders like the government as well? It is delegation, redelegation, retir- and retirement policies are from the (mental) for ccTLDs including IDN ccTLDs.

Although you think delegations do not occur very often, now with the IDN ccTLDs delegated it is - there is, say, almost a order or magnitude increase in delegations and the processes are very time consuming and complex and open for discussion because, yes, there is some elements of confidentiality, et cetera, involved as well.

Now the working group until now has established there are no authoritative documents and documentation of policies available although there are clear policies or there are policy statements like RSC 5091, like ICP 1 and like the GAC principles.

Some of these have been adopted, some of these haven't, and it's very clear how they merge into one authoritative documented policy. There is also a

perceived change in policy over time and without proper consultation all the ICANN stakeholders.

Moving to the next slide - now, so that was more or less the conclusion of the working group leading up to Brussels. Since Brussels, the working had an in-depth analysis of cases in order to identify issues and develop recommendations to address those issues.

The working group has focused on three different processes, so retirement, delegation and redelegation, in that order because there is an increased complexity in these processes. With regard to retirement, the main issues identified by the working group is there is no policy or clearly evolved practice in - over time.

There is only a limited number of ccTLDs that have been retired so taken out of the root. As ICANN is a policy based organization and the retirement of ccTLD needs to be based on policy, the recommendation or the draft recommendation to the ccNSO council will be to launch a PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs.

Regarding delegation, the working group reads consensus on the issues and draft recommendations on the governed delegation practice so keep in mind this is not only relevant for the ccTLDs for also for IDN ccTLDs. Again, the main issues are an unclear policy or interpretation, that are all or part of the policy.

The policy has changed, all parts of the policies have changed significantly over time and as ICANN is a policy based organization, it is - it needs a policy base on consultation through its stakeholders. So the recommendation of - the draft recommendation of the working group will be to develop a framework of interpretation for the board and/or the PDP.

The framework of interpretation is considered as a starting point to deal with the immediate issues and if this would work, then the need for a (conflict) policy development process, especially with regard to delegation could be revisited. That's the view of the working group so at least there needs to be some work done and it's very clear the major stakeholders need to be involved in either the framework of interpretation process that still needs to be defined or the ccPDP.

The working group is currently dis- still discussing the redelegation process of ccTLDs and it has made a distinction between the redelegation of ccTLDs with the consent of the current manager and the complex redelegation issues of practice. And complex is - it ranges from the current ccTLD manager not consenting to a range of issues.

The working group hopefully will conclude its report on the redelegations with consent in time for the Cartagena meeting but it's expected that a complex redelegations have to be dealt with after the Cartagena meeting.

This week we hope to be able to - the working group hopes to be able to publish its third progress report which will include a summary of the issues and recommendations and reports on the retirement and delegation and hopefully the redelegation with consent of the idea of the ccTLD managers will be published as well.

And feedback, as always, feedback will be requested on this report by either by the discussion in Cartagena. There will be a ccNSO meeting, the ccNSO GAC meeting where this topic will be on the agenda and how you get involved is participate at the ccNSO meeting and provide your comment. And that's, for me, the basic overview of, say, these hot topics in the ccNSO arena. And I want to like hand it over now to Olof to deal with the ASO issues. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and good evening everybody from Brussels. We've now reached the time for the (last N) in the ICANN name numbers, meaning IP addresses and autonomous system numbers and the like.

And we certainly need policy development as well and that's taken care of by the other (thing) community of which the address supporting organization is one part. But the addressing community is much bigger than that. It's a universe in its own right with plenty of interesting acronyms like RIR, (NRO inception). A little background is perhaps useful and - to explain that.

RIR, those are the regional infinite registries that receive huge chunks of IP addresses from the (iana) function of ICANN and then allocate them on a regional level. There are five of them, one (afric) for Africa, (aasia) for Asia Pacific, (aron) for North America, (lathnic) for Latin America and (ripe) for Europe.

And they have an over coupling organization for corporations called the Number Resource Organization or the NRO, okay. And now the ASO, the address supporting organization, it's actually a construct with the help of an MOU between the ICANN and the NRO which identifies NRO as the entity that takes care of the ASO function.

Simple, isn't it? And one major task of the ASO is to take care of and handle this global policy proposals and that sounds very grand and it is. This serves also a little bit of an explanation. So a global policy - what could that be? The regional Internet registries, they - there are many, many regional addressing policies. But there are a few that do affect (iana) and the (iana) function and how the (iana) function is - function should handle allocation of addresses.

And only those policies or policy proposals that affect (iana) are called global policies so it's a very, very narrow definition. And, well, those who listened in in June for the Webinar then, they heard we had two proposals in pipeline - one for autonomous system numbers, ASMs, and another for covered IP for

address (base) and right now put pipeline in inverted commas because they're not in pipeline anymore.

But what happened then? Starting with autonomous system numbers which those for numbers that the Internet service providers use for directing traffic in (bout) fashion you could say between them before they reach the local access, so to speak, for the IP numbers. Those numbers you could perhaps compare them to road signs on motorways in comparison to the street signs in local cities.

Well, we've had since quite a few years and - a policy for autonomous system numbers which included a transition from 16 bits to 32 bits in order to, well, deal with the number crunching needs of all the ISP. And the latest policy proposal then actually only addressed one little aspect of this and that was the date for full transition from 16 bits to 32 bits which turned out to, well, not really match the needs on the market.

There were plenty of legacy systems that couldn't really deal with a 32 bit (ASNs) immediately. So the - (Socan) changeover was then proposed to be deferred and, well, as I mentioned in June, well this proposal had reached the advanced stage of acceptance and has been approved by all the RIRs.

Then as global policy proposals go, it was then delivered to the RIO acceptance committee for a review and then to the ASO addressing council which in turn verifies - performs a due diligence check of the procedures and forwarded it - forwards it to the ICANN board for (replication).

All of that has happened and it's now an adopted policy. And not only that, it's also being implemented by the (iana). So it's not in the pipeline anymore. It's an adopted policy.

The second one was about recovered IP before which (boss) proposed us to handle address space - IPD4 address space but may be returned to the

(iana) from the RIRs and then will enable (iana) to hand it out in small returns then the normal size which is the so-called slash-8 or working 16 million IPD4 addresses.

So this proposal had developed for quite some time but in the process in the RIRs is developed in two different ways. In one RIR it ended up being adopted with one formulation, one text and in the four other RIRs it was adopted with another text.

And the difference wa- the differences were small but quite important like between may and must. So once adopted by them all, the NRO EC concluded that, well, this could not be consolidated to some good global policies proposal and could not be forwarded as it was. And so it was quite simply being addendumed or you could say dormant, perhaps (developed) in that latest point in time.

But more importantly, there is or was already, an alternative proposal that is under discussion in all RIRs to handle, well, more or less precisely the same (master). And the may have prompted the decision to put that in the fridge for the time being and look at the new one. So that's the situation for the second proposal we discussed last time.

Now how do I get involved in all this? If you're at all interested in addressing policies, well, there is just one advice to give and that's to get involved in your RIR in the regional Internet registry responsible for your geographic region because they all have open meetings where the policy proposals are discussed and developed and they all have open mailing lists for such matters, so it's really just a matter of reaching out and getting involved in their work.

But for Cartagena there's a particular opportunity to get an overview of not only the global policies which are underway but actually all the current policy

work of all the RIRs. The representatives for - from all the RIRs will have an ASO session on Wednesday, 8th of December in Cartagena.

So you have the possibility there to if you're present on this (pod) or listening in remotely to get a full overview of everything. So that's an advice to be followed if you're interested in this at all and want a real overview.

And that's all for me. Now I'll hand it back to (unintelligible) (please).

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much Olof and before we flip the slide I always appreciate a number of folks which have a comment about the draft that's becoming a staple of the policy Webinar. So we always have to figure out a way to get that in the presentation.

That wraps up our discussion of the substantive issues but we wanted to make sure that you are aware of how you can stay updated on these issues between ICANN public meetings and just as a regular course of action. And every month the policy team produces our monthly policy update.

We generally publish it around the middle of the month. You can access the document on the [icann.org](http://icann.org) Web site. You can also subscribe directly to it and have the monthly issues delivered directly into your inbox. About two years ago, we started translating the report into Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish, and we have just about 2000 subscribers right now.

We've been very pleased to see over the course of those two years that our subscribership has increased in all six of the UN languages. So it continues to be a resource that people adopt, use, sign up for and we encourage those of you who have not yet signed up for it to take advantage of the free subscription to that work product.

The next issue will be coming out just the week before the Cartagena meeting. It'll be a year end double issue covering November and December



and we want to have it available for everybody who is going to be participating in the Cartagena meeting either remotely or in person.

The other way, of course, to stay updated and I - we've all been referencing various pages on the icann.org site is through the various supporting organization Web sites as well as icann.org. At the Cartagena meeting we'll be sharing additional information about new improvements to both the ccNSO and the GNSO Web sites. They're both undergoing a retro fit, a redo that's going to improve things visually and we hope also improve things in terms of collaboration tools and more easily accessible information menus and the like.

We think it's going to be an exciting opportunity to - for changes for you all in the community to look at them and comment on them so we're looking forward to (doing) that. Our thanks in the ccNSO and GNSO communities go out to our colleagues in the at large community where we've stolen a lot of the ideas and the layouts for the new sites because they've proven themselves and worked so well in the at large community.

You'll hear a little bit from Rod Beckstrom and certainly from members of our communications team in Cartagena as well about improvements to the general redesign of icann.org and we're going to have training opportunities in Cartagena for folks both remotely and in person about the new confluent Wiki collaboration tools.

Those of you in at large are well aware that ICANN is transitioning from social text Wiki to the confluent Wiki system. That's already taken place in at large. I understand it was a challenging transition but one that everyone seems to agree is now beginning to produce results. So we're excited about those changes and hope that you'll all agree to be a part of this.

There are a number of folks who contributed to this Webinar and who worked actively on the policy team under David Olive's direction. We've got a staff of

15 spread out over a number of countries including the U.S., Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Poland, France. Some of us even call California its own separate country so there's a - quite a talented and broad group of us who participate and whenever you have questions we invite you to reach out to us either collectively or individually particularly on the issues that you've heard about today.

Before we move to questions and answers, I do want to alert those of you who signed up for this Webinar via email that we're going to be sharing with you a survey shortly after the Webinar has concluded and we encourage you all to please give us feedback. We're looking at many ways as possible to fine tune these Webinars to find ways to improve not only the content but the style and the mechanisms that we use to give you this information so we would really appreciate your filling out the survey, taking advantage of the fields in the final one or two questions that give you an opportunity to comment.

Let me pause, allow any of you in the Adobe Connect room who have questions to raise your hand. For those of you who aren't using Adobe Connect, if you do have a question and want to start a queue, please just indicate for me now. We've got about nine or ten minutes if folks have any specific questions that they'd like to ask.

Olof Nordling: Rob, in the meantime maybe I could try to respond to (Kiren)'s question about what I perceive as being a question about the coordinated policies across RIRs. Well, there are, in addition to global policies, there're also globally coordinated policies which do not reach the (iana) or do not affect the (iana) but where the RIRs try to get harmonization across the globe on certain policy matters.

So - and that's been I would say going on for quite a - quite some time and maybe you had something very recent in mind and it doesn't strike me as something that I recall, but they occasionally bring out such globally

coordinated policies and, well, discussions as of recently have been, well, there've been a lot of discussions about transfer policies, various ways of dealing with how do you hand over IPV4 addresses within or across the RIR borders.

So I don't know if that really answers your question but at least it's the beginning of an answer.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Olof for grabbing that right away. And I also noticed...

Olof Nordling: And I think...

Rob Hoggarth: Go ahead.

Olof Nordling: I think (Louie Lee) who is much more versed in all this, he's responding directly in the chat room to (Kira).

Rob Hoggarth: Great. I also noticed earlier in the chat room there were a number of questions back and forth about the next steps with respect to RAA amendment. I am going to assume that most of those were taken care of. There looked to be some good dialogue taking place there.

Let me give folks another minute or two to raise hands or otherwise declare something. I'll pause for a moment here. Hearing and seeing nothing else, David, I'd like to throw it back to you for some closing remarks. Thanks everybody.

David Olive: Thank you Rob and those who presented from the policy team. We appreciate this opportunity and thank you all for participating from many time zones and the numbers, I like that very much and we thank you for that.

We also would ask you to try to fill out the survey when we send it around to you for further feedback and we hope to see you in Cartagena either in person or remotely. And we thank you very much for your time with us today.

This concludes our Webinar on the 22nd of November. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you.

END