

TRANSCRIPT
Pre-Durban Policy Update Webinar
Thursday 27 June 2013 at 1200 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 1200 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-1200-20130627-en.mp3>

the Adobe Connect recording at:

<http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p2jhy3od769/>

on page:

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

And the presentation at :

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

David Olive: I would like to welcome everyone we'll be starting our webinar shortly, please stand by. We're just waiting for our slides to be uploaded and we'll be starting in a few minutes, thank you for your patience.

Thank you everyone for your patience we now have our slides in order, would you please start the recording thank you very much. I'd like to welcome everyone to today's Policy Update webinar, my name is David Olive I'm Vice President of Policy Development Support and have the pleasure of working with a team of wonderful professionals that will be presenting to you the latest developments in policy at ICANN in preparation for our meeting in Durban South Africa.

And so we also would like to welcome participant who are on the call from Africa and we look forward to working with our colleagues from the region at the ICANN meeting either in person or remotely we are looking forward to

our visit there. Before I start I just would like to say that we're trying again our new format that we initiated last time before the Beijing meeting. That is to say we will break up the various presentations and allow a few questions after each of the sections dealing with either the GNSO or the ccNSO and we'll have you do that as well and we will un-mute the lines at that time.

Of course if you'd like asked the question in-between all that work that should come up that you want to raise a point please put it in the chat and we'll try to answer that and get back to you either soon thereafter or again at the end of the session and you'll still be able to ask a few questions as well, so we'd like to proceed from there.

Today of course we are looking at and our team supports the policy development process at ICANN and the various supporting organizations both the generic names, the country code names and the addressing support groups draft and suggest recommendations to the board on various policies and practices for the DNS.

In that role of courts we also have advice of - on policy and other matters to the Board of Directors from our advisory committees and you see them here listed, our At-Large, our Securities Stability and Advisory Group, our Root Server Systems Advisors and of course the Government Advisory Committee. I'd like to show this diagram which talks about a visual look at our ICANN system and indeed how we try to engage all stakeholders in our policy development process at ICANN as well as our other activities that you see here on our slide.

The goal of this session of course as we do before each ICANN meeting is just try to prevent - present some current work that's being discussed in Durban and I encourage you to participate in those activities. We'll review

those plans and programs for Durban, inform you on the upcoming initiatives as well as opportunities for public comment and your inputs and answer any questions you might have after each of the presentations.

We will focus on of course the supporting organizations as they are assigned developers of policy recommendations for ICANN, but also some of the activities that relate to policy and other matters of the Advisory Committee in our presentation. The topics covered today are as follows, here for the generic names supporting organization the list is here for you to read and our experts will be talking more about all of them. For the country code supporting organizations the lists including some of their PDPs on IDNs.

It's also the 10th anniversary of the ccNSO an important milestone for large member of our ICANN community. At the At-Large Advisory Group some of their activities since the Beijing meeting and their events in Durban and finally the Root Server Advisory Committee is undergoing some restructuring and we'll hear little bit more about that to strengthen their role within our ICANN community. With that I turn it over to Marika Konings our Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO to talk about activities and policy development in the GNSO, Marika the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much David, hello everyone thank you for joining us today. So I'll be briefly looking at some of the GNSO projects that are currently ongoing, as you can see from this list there are actually many activities ongoing in the GNSO at the moment.

We focus our part of the presentation on those items that are rather either as a decision imminent, there's currently an opportunity to provide input although we actually have a call for volunteers open and maybe just a note as well that all GNSO working groups are open for anyone interested to participate in.

And at the end of our section we'll also briefly review some of those activities that are currently ongoing but where there's no immediate milestone that's coming up.

So first off I'll be covering the thick Whois policy development process. So for those of you who may not be as familiar with Whois at some of the others to some very familiar names on the participant list. Whois requirements are currently specified in the Registry and Registrar Agreement that ICANN has with our contracting parties. There are currently two models that are being used by gTLD Registry to meet these requirements.

One is known as the "thin" Whois model and that model is the registry only collects information that's associated with the domain name and that includes for example the information on the sponsoring registrar, the status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration. The 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 the registrars maintain a data that's associated with the registrants of the domain name and they provide that - provide their own Whois services. As of currently actually the jobs are com and .net operates under such a thin model. The other model is known as "thick" Whois and in that model the registry collects both sets of data, so both the data set that's associated with the domain name as well is that of - that is associated with the registrants. They collect that from the registrar and in turn publish that data via their Whois.

So, some of the other discussions that have been taken place in the GNSO it became obvious that for example if you look at it from a transfer perspective thick Whois would have a lot of advantages as the identity of the registrants of

the domain name would be known by both the registry as well as the registrar. But the results are a realization that there may be other factors that will need to be considered in order to determine whether thick Whois should be required for all generic top-level domains.

And as a result the GNSO Council initiated a policy development process on this topic in March of 2012. So where this project currently stands, the working group has actually now published its report for public comment and as a preliminary recommendation the working group is recommending that thick Whois should be - should the common requirement for all gTLD registries. So how have they come to this conclusion?

Its charter actually outlined a number of issues that would need to be considered in order to make the determination whether the requirement for thick Whois would be beneficial or not. And as such the working group considered 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 concluded that there are actually more benefits and disadvantages to requiring thick Whois for all gTLD registries.

And in this report the working group does recognize that this would mean a transition of over 120 million domain name registrations from existing thin registries to - from the thin model to a thick model. And as a result they do recommend a due consideration will need to be given to how such a transition is prepared and eventually implemented. The working group has published its report for public comment and is now looking for your input on the findings and recommendations that are contained in the report.

Comments may be submitted until the 14th of July and followed by a reply period. The working group would like to point out that due to the closeness of the Durban meeting the working group also accept any normal or regular comments that are received during the reply period which will main open until the 4th of August. So in addition to that the working group is also hosting a session in Durban on Wednesday the 17th of July between 12:30 and 2:00 o'clock local time, during which an overview will be provided of the report and there will be an opportunity to ask questions and provide inputs.

And following the closing of the public comment forum the working group will review the comments they received and revise its report accordingly for submission to the GNSO Council. So here you find a couple of links where you can find additional information, the report itself as well as the working group workspace and a link to the public common forum.

So next topic I'll be covering relates to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings which is another policy development process that's currently ongoing in the GNSO. So currently there is no requirements to lock the domain name in the period between filing of the UDRP complaint and commencement of the proceedings. The UDRP itself only refers to maintaining the status quo but it actually does not define what that means or what point of time status quo should be maintained.

Answer this in turn has resulted in different interpretations and practices by registrars which has resulted in confusion and lack of clarity for all parties involved, 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 policy development process on this specific topic only as a more extensive review of the UDRP as scheduled for later point in time.

As some of you may recall the working group published its initial report prior to the ICANN meeting in Beijing for public comments. In response to that five community contributions were received. Most of those comments were in support of the recommendations or raised some minor issues but at the same time there were also two more substantial issues raised. One of which related to the loss of informal response time for respondents to a UDRP proceeding as a result of proposed changes in the requirements for the complainant to notify the respondent at the time of the filing of the complaint.

And the other one relates to the process that needs to be followed in the case of the settlement. So since the beginning the working group has been working hard to review other comments received and respond to each of them accordingly. And they're now in the process of finalizing their report and they're actually aiming to submit that in time for GNSO Council consideration in Durban, the deadline for submission is the 7th of July for documents that need to be considered by the GNSO there.

So what is the expected final report to say and just to know that this is still in draft form and not a final stage yet. Over almost the recommendations are actually identical to the ones that were put forward in the initial report, maybe some minor tweaks here and there. But one new recommendation has been added that addresses the issue of loss of informal response time as I referred to before in response to the comments that were received. So this new recommendation allows for an automatic extension upon request by the respondent of four days to the overall response time.

And in addition the working group is also expected to put forward a proposed process for dealing with the settlement that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the different parties that are involved in the UDRP

proceeding. But overall again the intentions of all recommendations is really to clarify and standardize the process for the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceeding by outlining the different roles and responsibilities of the parties that are involved in this.

So following the submission to the GNSO Council as set which is expected to happen before or just prior to Durban, the GNSO Council's then expected to consider the recommendation and reports and decide whether to approve the report or not. And my personal expectation is that such a consideration I think there will be a discussion and review in Durban but probably a formalization will need to wait until after Durban for the best efficient time for all the groups to review and consider their recommendations contained in the report.

Again here some further information to related documents, you'll find a link to initial report as well as the public common forum as well is the working group workspace. So with that I'll hand it over to my colleague Brian Peck who will talk to you about the production of Red Cross IGO and IOC and INGO names of the policy development process.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much Marika and hello everyone my name is Brian Peck with the ICANN Policy Staff, I'm the Policy Director. And as Marika mentioned we'll spend a few minutes to talk about the update on the current work being done related to the protection of the Red Cross/Red Crescent names international in the Committee, international government organization and other international non-government organization names.

Currently as a result of past board's (ultimate) resolutions and the names of the Red Cross and red Crescent movement and International Olympic Committee all on a reserved names list which basically prohibits the registration of their names as their respective names at the second level of the newest gTLDs. This

reserve names list is currently in Specification 5 of all the new gTLD registry agreements.

In addition the ICANN Board is in discussions with the Government Advisory Committee or the GAC on determining which international, you know, government organization identifiers would also qualify to be placed on this reserve names list. Those that will be determined to do so will be also - receive the same protection as currently being extended to the Red Cross and Red Crescent (NIOC) names in the new gTLD Register Agreement.

And these protections are in effect until any other policy development process recommendations are determined by the GNSO (achieve) Working Group versus currently deliberating on this issue. In terms of the GNSO Policy Development Working Group the GNSO Council initiated a PDP last fall and basically tasked the working group to evaluate and develop policy development recommendations for any additional permits and special protections at both the top and second level in all both existing gTLDs and new gTLDs for IGO and INGO identifiers, including both the Red Cross/Red Crescent and IOC names.

The PDP Working Group has been working since last fall, they recently published their first initial report for public comment on the 14th of June. The public comment is open right now until July 17 after which the apply period closes on this 7th of July. The policy recommendations that are listed in the initial report did not represent a consensus position of the working group but rather list and describe the current policy recommendation options that are being considered by the working group and is seeking feedback from the community to help the working group determine its further deliberations once the public comment period close.

In terms of next steps the PDP working group will have a face-to-face working group session at the Durban meeting on Monday the 15th of July, local time 1500 to 1700. That is open meeting and some members are welcome to attend. In addition there will be a panel discussion on special protections for IGO and INGO names in Durban on Wednesday the 17th of July, 11:00 to 12:30 PM local time during which there will be an opportunity for community to learn more about the issues related to this matter, ask questions about that.

And the second purpose of this panel discussion is to solicit and encourage feedback from the community again to help the working group moving forward with its deliberations in determining policy - set of policy recommendations for this issue. Once the public comment period closes on the initial report the working group will review the input received in view of reaching consensus on a set of policy recommendations for the GNSO Council to hopefully adopt and moved to the board. Publication of the draft final report for public comment will then take place before any final report is submitted to the GNSO Council.

Further information is provided here in terms of the initial report, the public comment box, additional information on the activities of the working group itself and we certainly encourage community members to review the initial report and solicit them provide public comment on these issues. And with that I'd like to turn it over to my colleagues Julie Hedlund and Steve Sheng to talk about the PDP process on the translation and transliteration of contact information, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Brian and this is Julie Hedlund and along with my colleague Steve Sheng. As Brian mentioned we'll be talking about PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information.

First it's important that people understand the terms we're using here, translation is the translation of text into another language. Transliteration is the writing the letters using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet. So in Russian you would say (mulf-cabie) in the Cyrillic script, in English it's Moscow and other languages it has other names. Transliteration would be in Moscow the Latin script (muckaba) and so those are two terms that are important understand.

And it's also useful to mention that when we say contact information we're talking about a subset of domain name registration data, that is the information that enables someone using a domain name registration directory service such as Whois which was mentioned previously by my colleagues in other issues, allows people to contact the domain name registration holder. So the two issues being addressed in this PDP are should this contact information be translated into one language such as English or transliterated into one script such as Latin.

And also who should decide to who would bear the burden, the costs associated for example to translate or transliterate that contact information. Our recent developments include a call for volunteers that was issued just last week for drafting team to develop a charter for the PDP Working Group that will address these issues. And anybody interested should email the GNSO Secretary at the address here by July 1.

Related issues are that staff is going to commission a commercial feasibility study on the translation and transliteration of contact information to help them form the working group. And another forthcoming working group will determine the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements, including the relevant outcomes from this PDP. And the next

steps are as we mentioned the formation of drafting teams to produce the working group charter.

The GNSO Council will consider and approve the charter and then the staff will issue a call for volunteers for the PDP Working Group to form and the working group will consider the issues that we've laid out here, consult with the community and produce an initial report. For further information you see the links here to the motion to a final issue report on this matter that was issued by the Joint GNSO (Effect) Working Group and the final issue report that was used to help form and frame the issues being considered under this PDP.

And now would like to turn things over to my colleague Berry Cobb who will talk about the Whois Survey Working Group.

Berry Cobb: Great thank you Julie, yes my name's Berry Cobb and I also assist GNSO Policy Team with different variant policy efforts and I'll be presenting two smaller efforts for you today.

The first is the Whois survey requirements which is an existing effort that's approaching conclusion and then secondly also touch upon a new effort starting regarding GNSO metrics and reporting. So starting with the Whois Survey Requirements Working Group, in 2012 this workgroup was chartered to create a survey based upon a staff report that consisted of 11 possible technical requirements of a future or new Whois system if one were to be designed.

The community determined based on that report that it would be good to receive feedback about some of those requirements as to whether they should be implemented or not and to understand what support they may have. In that

time the working group developed a draft of the survey, they posted for public comment and receive feedback from the community about to improve it at which the working group did and eventually a final survey was deployed in September 2012.

The survey's important in general because it gave - first gave the community an opportunity to provide input on the technical requirements. Not only was the survey a multiple-choice type format but there were also plenty of opportunities for reform (acts) to provide Pacific comments related to certain technical requirements. The result of the survey we're still figuring that out in terms of their final recommendation but ideally hopefully the results can aid in deliberations of larger efforts with respect to domain registration and data that are going on today.

And one thing to note is that none of the survey was intended to define or suggest any policy with respect to Whois purely only technical requirements. So as I mentioned the survey closed at the end of October last year, staff has completed a draft version of the final report and basically some of the high-level numbers that we - we received well over 200 responses but only 67 of those were formerly submitted through the survey tool. It should be noted that this is definitely not a easier survey that most of the community may be used to.

Not only was it very technical in nature but it was also very detailed as to the questions being asked about each technical requirement that many cases required a specific skill set that - to complete that particular question. And given the complexity of the survey it's expected that's why there was such a large amount of the responses that weren't formally submitted to the tool. The draft final report said that we have as near - almost as near 60 pages with

easily 50 of those being a summary of the analysis that was performed on the questions.

Taking note that the broad data that was being considered was well into hundred and 30 pages. So we managed to try to condense that down a little bit and make it much more easier to read and understand exactly the results of each question. There are a few proposed recommendations that I won't get into details right now other than to know that the working group will be reviewing through some of these recommendations and determining if further recommendations are required and the like.

So basically the next steps the working group will complete its final report based on the final recommendations that are agreed upon within the working group. They'll determine whether a public comment period is going to be necessary or not based on these recommendations. Do note that this is a non-PDP effort and again does not have any impact on policy. And then lastly once we get those two areas tied up we'll send the report to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Lastly here is the links to a few information sources about the working group's deliberation, the (Whois) Working Group has a page on the (IT for) GNSO Web site as well as some of the draft materials that are available out on the wiki. So next I'll move over to a new effort that is just getting spun up, this is the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Working Group or eventually we'll be a working group. And some of you better or more familiar with going from a GNSO this may be more familiar to you termed as uniformity of reporting, but the term "uniformity" was a misnomer so we decided to re-title this group.

Essentially what's happening is a drafting team's going to be formed to develop a charter to collaborate with the GNSO community on areas of other

registrant complaint and abuse data that may be useful to a the GNSO policy development process as it's used our address via the GNSO. The working group is likely to view current process documentation, internal as well as external data sources regarding domain abuse and the like and possibly make any recommendations to enhance any of our current documentation that may facilitate the metrics and reporting within the policy process.

Recent developments, so as a quick history lesson that effort was first spun out of a prior working group that used to discuss abusive domain name registration, you may recall it was labeled as Registration Abuse Policies Working Group or RAPWG for short. And they recognize during that effort which was around 2009 and 2010 that access to some of that data was very limited to help informants deliberation. As such they created a recommendation that eventually resulted in a issue report that eventually formed this particular effort.

At the time of the RAPWG compliance data was certainly less than optimal but their Contractual Compliance Team has made great strides in enhancing complaint intake and meeting many of the reporting requirements that were based on the original recommendation. Given that the first recommendation out of the staff issue report is that the GNSO Council waits until the end of the year for contractual compliance to complete their three-year plan in terms of implementing their end state goal with respect to compliance and reporting and of the compliance function.

Second the Council also approved the formation of the working group which is the nature of this presentation and where we're at today is a call for volunteers has been deployed seeking help from the community to help inform the deliberations of this group. Currently we've only had four members

sign-up and certainly between now and through Durban we'll be trying to solicit more volunteers.

And we're looking for pretty good broad spectrum of representation across the community to help inform the deliberations, so as I mentioned that once the drafting team gets started they'll develop a charter for the eventual working group and then of course the working group will get started probably sometime after Durban. And just like the others here's a couple of links to some prior - some information to some prior efforts with respect to this topic and I look forward to meeting you if you decide to join up.

And with that I'll turn it over Lars and he'll discuss a few of the other projects that are going on in the GNSO, thank you.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you Berry, this is slots Lars Hoffmann I'm also a member of the Policy Team based in Brussels and I will be talking very briefly about Inter-Registrar Concept Policy Part B PDP which is not only a mouthful but also only the final policy development process in a series of IRTP reviews that started back originally in 2008.

The IRTP Policy Working Group had a it's not gross session on the 25th of February this year and since then the group has sought community input on it six traffic questions. The group has identified the efficiency and the effectiveness of the existing Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, TDRP is one of the key issues that they may require its attention. In this context the group has reached out across the dispute resolution providers as well as registrars and registries and also ICANN compliance in order to have an overview of the areas where the existing TDRP works well and where it works maybe less well.

As part of its analysis the community and put that the group has received, the group has successfully reviewed the traffic questions and is currently in the process of formulating its staff recommendations on those questions that appear to be deep 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 and for those of you that are in Durban are very welcome to join and take part in the group's discussion.

The agenda and all that information are available on the Duban (market) calendar on the ICANN Web site and I would like to end noting that the group expects to produce its initial report in August and has to complete its work in time for the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires in November of this year. Thank you very much and I pass it on to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Lars and back to me very briefly to talk about policy and implementation because as several of you know this has been quite a broadly discussed topic within ICANN but also within the GNSO.

And the result of those conversations, the GNSO decided to create a drafting team that's in the process of developing a charter for a working group that will be looking at issues that have been raised in this context that are specifically focused or (affect) the GNSO. The drafting team is in the process of - has convened and has already had a couple of meetings, they started the discussions earlier in June and they're basically identifying the issues that need to be addressed and included in the charter.

So they are currently looking at some of the items that are expected to be included concern the development of a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation rated discussions. And possible recommendations on a process for providing GNSO policy, guidance,

framework for implementation, related discussions related to GNSO policy recommendations, a guidance on whether something should be specific policy.

And when it should be considered implementation and also further guidance on how GNSO implementation review teams are expected to function and operate. The drafting team is aiming to deliver its charter in time for GNSO Council consideration in Durban which mean they would need to deliver the charter at the latest by the 7th of July so that they're working really hard to try to achieve that. And they have a couple of meetings scheduled next week in order to try meet that deadline.

And here you have a link to the workspace where you can find some further information on what they're looking at. But again this is an effort that once the GNSO Council adopts a charter a broader call for volunteers will go out and anyone interested in this topic will be encouraged to participate in that effort. Another topic that currently at least from a GNSO perspective is slightly on hold related to the purpose of gTLD registration data, is also a policy development process that was initiated by the board who requested an issue report on this topic a while back.

Together with the creation of an expert working group that was also tasked to look at this issue and so for on the GNSO side staff a part of preliminary issue report that was published for public comment a while back. And we did receive one comment from the ALAC and that's basically currently in a holding pattern as the final issue report will be prepared following the finalization of the recommendations of expert working group.

Those recommendations will feed into the final issue report which will then market the (ticket) for the policy development process by developing a charter

and going into the working group phase. As you know - or as you may know the Expert Working Group has now published its initial report for comment, that is a topic where you'll - you can expect to see more discussions and updates in Durban.

But from a GNSO perspective it said that PDP itself will proceed as soon as the final set of recommendations is received following which the policy development process will proceed. So this is basically the end of the GNSO section of this webinar, so we'll pause here for a second to see if there's any questions that specifically relate to the topics that have been discussed here. You can either do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room or typing in your questions in the chat.

And I'll pause a couple of seconds here, but at the moment I don't see anyone raising their hand. Just maybe do know that in the GNSO many updates will be provided by the different working groups during the GNSO we can session on Saturday and Sunday in Durban. You can check how the GNSO wiki will provide further information on the schedule that (displays). And in addition to that as there are several workshops and updates as scheduled as well throughout the week in addition to working group face-to-face meetings that are all open for anyone interested.

So if you want to see how a working group works in practice that will be an opportunity to do that there is well.

Woman: (I'm not sure but I understood that way - well you probably said that I)...

Marika Konings: I do hear someone speaking, but I don't think it's necessarily a question so you want to mute your lines if you're not asking a question and please raise your hand if you are asking a question. Or speak up now if you're not in the Adobe

Connect but on the phone bridge. Okay seeing there are no questions I think we'll move on to the next topic which is focused on the ccNSO and Bart Boswinkel will cover that for you.

Bart Boswinkel: Good day everybody I will give you a brief update of some of the topics that the ccNSO will discuss or at least will have topics for the cc community at the Durban meeting.

First of all the ccTLD financial contribution discussions which is - hopefully will reach its conclusion at Durban or just after Durban. The results of the study group on the use of country names which will publish its draft final report either today or tomorrow, current status of the IDM PDP 10th anniversary as David already mentioned and some other events and say the status of working groups.

First the financial contributions as most of you will know who have been involved at the ICANN meetings for some time, this is from a cc perspective has been quite a contentious issue not just between ccTLD community and ICANN but the broader community as well. So in 2010 a ccNSO Finance Working Group was established and its mandate was to develop, model a mechanism for allocation of ccTLD expenses that ICANN is incurring and secondly to propose a distribution model across the ccTLD community.

Currently there is a guideline for these expenses or two for financial contributions of the ccTLD, but this is from 2007 and hasn't kept up with the pace of the development of ICANN and the broader community. The goal of this working group was to find a model that is - that would achieve voluntary agreed, predictable and sustainable contributions. And the sustainability is that it would at least last five years, so we'll not have to re-visit this topic over the next five years.

One of the major developments in the past years since the Prague meeting is that the working group and ICANN staff involved in the discussions and the dialogue moved away from what is called the expense area grouping which is part of the (up-span) and budgets up to fiscal year 2011 into a more value based exchange approach. And what this means I'll explain now, because the expense area group and said allocation to all the specific groups within ICANN according to research and model an algorithm wasn't the tool that the CFO thought was the most appropriate.

We either had to find a different model - and the model was based on an exchange of values, this in itself was rather vague but within that model we have some - the working group and ICANN staff developed some conceptual value categories. And these are specific - these are specifically aimed at ccTLDs, now you could say - what you have to think about with this category is Secretary of Support for the ccNSO and the broader ccTLD community travel funding specifically for the ccTLDs, that's about it - it's very limited.

The second category that was distinguished and where there is a exchange of value almost that's the shared category. Again this is expenses incurred by the ICANN or by ICANN itself but also by ccTLDs which are in principle tangible but not directly accountable or attributable to the ccTLDs but also to other groups. You have to think of something like meetings, meetings is a very good example for exchange of value.

As you may know the ICANN meetings are mostly co-hosted by ccTLDs. For instance the upcoming Durban meeting is co-hosted by the ccTLD manager of (.dot Zet A, Zetna) and the Toronto meeting was co-hosted by CIRA. And then finally the third category is the global category and this is more around what the - both ICANN and the ccTLD community contribute - and activities to

strengthen the multi-stakeholder model both the global, regional and national level which is value to the full community.

So this is the conceptual buckets used to identify potential cost. Now I will not spend too much time, as with all conceptual models there are no clear-cut boundaries as you can see in this slide, so I'll move on. So - at this stage the Financing Working Group and ICANN staff has come to a reasonable understanding of the monetization of the category so that ccTLD Finance Working Group itself is focusing on the distribution model which they already discussed at the Beijing meeting and will be hopefully finalized at the Durban meeting.

And the current status has is set for discussion is the finalization of the exchange model and its monetization, refinement and hopefully preparation of the guideline. So hope - by Durban we hope to conclude a very long and - effort and (gaining) process with the conclusion of some of the (contained) issues. The second topic which I'll just briefly touch upon is the results of the study group on the use of country names sTLDs.

As I said the working group - or the study group will produce its draft final report during this week. The main observations in this draft final report and as you could imagine is that the use of country names as TLDs is a very, very complex area especially in light of the multitude of languages and script and also no surprise there is no consistent treatment of country and territory names across the ccNSO and GNSO policies.

And the working group recommends through the ccNSO to set up a cross community working group to review the current definitions under the different policies, so both at the cc and the GNSO level and come - propose a consistent framework across these different policies in order to create and harmonize the

definitions. And until such time it is suggested that the board will extend the current rule under the new gTLD and applicant guidebook to exclude country and territory names as gTLDs.

Current status of IDN PDP again just a brief update, the ccNSO adopted the final report of the working group on the PDP in Beijing. As a result of the PDP of the ccNSO that envisions a member's vote, the first round has been conducted, unfortunately only 65 of the 136 members who were eligible to vote voted, so we did not meet the quorum rule which says that minimum 50%, so there will be a next round of voting which is envisioned to take place post-Durban meeting.

During the Durban meeting there will be a discussion at the ccNSO meeting on the voting and what needs to be done to improve in future. As David already mentioned in June the 2003 the ICANN Board adopted Article 9 of the ICANN Bylaws, as such creating the ccNSO so in June, so this month it's the 10th anniversary of the ccNSO. The main events during the Durban meeting and the ccNSO Council has set up a special celebration committee but the main events for the broader community are a panel discussion on the achievement and added value of ccTLDs to ICANN and other stakeholder groups and SOs and ACs.

And there will be a ccNSO cocktail on Tuesday evening for the ccTLD community and invite guests. There will be some more ccTLD focused events as well but I have included them. And finally some other events and working groups at the Durban meeting is the Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN working group has published a draft final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. As always on Monday there will be a tech day, this is not limited to the ccTLDs but has a broader agenda that is probably relevant for the future new gTLDs as well as especially the smaller ones.

It's on operational and technical issues that - for TLD in general and how - so it creates a more - a platform for discussion across the different SOs and ACs and on the ccNSO meeting on 16th and 17th of July, so that's Tuesday and Wednesday which are always open. We foresee a panel discussion on cross-regional capacity building, there will be an extended security session with different presentations and there is a ccTLD new session, so what is happening in ccTLD land.

And finally on Wednesday afternoon the ccTLD will elect a new chair of the ccNSO as (Leslie Cowdy) will step down at this meeting - at the Durban meeting. Some background material and again if you have any questions please raise them and there will be an opportunity at the end of the sessions, otherwise I'll hand it over to Barbara Roseman to give a presentation on RSAC.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you this is Barbara Roseman and I'm the staff support for both the Address Supporting Organization and the Root Service System Advisory Committee.

The ASO is not going to be holding a meeting in the Dur- that the Durban meeting but they will have attendees from all the regions and will be available for anyone who wants to sit down with them and have a discussion about IP member related issues. They recently reappointed (Klorae Ruth) who's (D-10) of the ICANN Board who's term will - who's current term will end at the end of the annual general meeting in Buenos Aires and start again at that time and it's a three-year term.

The ASO is also working on identifying rules for IPD for transfers between the RAR region. So there are five regions in each of them have slightly

different rules about that govern how IPD floor transfers can work between organizations. And with the run out of IPD for pre-poll they are now looking at ways of facilitating transfers between the region and so that's not subject to global policy at the moment but it is something that they're working on.

They're also redefining their operating procedures to the ASO Address Council, this is something that they do periodically to ensure that participation stays lively and that they understand the rules for how they make decisions on the Council. As I said there will be five members available on-site and Durban, there will also be members of the NRO which is the Numbers Resource Organization and those are generally the CEOs of the various RARs.

There will be a IPD-6 presentation done on Wednesday, July 17 and there is an open meeting with the board also on Wednesday in the morning and that will be on the schedule shortly. For the Root Server System Advisory Committee they're actually going through a reorganization based on the review that was done of their current forum. There executive committee has now formed, it consists of the 12 Root Server operators of the main group and, excuse me, and the three participants in (Root Server Maintainer) which is IANA, the IANA oversight function which is NTIA and the Root Zone Publisher which is VeriSign.

They are currently working on defining and publishing their operating procedures and they're forming the caucus - the RSAC Caucus which will be a large community of CNS experts to work on working groups and other RSAC areas of interest. They will be holding their next face-to-face meeting at the ITF in Berlin and following this year at least twice a year they will meet at a ICANN meeting. This year they will be meeting at the Buenos Aires meeting coming up in November but were unable to organize things are enough to attend the Durban meeting.

So I think it will be very interesting to integrate the Root Server System Advisory Committee into the normal ICANN policy process just as SSAC has made a practice of participating in the ICANN meetings more directly. So that is the update for the ASO and four RSAC and if there any questions I'd be happy to take now, otherwise I believe I'm sending this off to David - oh I'm sorry Heidi, excuse me.

Heidi Ullrich: Hi everyone my name is Heidi Ullrich I'm the Director for At-Large and I'm delighted to give you a brief update on the ALAC's policy issues that have taken place between ICANN meetings in Beijing and Durban as well as provide a preview of At-Large activities and Durban.

The first is the highlights of the policy issues being discussed within the ALAC - the ALAC produced 11 policy advice statements in response to opening public comments between ICANN meetings in Beijing in late June 2013. The five most recent policy advice statements consist of the following, the fiscal year '14 draft operating plan and budget, new gTLDs board committee considerations of GAC safeguard advice.

An ALAC statement on the proposed final 2013 RAAs, the ALAC statement to the board regarding security and stability implications at the new gTLDs and then ALAC's statement on trademark (unintelligible) and IDN variance. The policy advice development process that the ALAC uses including close collaboration with the five regional At-Large organizations and over 16 active supporting group ensures that the ALAC statements reflect the views from the edges of the At-Large community.

More information on all of ALAC's statement is available on the At-Large correspondence page and in the monthly policy updates. Moving on are the

ALAC and (RALA) activities since the Beijing meeting they are actually either currently ongoing or have already taken place. And the first one is the preparation of a beginners guide on ALAC policy, this guide which will be presented in Durban list the NGs perspective on six key policy issues consisting of Whois, the RAA, IDNs, ICANN Strategic and Operating Plan, the new gTLDs and the Public Interest.

And this beginner's guide is the fifth in a series of guides that put - on topics requested by the ICANN community. The second is that the ALAC regional officer and ALAC delegate to the NomCom selection process is currently underway. All five of the regional At-Large organizations or (de-railors) have either recently completed or are currently undergoing this selection process for various At-Large leadership positions including ALAC representatives, regional officers and the ALAC voting delegates of the NomCom.

And the aim this year was to sync all of the election processes and have them completed by the Durban meeting and that again is on track to be completed. The third is a series of (Azzarello) capacity building webinars in the context of this event and during the (Becar) meeting in 2001 (Azzarello) held a capacity building meeting course for their At-Large structure. And one of the requests from (Azzarello) was that the presentations be put onto a webinar and so we have been doing that since Beijing into three webinars, two of them have already been held.

The first one was on the ICANN mission structure and constituencies, the second webinar was held last week on ICANN's role in the infrastructure of the Internet and ICANN public participation and communication. And the third one is been scheduled for next week on the topic of how you can help shape the future on the Internet. And finally the (Railo) activities since Beijing

was last week, (Azzarello) held general assembly on the sidelines of the Arabic conference in Lisbon.

This general assembly brought together over 80% of the (Azzarello) At-Large structures to discuss how to improve (Azzarello)'s in reach in members involvement and define their priorities. And as you can see in the photo ICANN's President and CEO Fadi Chedhadé spoke with the members (Azzarello) and was also the key note speaker at an outreach reception that was held immediately following the general assembly.

I'd like to just briefly discuss At-Large activities being planned in Durban, At-Large is going to be holding 21 formal meetings during this meeting, they're going to be meeting with the board, GAC, ASO and the ATRT too as well as planning and participating in many of the public meetings that are taking place in Durban. And finally following on a successful policy roundtable held in Beijing At-Large will also be holding a public - a multi-stakeholder roundtable this time on the theme of new gTLDs addressing consumer and public interest concerns and that's going to be held Monday the 15th of July between 1400 and 1600 local Durban time.

And finally (unintelligible) will be hosting a showcase and reception on the theme of (Azzarello) getting closer to the local African end-user community which was a little bit different. This time it will not only feature key speakers such as Fadi and Steve Crawford, but also bring in a local community academic students and professors as well as NGO representatives. This (Azzarello) showcase and reception will be held on Monday the 15th of July between 1800 and 1930 and the venue and you are all very warmly invited to participate in this event.

This disc includes the ALAC update and I'm going to now pass the phone for questions and then over to David, thank you.

David Olive: Other questions for Heidi and her presentation on the activities of ALAC? We will also be able to add further questions and a moment, I'd just like to thank the presenters for their presentations and information and also to our members online.

How to stay updated of course we have various recommended ways, the Policy Monthly that comes out is a very good source of the summary of various activities of the supporting organizations and advisory councils. You've heard some of the topics being raised in greater detail on this webinar that provides a monthly update for you. And that's also online at the URL seen on your screen that's to you if you subscribe via email.

But another way of doing it rather quickly would be through My ICANN and we encourage you also to subscribe there with some delay, it first comes out in English - we have it available in languages that you see on our screen, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish to help people keep up-to-date and understand the policy development process and activities as well as the issues being discussed.

The presenters of course are part of the policy development support team for the various supporting organizations and advisory committees, a full list is here - you know some of them and you may be able to contact and meet others at the ICANN meetings and will mostly be in Durban as well. At this point I'd like to highlight two new members joining our Policy Team, one is Oloff Nordling who is really coming back from the Policy Team, he'll be joining us as Senior Director for GAC Relations as our policy team does support governmental advisory committee industry in its work.

And also a senior policy director in support of the GNSO Mary Wong will be joining the staff July 1 and will be in Durban both Olof and Mary will be in Durban at that time as part of working. So with that I would like to then just ask if there are any final questions on what was presented either within our GNSO section, our ccNSO section, our ASO or RSAC section or the Advisory Group update, we're happy to hear from now you can raise your hand in Adobe Connect or think the phones are about to be un-muted so that you can speak of your online.

With that I would also remind people that the slides, the transcript and audio recording of the session will be made available and we recently put in the chat where that can be accessed after this for your reference and to replay or re-read some of information to be provided. It's there for you and will be posted in a few hours and of course we are repeating this presentation at a later hour to help with people in different time zones.

So not seen any questions we would like to thank everyone for participation, thank you for taking your time to be with us, to exchange information on the policy development activities we see coming for ICANN conference in Durban and with that I would wish all of you a good evening, good morning or good afternoon wherever you may be an our ICANN community. Thank you very much for joining us.

END