

**ICANN Policy Update  
WEBINAR  
09 June 2011 at 12:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar 09 June 2011 at 12:00 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-20110609-en.mp3>

and

<http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p15758286/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal>

on page:

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

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded, please go ahead.

David Olive: Thank you very much. Again I'd like to welcome all of you to today's ICANN Policy Update Webinar. As you know this is a regularly scheduled event prior to an ICANN meeting in order to provide interested parties with the latest on policy development activities as we are all preparing for the Singapore meeting.

There is a lot of information contained in this presentation, slides and recordings will be available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information.

As the Vice President for Policy Development Support it's always a pleasure to welcome people to our Webinar and the policy team has done a wonderful job today to provide the latest information to you.

Briefly I would like to give you some housekeeping items to reduce interference we will mute the lines. Please turn down the sound on your

computer if you are in front of your computer; that'll help. This is an Adobe Connect room, as you know, and the slides can be viewed and questions posted. And the link to this was on the invitation email to you.

While there will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of this meeting during the session you can also submit your questions in the chat box to the side - to the right there of the screen - and we will do our best to answer your questions and follow up of course afterwards.

At the end of the briefing if you want to ask a question you can state your name or raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room and we will of course recognize you and proceed with that.

Many of you are planning to attend the Singapore meeting in person or to participate remotely. And so the goals of this session are here to provide you with further information but we also want to note the - special attention has been paid to enhancing remote participation and further details of that can be found on the ICANN site.

Highlights for the Singapore meeting include a newcomer's track day on Sunday for people who have maybe attended only a few ICANN meetings or it is the first time to attend an ICANN meeting. This is a good program for you as an introduction.

There will be sessions on the new gTLD program, also on security and stability issues, abuse of the DNS forum will also take place. And there's further information at the Singapore 41 site that is listed here.

Policy developed at ICANN is the focus of course of our presentation today. And most of you are aware of the following bodies who are responsible for such policy development at ICANN: the Generic Name Supporting Organization, GNSO, develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domain space.

The Country Code Supporting Organization, ccNSO, develops policy recommendations applicable to the country code top level domains. In addition to the supporting organizations we also have the Address Supporting Organization and we'll here a little more about their activities in this presentation.

And of course there are advisory committees, important - doing important work advising the Board of Directors in particular the At Large Advisor Committee, the Security Stability Advisory Committee, the Root Server Advisory Committee and of course the Governmental Affairs Committee.

The next few slides will talk about the topics covered in this session. And we will start out with the Country Code Supporting Organization. Bart Boswinkel will talk to us about the activities there. We'll move to the GNSO, Rob Hogarth and Marika Konings will talk about some of their issues that they're working on. We'll also hear from Margie Milam and Liz Gasster. And finally from the Address Supporting Organization Olof Nordling will talk to us about some of the programs there including recovered IPv4.

With that I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Bart Boswinkel, who will start us off with the ccNSO activities. Bart, please.

Bart Boswinkel: Good afternoon and good day to all of you. Thank you for joining. I will give you a brief update from the issues which are going on in the ccNSO and - with a focus on the topics that are probably of most interest to the ccTLD community.

The first one will be on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group and some other major ccNSO activity; one very interesting topic I would say which is upcoming at the Singapore meeting will be a panel discussion organized by the ccNSO which has a broader impact. And a little bit on joint working

groups so cross community working groups in which the ccNSO is participating.

First of all the Framework of Interpretation Working Group the reason for including it in this presentation is this working group will probably be one of the most intense and longest standing working groups the ccNSO will - or the ccTLD community will be focusing on. And it's dealing with issues regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

As those of you who have attended previous calls it's probably you're aware that delegation and re-delegations of ccTLDs by ICANN is of existential value to the ccTLDs themselves. So what is the Framework of Interpretation and why is it called that way - the Framework of Interpretation Working Group?

The Framework of Interpretation is - its objective is to develop interpretations of RFC 159 to ICP-1 and the GAC principals in a consistent and coherent manner. And these documents more or less are embodied - the policy statements dealing with delegation and re-delegations of ccTLDs.

And the working group has to come up with say interpretations of these documents in a coherent and consistent manner hence the name Framework of Interpretation.

So a bit of the background, as I said, delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs is of existential value to ccTLDs. And in the past until San Francisco the ccNSO had a what is called Delegation Re-Delegation Working Group which identified some issues in the practices relating to the policy itself.

So it's not about the policies themselves but more or less the prefaces on implementation and the issues stemming from them, say, most of these documents, especially - like RFC 1591 go back until the early 90s so - and the world has changed since that time.

So the purpose is to create an environment that is both consistent and predictable regarding decisions and that all parties involved know what their roles is and can be held accountable for it so that not just include ICANN and IANA are but also the ccTLDs, incumbent ccTLDs and potential ccTLDs.

Why is it a working group and not a policy development process? One of the reasons is - say this is not about restating the policy itself because that's embodied in the documents that I just described. And a second reason is the DRD and the ccNSO want to ensure that the GAC and GAC members are participating during the process of - or developing the Framework of Interpretation and the best method to do this is to set up a working group.

And it is structured more or less in the same way and it's building on the experiences of the GAC and the ccNSO with the IDN ccTLD project under the Fast Track process.

The first activity until now that will be finalized hopefully in Singapore is to develop a work plan. And according to this work plan this working group will probably be active over the next - and very intensely over the next two years.

So other major activities for the ccNSO is the implementation of the ccNSO improvements. One of the - the ccNSO these are the result of the ccNSO review which was conducted over the last 1.5 year. And the major improvements of - for the ccNSO for the short term are describing the roles and responsibilities of the ccNSO Council chair and vice chair; that has already been completed.

And in Singapore there will be a discussion and exchange of views on the work plan of the ccNSO. And this was also one of the recommendations. The ccNSO, as some of you may know, is actively engaged in ICANN's strategic and operational planning processes so I'd like to mention that the ccNSO has two standing working groups which deal with these planning processes of

ICANN, that's the Finance and Strategic - and Operational Planning Working Group.

These working groups will meet and they will conduct a session at the ccNSO meeting in Singapore as well. And the final other major, yeah, activity for the ccNSO currently is all the IDN ccTLD related work ranging from the IDN PDP; an exchange of views of - and experience of the IDN ccTLDs who have already become operational, or who have applied for an IDN ccTLD.

There will be a full blown session on I think it's Tuesday dealing with IDN ccTLD related work. As I mentioned during the introduction of this part of the presentation it is there will be a panel discussion and it - focusing on the impact of geographic and cultural defined new gTLDs on ccTLDs and vice versa.

And it's - it is more exploring the impact and the relations of the TLDs servicing the same geographic area. The topic area is - focus areas will be competition marketing and regulatory and policies. The panelists are potential new gTLDs already a - say geographic TLDs, that is .asia, ccTLDs, a representative from ALAC and a representative from the GAC who will be dealing with some of the regulatory issues in one of the countries.

The panel discussion will be held on Wednesday afternoon, the 22nd of June, from 2:00 until 3:30. And everybody is welcome to attend this meeting. As always the ccNSO sessions are open for everybody to join.

So a little bit on the joint working groups in which the ccNSO is participating. First of all it is the DSSA Working Groups which is the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group. This is probably the most inclusive working group the SOs and ACs have developed.

Members in the working group are from ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO, SSAC and most likely GAC will participate as well although they haven't had the chance to discuss it.

Currently the working group is focusing on its work plan and they will conduct a session in Singapore as well. A second joint working group in which the ccNSO is participating is the JIG - the Joint IDN Working Group. And this is a co-working group with the GNSO.

This working group produced its first final report on the introduction and policy aspects of single character IDN TLDs. Their recommendations have been sent to the Board. And currently the working group is working on some questions that have been raised regarding the implementations of the - recommendations of the working group.

The third one I'd like to mention on this - in this presentation is a study group on the use of country names as TLDs. This is again a - yeah, a cross community working group with members from the ccNSO, GNSO and ALAC. And it is focusing on say the policies that deal with country names as TLDs. The overview of policies is - has been discussed by this working group but needs to be refined a little.

The next item will be developing a topology of country and territory names to understand how these rules apply and what the impact of the rules are and how to qualify country names and territory names whether they are eligible as ccTLDs, eligible as gTLDs or none of the above.

That concludes my presentation and I'd like to hand it over to my dear friend and colleague, Rob Hogarth.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks very much, Bart, appreciate that thorough overview. During the next segment, for about the next 45 minutes or so, we're going to focus on policy

issues currently being addressed by the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the GNSO.

As one of the most diverse segments of the community it has its hands - as a number of others do - in nearly every major policy issue that affects the community.

We are going to try to focus a little bit today on just a number of the major issues. Time permitting or your extra questions at the end of the session that I'll moderate for a bit we'll make time if there's an issue that you're interested that's not on this list.

My responsibility is going to focus on the first two bullets. We're going to talk a bit about the latest developments in the GNSO improvements project. And an area that I want to address to you all just as a head's up, the geographic regions issue, as Bart just noted there are a number of cross community working groups currently underway. The geographic regions is a cross community working group that the GNSO is involved in. And there are some developments upcoming in that area that we want to attune you to.

The other issues that you see there on the list will be handled by my fellow colleagues, Liz Gasster, Marika Konings and Margie Milam.

GNSO Structure and Process Improvements - well for those of you who have attended the last several Webinars the slide on your screen is probably familiar to you with the addition this time of some extra checkmarks and some number labels for you.

For those of you just becoming familiar with the process or for those of you who have been aware of the GNSO review and improvements issues going on for literally the past three years the good news is that we're in the final stages. There is a light at the end of the tunnel and it's truly a conclusion of this tremendously comprehensive effort.

What members of the GNSO community have been doing is really working to fulfill the Board's vision of a GNSO that maximizes as much as possible community participation, a revised GNSO structure and set of processes that enhance a policy development process that is much more substantive, tremendously more consistent and something that closely tracks the practical needs of the community and finally a goal of improving communications not just within the GNSO but between the GNSO and other communities and structures within ICANN.

And over the last several years the community has addressed a number of issues and primarily in the order of the numbers that I have on this slide. The fundamental action that has been resolved and was achieved back in the Seoul meeting back in 2009 was restructuring the GNSO Council. That's been achieved and seems to be working effectively for most of the community so that's been going on for a couple of years now.

The second major area, enhancing constituencies which now has a checkmark because the community and staff have been able to collaborate on a set of toolkit administrative support items that are now being nearly fully implemented.

There are a couple of areas that we'll still be working with members of the community on but we've made tremendous progress in that area. And most recently the GNSO Council has moved forward with outreach recommendations recommended by a work team of community members.

The third major area which basically formalizes an evolutionary approach that the GNSO has been going through is the adoption of a working group model of policy development which is designed to basically open the doors to as many possible participants and players in policy development discussions and activities taking advantage of the passion, the technical expertise and the

experience of many members of the community on issues that are of interest to them or that affect them.

So those first three items all have checkmarks because there's been tremendous progress where we've been able to close the door on implementing recommendations by the Board. The two remaining areas that we're very close to the finish line are - is revising the policy development process - and there will actually be discussions in Singapore about the progress of that work team and the final recommendations that are being made to the GNSO Council that the community will have another opportunity to provide comments on.

And, number five, improving communications with ICANN structures; a major initiative has been the improvements to the GNSO Website. That continues to be ongoing but this also includes various outreach mechanisms and other developments that have been underway that we think are showing some really great progress and promise.

Let's look at the latest news and process developments. As I mentioned the Council has approved new working group guidelines. Those are now published on the GNSO Website in two formats; one the complete set of guidelines with every detail from how the Council creates a working group through how the various members join, make decisions, interact all the way to the final report to the GNSO Council.

But also a second document that the Council asked the staff to produce which is more of a summary, a set of higher level treatment of the guidelines to give new participants a real good general idea about what the guidelines cover and some of the highlights.

So both of those documents are available on the GNSO Website and I recommend those of you who are interested in participating in working groups to familiarize yourself with those.

As I also mentioned the policy development process has moved forward. Shortly when the GNSO Council concludes some of its discussions with the work team and moves forward potentially to a vote soon on approving those recommendations there will be a new public comment period giving members of the community an opportunity to react to the almost 50 recommendations that the work team has made. So that's going to be an area that many of you will want to pay close attention to.

As I mentioned also the community outreach recommendations were not only posted for comment but have now been approved by the GNSO Council with instructions to the staff to collaborate with interested community members to develop essentially a charter for a working group and a team that will look at implementing the recommendations that have been made by the work team to improve GNSO outreach.

So right now the staff is working with community members to set up a drafting team that will create that charter. And so this is another substantial project over the next many months but finally moving to actual implementation discussions for some of these recommendations.

One of the major things that's been happening, although it's counter intuitive when you see that a new Council standing committee has been chartered, what the Council is doing is it's basically beginning to take down the bureaucratic structure that has been in place to develop a lot of these implementation recommendations.

One of the steering committees of the GNSO improvements effort has been disbanded and in its place there's going to be a new standing committee made up of members of the community and chaired by a member of the GNSO Council that'll be in place to make sure that some of the various improvements are working effectively and to be able to respond to tweaks or fixes to processes and mechanisms that may need those.

And then finally from the perspective of this slide, as I mentioned, the GNSO Website that's currently under development it provides a new look and feel and the expectation is that it will be a much easier interactive format to allow all of you to gain access to GNSO work product.

That is currently in the transfer of content phase. For those of you on the At Large community you can appreciate from your own experience the challenge of moving over to a new site. That's currently underway and we hope to have a final site up and live for the community before the Senegal meeting.

In terms of structural developments - this is the other area where we are very close to conclusions and will have practical impacts for members of the community. The Commercial Stakeholders Group and the Non Commercial Stakeholders Group have both committed and finished work on permanent charters.

The Structural Improvements Committee of the Board has developed a new process for constituency recognition. It was one of the goals of the GNSO improvements effort. As I noted earlier to maximize participation and to make it easier for new constituencies to gather, make proposals to the Board and be formed so the SIC has developed a new process that will shortly be before the Board for approval.

And we have two pending constituency proposals from consumers and not for profit operational concerns. Those are still pending and we'll probably be hearing some action from at least one of those at the Singapore meeting.

And then finally we're continuing as staff to work with the community on the implementation of the GNSO toolkit. Services are being widely provided now to many members and structures within the GNSO community. There are a couple of areas like Website support and organizational recordkeeping that

we still need to work with members of the community after the Singapore meeting to bring online.

One of the interesting aspects I believe of this toolkit effort in the GNSO is it's really helped us as staff look at the overall services that are provided to all members of the ICANN community.

And I think it's really driven an effort that some of you may have seen in the FY'12 strategic and budget discussions about a broader emphasis on what sort of tools and support not just the GNSO have been getting and those individual entities but all the supporting organizations and advisory committees. So that's been an effort I think that's had benefits for the wider community well beyond just the GNSO.

As we look toward the Singapore meeting here in the next couple of weeks expect action in Singapore on the new constituency process. There's been a public comment forum that's now concluded and that item is teed up for Board review and approval.

As well the CSG and NCSG charters are teed up for Board review and approval so we're hopeful that that can take place in the Singapore meeting when the Board gets together at the end of the Singapore week on Friday. And finally as I noted we're likely to have action on at least one of the new constituency proposals in the GNSO as well.

The other item of course that we'll have some discussions in Singapore particularly on the weekend before the official meeting begins GNSO members will be talking about the policy development process recommendations.

So we hope you guys will stay involved or at least be aware of developments that are taking place within the GNSO. This slide shows and encourages you to keep your eye out in the public comment forums because there will be

additional process and structural issues that will be posted for public comment in the coming weeks.

Familiarize yourself with the working group guidelines. As I noted earlier those guidelines as well as a summary are posted on the GNSO Website. And we maintain a Website - the GNSO Improvements Website that provides background and other information about all these developments sort of as an archival and educational resource for members of the community so I've got the link for that as well.

And then of course everyone is encouraged, particularly those of you who are not affiliated with a group yet, to reach out and join a stakeholder group or constituency that's already in place because those are great organizations and structures in which you can talk with your brethren and learn more about some of these issues.

Let me talk briefly, as I conclude there with the GNSO improvements, just give you the quick head's up with respect to developments on geographic regions. A couple of years ago the Board created a cross community working group and literally all of the various SOs and ACs in ICANN approved and helped the Board approve a charter for this working group to look into the geographic regions framework that was developed when ICANN came into being.

And this cross community working group has utilized the last two years to, you know, conduct some very thorough research on not only the origins of the geographic regions framework but the principals and intentions behind it. They've looked at how geographic regions are currently being applied in a number of different ways by all the various components of the ICANN community.

And they've produced two reports; one an initial report that talked about all that background research, an interim report that was produced last November

that scoped out some potential areas for changes and potential recommendations that the working group could make.

And the working group is in its final phases now. A number of you participated in the community workshop that took place in San Francisco and the working group is looking at another potential workshop in Singapore basically to talk about what their final recommendations might look like.

Members of the working group are currently drafting their final report. And the anticipated process is that the working group will circulate the draft final report for the community to look at and react to primarily in their own SOs and ACs but I think we'll have a broader inquiry.

And that will ultimately lead to a final report with full blown recommendations that the various supporting organizations and advisory committees will also have an opportunity to comment and look at.

So we're not in the final, final stage of this effort but I alert you all to it because it will potentially create some recommendations that will impact all the SOs and ACs, all the supporting organizations and advisory committees in ICANN and so it's an area that you should all be aware of and certainly take an opportunity to comment on when the opportunity presents itself.

I'll stop there, Marika, and turn it now over to you to talk not structure but substance with the IRTP efforts. Thanks a lot.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Rob, and good day to everyone and thank you for joining. I just want to apologize they're doing some work in the building here so I'm hoping it's not going to cause too much a disturbance on the line.

And so as Rob said I'll be talking to you first off about the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy which is also known as IRTP. This is a consensus - a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 with the objective to provide

registrants with a transparent name to transfer domain names between registrars.

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

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

So the result of the review a number of issues were identified which were then grouped together in five different policy development processes, also known as PDPs, that were then titled A-E and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner. The PDP working group has been considering the issues that are part of Group B and hence the name the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group.

So the IRTP Part B Working Group was tasked to address a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain name registration that has been inappropriately transferred either as a result of a hijacking or a conflict between the registrant and admin contact.

And the working group has been reviewing whether a separate process or provision should be introduced to address such instances. In addition the group has also been discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

So the working group started its activities in 2009 and through a review of comments received on its initial report and its proposed final report the working group has now submitted its final report on the 30th of May to the GNSO Council for its consideration. This final report contains nine

recommendations that are intended to address the working group's charter questions.

So now I'll briefly take you through the different recommendations but we'd like to strongly encourage you that if you're interested to understand the background and thinking behind each of these recommendations that you review the actual final report which contains all those details.

The first recommendation deals with the issue of registrars getting a quick response from another registrar in the case of an emergency such as a transfer as a result of a domain name hijacking.

So the working group proposes to require registrars to provide a transfer emergency action contact, or TEAC, which if contacted needs to provide a response within four hours. I think it's important to emphasize that the four hours timeline relates to a response and not necessarily the resolution of the issue which might take longer.

A second recommendation encourages the promotion of a report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, or SSAC, that detail a number of proactive measures that registrants themselves can take to prevent a domain name hijacking.

The working group also recommends requesting an issue report which is the first step of a policy development process on thick Whois in order to assess whether it would be desirable to require all incumbent gTLDs to provide thick Whois which in the context of transfers might have real benefits but the working group wants to make sure that any undesired consequences are also explored as part of such a PDP.

Recommendation 4 is another request for an issue report this time on the subject of change of control as well as a review of locking procedures as they are outlined in the IRTP Reasons for Denial Number 8 and 9.

Recommendation 5 relates to a provision that is currently optional in the IRTF whereby the losing registrar may notify the registrant of a transfer out. The working group recommends that this provision is now made mandatory so that early awareness on the part of the registrant that a transfer has been requested by the admin contact and that any issues that may arise from that can be resolved prior to the transfer happening instead of after the fact which can cause significant issues.

Recommendation 6 provides proposed language to clarify Denial Reason Number 6 to make clear that the registrant has to give an informed opt-in consent to have registrar locks applied but also must be able to remove the lock upon reasonable notice and authentication.

So Recommendation 7 deals with locks in the context of the UDRP. And the working group recommends that this issue is considered as part of a review of the UDRP should such a review take place. And Margie will talk to you later about what is happening in that area.

Recommendation Number 8 deals with standardizing and clarifying Whois status messages regarding registrar lock status as these are currently found to be confusing and not consistent.

And in relation to Reasons for Denial Number 7 the working group recommends to delete this provision as in its current state it's not even possible to apply this reason for denial and instead replace it with a provision that details how domains may be locked or unlocked.

So what are the next steps? So the GNSO Council will now consider the report and its recommendations to have a first exchange of views on this topic at the call that will take place later today followed by further discussion at the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

And if once the GNSO Council has approved the recommendations those that relate to changes to existing consensus policy will need to be approved by the ICANN Board.

So on this slide you find some links to the final report, the public comment review tool in which you can see how the working group has considered the different comments that they've received on the proposed final report and how they have been addressed in the final version of the report. You'll also find a link to the actual existing IRTP.

So the second GNSO policy development process deals with post-expiration domain name recovery. This is an issue that was brought to the GNSO by the At Large Advisory Committee or ALAC, which raised a number of questions in relation to the predictability and transparency of existing expiration and renewal policies and practices.

In addition to those issues the working group has also been addressing questions like do registrants have adequate opportunity to redeem their domain name registration following expiration? And is there adequate notice that a domain name is actually about to expire?

So this working group took a similar path as the previous one and has arrived at its final report by a review of public comments received on its initial report and proposed final report. So the working group is now in the process of finalizing its final report and expects to submit that to the GNSO Council for its consideration next week.

So in general the working group is of the opinion that the recommendations it is planning to put forward will provide additional guarantees to registrants. It will improve registrant's education and comprehension of renewal and post-expiration related processes and are in line with existing practices.

So to give you an idea of the recommendations included in the report the latest draft of the final report proposes amongst others to provide a minimum of eight days following expiration during which the registrants can renew their domain name registration.

It recommends that the redemption grace period, or RGP, should become a consensus policy for all unsponsored gTLDs and registrars offering registrations in those unsponsored gTLDs.

It proposes that the fees charged for renewal must be clearly posted and communicated at the time of registration. It recommends that at least two notices need to be sent to the registrant at set times to warn the registrant about the upcoming expiration and one notice should be sent following expiration if the domain name hasn't been deleted or are renewed by that time.

Furthermore it recommends that the expired registration's Website must explicitly say that the domain name registration has expired and provide instructions on how the registration can be redeemed. There are a couple of recommendations that deal with encouraging development of educational materials aimed at registrants that explain how to prevent unintentional loss of a domain name registration.

There are a couple of recommendations dealing with best practices that outline certain approaches that might prevent unintentional loss for example by providing guidance on how registrants can ensure that they receive notices by, for example, white listing addresses from which those notices will be coming.

And the working group also recommends that regular updates on the effectiveness and status of the implementation of the recommendations is provided following approval and implementation so that - so it can be

assessed whether the policy and the recommendations are working as was intended.

So as mentioned the working group intends to submit its report to the GNSO Council next week which will allow the GNSO Council to have a first exchange of views on the report and its recommendations at the ICANN meeting in Singapore. And again if an once approved by the GNSO Council those recommendations that relate to consensus policy will need to be approved by the ICANN Board.

So here you'll find some additional links. This provides a link to the actual proposed final report as the final report isn't published yet. We also find a link to the workspace of the working group where you can find the latest draft of the final report and instead you should be seeing the final report appearing somewhere on the ICANN Website hopefully in the course of next week.

So now we'll move onto the discussion paper on the creation of nonbinding best practices to address the abuse of registrations of domain names. And I invite all of you to come up with a good acronym here because I think I can't say this word too many - (unintelligible) too many times over and over again.

So this is actually a project that stems from one of the recommendations of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group, or the RAP Working Group, that delivered its final report to the GNSO Council in May 2010.

One of the recommendations in that report stated that nonbinding best practices to help registrars and registries address the elicited use of domain names should be developed. In addition the RAP working group provided a list of subjects that they felt should be considered as part of such an effort. The GNSO Council acted on this recommendation by requesting a discussion paper from ICANN staff to explore this issue in further detail.

So staff has been working on this discussion paper in which we intend to raise a number of questions and issues relating to this topic in addition to providing a preliminary inventory of existing practices that may be considered as part of any follow up activity.

But in order to obtain the GNSO and community input on this topic we've actually scheduled a workshop at the ICANN meeting in Singapore which will take place on Thursday the 23rd of June from 11:00 to 12:30 local time.

So at this workshop we're planning to provide an outline of the discussion paper based on our current thinking followed by discussion and input from the community which we hope to use to finalize this paper for submission to the GNSO Council.

So if you're interested in this topic I would encourage you to attend this workshop and share your views. You can find some links here to background information and also the session.

So with that I'll hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you, Marika, and hello everyone. I'm going to talk to you about the preliminary issue report on the current state of the UDRP. This is some work that we've been working on since early this year.

As many of you know the UDRP, or the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy as it's called, is the policy that deals with cyber squatting and provides an administrative remedy for trademark holders that are trying to deal with disputes related to cyber squatting.

So early this year on February 3 the GNSO Council in response to the registration abuse policy's final report that Marika mentioned made a request for an issue report on the current state of the UDRP.

The issue report is essentially the first step in deciding whether a policy development process should be initiated on the policy. And since the policy has been in affect for over 10 years there was a feeling that it's time to take a look at the policy to see if it needs to be updated or improved in any way.

So the GNSO Council requested that the issue report address the problem of cyber squatting and whether, you know, whether the UDRP has been successful in that regard and also to identify any insufficiencies or inequalities associated with the process.

And they also asked us to look at the definition of cyber squatting to see if it needed to be updated or modified. And finally the GNSO Council had asked that staff write suggestions on how a possible policy development process or a PDP to review the UDRP might be managed.

So as we took a look at the issue having had the UDRP in affect for over 10 years it became clear that there was a tremendous amount of information and documents to look at and it was very difficult to really identify what the issues were in a short amount of time.

And so with help with a drafting team that was put together by the GNSO Council we took an approach of scheduling a webinar with experts in the field of the UDRP to get their views on how the UDRP is working and whether it's effective and what should be done with it.

So on May 10 there was a two-hour webinar that had representatives from all aspects of the community that deal with the UDRP talk about their experience with the UDRP and how it's been in affect for over 10 years and what could be changed or should be changed.

We heard from UDRP providers, from like example WIPO and NAF. We heard from panelists, we heard from attorneys for respondents and complainants as well as academics and representatives from the registrar

community so it was a nice ability to look at these various - these opinions to find out what the issues were.

And we also developed a questionnaire that went to the UDRP providers because they are the ones that are really managing the process and to see what kind of data there is for - to support any changes in the UDRP.

And the other thing that happened was instead of going through the traditional process of just filing an issue report immediately with consultation with the GNSO Council we decided to take a different approach and try the new approach that - for policy development processes that is going to be approved by the GNSO Council which is essentially publishing a preliminary report and then opening a public comment forum, hearing from the community and then taking that information back and producing a final issue report.

So that is the approach that we're taking with respect to the UDRP. The preliminary issue report was published at the end of May. There will be a session in Singapore if you would like to share your viewpoints on the UDRP and whether it's effective or should be changed. And I've provided a link to the session in Singapore.

And after Singapore there will be a final issue report published that takes into account the feedback we get in Singapore as well as the public comment forum. And then at that point the GNSO Council will vote on whether to initiate a policy development process on the UDRP.

So as you read the preliminary issue report, you'll hear the perspective of staff having taken into account the various viewpoints from the webinar on the UDRP.

And generally speaking, the UDRP is viewed as a success. It's been in effect, as I said, for over ten years. There's been over 30,000 complaints filed. We

have four service providers that are actively engaged in providing choice and competitions to the various trademark holders that want to deal with this issue.

And it really is viewed as a viable alternative to costly litigations that would normally involve parties in different jurisdictions and would be extremely expensive.

And so on the UDRP webinar, we heard from, for example, from respondents that had dealt with the disputes prior to the UDRP being implemented really explaining what life was like when there was not this administrative process.

The other thing to note is that the UDRP has served as a model for ccTLD, so really, it was something that was easily taken and adopted in other registries because it did serve this function.

And it also has been a great tribute to the service providers that have been engaged in implementing the UDRP that they really dedicated a lot of resources to educating the public and publishing decisions and making the whole process transparent. And so it's been a very useful tool for the ICANN community.

And so the paper, as you read through the preliminary issue report, we tried to summarize the community opinion in the UDRP. And as I mentioned before, I mean, it is viewed as something that is cost effective compared to the alternative of very expensive litigation.

The UDRP is considered to be flexible and fair to respondents. In other words, over the last ten years there's been a lot of evolution of themes and paying attention to things that are important to respondents such as fair use, such as reverse domain name hijacking, such as free speech. All of those issues have been dealt with through the decisions that have been published over the years.

And so the UDRP is also viewed as a very predictable and transparent when there is a problem decision, oftentimes you'll see articles in the press about why this decision was made, but really, you know, it's there for the public to see how these decisions are being handled and whether the UDRP is really being implemented correctly.

There is a concern that the UDRP is unfair to brand holders primarily because of the volume of cybersquatting involved. It's not so much that the policy itself but the fact that due to the volume of cybersquatting it is even the reduced administrative procedure is still expensive to brand holders.

And so the general consensus from at least the webinar was that although the UDRP is not perfect, it was felt from various viewpoints in the community that more harm than good can result if there is a policy development process initiated on the UDRP.

And so the various experts suggested that if the UDRP is to be reviewed at all, the best thing would be to focus on process improvements as opposed to the actual policy itself.

And so we came from the webinar with this consensus that a PDP could actually undermine the effectiveness of the UDRP.

So in the staff recommendation in the issue report, we really took to heart this community consensus that emerged from the webinar and felt that since the community feels that the UDRP should not be tampered with, staff recommends at this time to not initiate a policy development process on the UDRP.

If - however, if the GNSO Council believes that the UDRP should be reviewed, we did provide some suggestions on how to do that and suggested forming a team of experts to focus on process recommendations only. In

other words, that we felt that there could progress made in really dealing with the process issues as opposed to the policy.

And once that's done, if it appears that there are policy issues that need to be dealt with, then a policy development process could always be initiated later on if there's still a desire to review the policy.

So that is essentially the staff recommendation in the preliminary issue report. And on this slide, I have provided you some information if you'd like to learn more about the UDRP. There's a link to the actual policy itself.

If you missed the webinar and would like to hear these viewpoints, there is an archive at the link provided and there's also a transcript. So I invite you take a look at that.

And certainly, you know, because the UDRP is an important policy for ICANN and if you have an opinion on whether the policy should be reviewed or updated, please, you know, try to participate either in the public comment forum which is open until July 15 or in the Singapore session that I referred to earlier. And that way we'll be able to take your opinion into account as we prepare the final issue report.

And with that, I will hand you over to my colleague Liz Gasster who will provide you with a Whois update. Liz?

Liz Gasster: Thank you Margie. Good day everyone. I'm going to update you today on some recent GNSO activities regarding studies of Whois that the Council has been considering for some time.

There were four studies that are being considered by the GNSO, misuse of public data, a registrant identification study, a proxy and privacy abuse study and proxy and privacy relay and reveal study and I'll be describing each of these and the status of each.

I just want to note that we're using misuse - the term misuse related to this first study and abuse related to the third study, not because we think there's a big distinction in the meaning of those two terms, but rather to just help distinguish between the two studies.

And then I'll also describe briefly some current activity related to a Whois service requirements report that staff published last year.

So as many of you know, Whois policy has been debated for many years and the GNSO Council decided some time ago that studies were needed to better inform the policy development process to provide some facts and underlying data that would be useful.

So they identified several Whois areas but reflected key policy concerns and asked the staff to determine the cost and feasibility of conducting those studies which we've done through an RFP process soliciting views from potential independent researchers. That research is all done and so now the Council has been reviewing which studies to actually proceed with.

So this misuse study which we'll assess whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and also looks at the impact of anti-harvesting measures, they're actually two studies in this; one, an experimental study that would register test domains and the other a descriptive study that would analyze misuse incidents that have been reported.

This study will cost about \$150,000 and ICANN has awarded the research to Carnegie Mellon University, the cyber lab there in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in the United States.

This was approved by the Council last September. We had a little lag while we negotiated the contract and that study has now been initiated. Again, we'll about a year to complete.

The second area of study is what we're calling a registrant identification study. The Council has not yet acted on this study. This study should cost about \$150,000. We expect the Council to act on this study later today at its Council meeting. There is a motion to approve this study for the Council's consideration.

It's possible that the motion could get held over until Singapore but I do expect it honestly to be voted on today. This study will look at information about how domain registrants are identified and classify the various types of entities that register domains.

We've done some work recasting this study at the request of the registries to make it more sort of data gathering and less hypothesis-driven and this also aligns it more with some GAC - proposals by the GAC for studies that were suggested by the GAC in 2008.

The third area of study is what we're calling a Whois privacy and proxy abuse study which will examine kind of a broad sample of proxy and privacy registered domains that are associated with alleged harmful acts and try to assess how often bad actors try to obscure their identity in Whois and how this rate of abuse compares to overall use of privacy and proxy services.

This study was approved by the Council in April and we're just finalizing a contract now. We'll be announcing the research entity when that contract is finalized and this study, too, will take about a year to complete.

And then lastly, a fourth area of study would examine cases or examples of relay and reveal requests sent to - for proxy and privacy registered domains and explore how they're processed and identify factors that may promote or impeded timely communication.

Now this study when we sent the RFP out we did not get any responses and when we tried to ascertain why that was the case, we reached out to potential bidders who had responded to other RFPs and learned that they were unsure of the feasibility of this study, especially whether it would be possible to obtain a sufficient data sample and also whether it would be possible to create the right kinds of confidentiality structure to make potential participants comfortable participating in this study.

So what we proposed as an alternative was a pre-study survey that would actually solicit potential participants and try to set up some ground rules for confidentiality to basically test whether a full study is feasible to do.

And the Council agreed that that made sense to proceed with, so the pre-study survey was approved also on the 28th of April. We're just finalizing a contract for that, too, and we'll be proceeding with that survey as soon as that's done. It will take about four months or so, maybe five, to complete that study.

Now I would like to just briefly touch on a report, this inventory of Whois service requirements that was requested back in May of 2009. The GNSO Council asked the staff to compile a comprehensive set of technical requirements for Whois that reflects both known deficiencies in the current service and technical requirements that may be needed to support various policy activities or policy initiatives, proposals that have been suggested in the past.

This report was finalized on the 29th of July of last year but due to other priorities in the Council, they had not had a chance to really talk about next steps until recently.

This slide just emphasizes that the purpose of the report was not to gather policy requirements or to recommend policy. It was just to organize a set of technical requirements for community consideration. This is a list of some of

the elements that are included in the report from July of last year, some of the proposals that had been proposed for Whois previously.

But just recently having reviewed this report again, the Council decided to convene a drafting team to develop a survey, to try to estimate the level of agreement and viewpoints within the ICANN community with the various requirements that were defined in this study - in the report.

So hopefully these survey results might determine whether there's benefit to initiating a working group to develop a plan for looking at these technical requirements.

So the drafting team just met for its kickoff meeting earlier this week. They may meet in Singapore or the week after, but again, they're working on a survey to try to solicit views on this report. And so you'll be hearing more about that in the weeks' to come.

Here's some more information, if you'd like to learn more about what's happening with the Whois studies with the inventory of Whois service requirements and also a link to a wiki that has an informal technical discussion underway about Whois which you could certainly join that discussion if you're interested and just send me a note if you are. I can make sure that happens.

And then lastly I wanted to just touch briefly on a couple of other issues that are going on. They're related to Whois and otherwise. There is also an internationalized registration data working group and I provided a link there to update on their activities.

And there are also a number of other GNSO and joint working groups that are meeting in Singapore that we did not have time to cover here on this schedule today but which I encourage you to look at the Singapore schedule

to learn more about. And I'm happy to answer any questions about other activities going on related to the GNSO in Singapore.

So now I'd like to turn things over to my colleague Olof Nordling to talk about ASO policy issues. Thank you. And Olof?

Marika Konings: Well this is actually not Olof. This is Marika. Olof unfortunately couldn't participate in today's session of the policy update webinar and actually has asked me to cover his part and I hope - I'll do my best to cover this as well as he might do.

So that's definitely not my picture, but that's Olof, so if you have any questions and you see him in Singapore you definitely should talk to him about more details about what the ASO does.

The ASO brings us to the address - or the numbers part of ICANN. The ASO stands for the Address Supporting Organization and they deal specifically with IP or internet protocol addresses.

So to understand how the ASO works, it's important to talk a little bit about the background, so the five regional internet registries and they incorporate through the NRO or the Number Resource Organization, so each geographic region has its own RIR, so you have AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North America, LACNIC for South America and RIPE for Europe.

So the Address Supporting organization is actually set up through a memorandum of understanding between ICANN and the NRO in which the five RIRs sit.

So the main task of the ASO is actually to handle global policy proposals. So what are those global policy proposals? So the RIRs themselves deal with

regional policy issues and they have their own process and procedures for that and those only apply to the region that they operate in.

But in addition to that, there are a few policies that effect IANA and only those are actually called global policies and those go through the ASO or need ASO approval to become policy and then move up to the Board.

So currently there is actually only one global policy proposal in the pipeline and that deals with recovered IPv4 address space post-exhaustion.

So why is this issue important? The proposal itself enables IANA to handle a recovered IPv4 address space and allocate smaller blocks than has been able to do before.

There are actually a couple of proposals before the current one which didn't reach the ASO level as they weren't adopted in a similar way in a different RIR. As I understand, there was an important difference where in certain proposals the work must have been adopted while another part the word may had been adopted which of course would mean a significant difference.

There was no agreement on those proposals. So now there's a third attempt to have a proposal on this theme. The proposal itself has been introduced in all the RIRs, has already been adopted by APNIC and is currently under discussion by the others.

Then as mentioned, this proposal would replace the other two that didn't reach global consensus.

So if you're interested in address related issues, how can you get involved? All the RIRs have their own policy development processes and they're open for anyone to participate. And if you're interested, so you should approach your - the RIR of your choice to find out more.

They conduct open meetings while the policy proposals are discussed and have open mailing lists to which you can contribute. And the ASO is actually organizing a session in Singapore on Wednesday. All the RIRs are going to be present there and will be presenting their current policy work.

So I encourage you to look at the Singapore schedule to find out more about that and attend the meeting if you're interested to learn more about the topics that they deal with.

And with that, I'll hand it back to Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks Marika. This has been a very good session. A lot of real detailed substantive information and we all process information in different ways. To keep you up to date between, you know, these types of webinar sessions and to give you other opportunities to get insights into policy development activities across the organization, we've got a couple of different resources that you may be familiar with or may want to take advantage of.

The first is the monthly policy update that we publish every month as a policy team. Naturally we produce it about 11 times a year. It comes out mid-month to about the third week of the month, and you can subscribe to it for free on line so you can get it pushed to your email address.

We worked very hard over the last couple of years to make the policy update available in all six UN languages. We're still working mightily to improve the speed of delivery of the non-English versions of the policy update, so slowly but surely we are improving in that regard.

The key is that we provide on at least a monthly basis updates to all of you in the community on developments from a policy perspective. So we hope you can take advantage of that resource.

There is also of course the ICANN Web site and the Web sites of the individual supporting organizations and advisory committees. The ICANN.org site is being slated for a refresh over the course of the next 12 months or so. But on the current Web site, for many of you who are more experienced in social media, I hope you are aware of or can take advantage of the RSS feeds, the ICANN Twitter feed and email alerts from the other various ICANN publications. So that's one way that you can reach out and get content pushed to you.

Also as I indicated with the improvements coming on the GNSO Web site with recent improvements to the ccNSO Web site, we hope we're going to be delivering information to you in much more familiar and usable format that you can take advantage of.

You've heard from about five of us on the call today bringing you information from four different time zones. We are joined by a host of other colleagues and on the ICANN policy team we actually have 16 of us currently working in seven different time zones around the world. So there is somebody on duty every hour of the day trying to get something accomplished and completed.

As you can see, we have a really good team. We're fairly distributed geographically, but we are always available to answer your inquiries, to try to assist you in any matters that you are working on or have an interest in. So please reach out to us at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

To my colleagues and to you David, I think that concludes our substantive information sharing. What I'd now like to do is offer those of you who have been listening in the opportunity to once again submit any questions that you have either in the chat pod, on Adobe Connect or if Gisella, Glen or Marika we can ask the operator to open up the lines. And if individuals have a question you can, you know, after a quiet moment of silence if no one else is talking, please ask your question or otherwise utilize the Adobe Connect

feature and please just raise your hand and we'll try to get your question answered in that manner.

So I will pause, wait about 30 seconds to give folks an opportunity to come off mute or come online and ask any questions about the topics we covered or potentially any topics that we have not covered.

Thank you, Gisella. I see your note in the chat plus the lines are open. I do hear some background. Well, seeing no hands raised, and I'll do another check here in the Adobe Connect room and no one currently typing in the chat pod, David, I'll turn it back to you for any final comments, thanks or entreaties for our participants.

David Olive: Thank you very much Rob. I would like to thank all of you for taking the time to be with us today and also on behalf of the entire policy team, we encourage you to be part of the Singapore meeting either in person or remotely, and also to subscribe to our policy updates and other information sources to help you as you look at your preparation and the various supporting organizations or advisory committees.

So again, we'd like to thank you all for your participation here today and look forward to seeing you in Singapore in person or online. So with that, I'd like to say good evening, good afternoon and good morning to people and we will talk to you again in another webinar in the near future.

Thank you very much.

END