

ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
09 June 2010 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 09 October 2010 at 19:00 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-webinar-2-20100609.mp3>

On page:

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

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

David Olive: Thank you operator.

David Olive: Again welcome to all to our ICANN Policy Update webinar. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support at ICANN. This briefing is a reoccurring event prior to an ICANN meeting. And today the Policy Team wishes to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help you and us prepare for the ICANN meeting in Brussels.

Recently we also conducted an Outreach Policy webinar that focused on newcomers and provided an introduction into how policy development takes place and how one can get involved and participate.

There is a lot of information contained in today's presentation. The slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information again at your own pace. In addition, we will also conduct a survey or poll at the end of this session.

We wish to listen to members of the community and to make sure that the information we provide is useful and helpful. And there will be more details at the end of our remarks on how to do this.

For some housekeeping matters, please do not use the call back option on the Adobe Connect. Use the conference connections that you found in the email. And to reduce interference, please mute your phones. This is of course an Adobe Connect session in which the slides can be viewed and questions posted and you received that link in the email invitation.

There will be time to ask questions at the end of the meeting. However, during the session you can submit your questions in the chat box at the bottom of the Adobe Connect window.

Man: Queue.

David Olive: And the policy staff members will do their best to answer your questions. In case questions arise after the meeting, you can follow up on the discussions today and please feel free to contact us at the policy-staff@icann.org.

Also please do not use the call me button of Adobe Connect. It's for recording the session. And of course at the end of the meeting if you want to ask a question, un-mute your phone, state your name to be added to the queue or raise your hand in Adobe Connect and you can change that status on the lower left hand corner.

So much for the housekeeping matters. The goals of this session are to update you on the current policy work, review issues to be considered at the ICANN Brussels meeting, inform you of the upcoming activities and opportunities that provide for your inputs and to answer any questions you may have.

Many of you are planning to participate in the Brussels meeting either in person or remotely. For those who'll be participating remotely, special attention has been paid to enhancing that remote participation. Further details on these remote service facilities will be available at the Brussels Web site at the ICANN site.

In addition to the policy activities that will be highlighted in our presentation today, there are other important sessions taking place in Brussels such as a new gTLD update, law enforcement amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement, a panel discussion on global DNS vulnerabilities, security and pass forward by a group of experts, an affirmation of commitments discussion, a discussion on ICANN's fiscal year '11 operating plan and budget and the abuse of the DNS forum.

Again, for further information please review the schedule in Brussels on our Web site.

The focus of this presentation is on policy development at ICANN. And as most of you are well aware, the following bodies are responsible for such policy development -- the Generic Name Supporting Organization, GNSO which develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domain names, the Country Code Supporting Organization which has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to the country code top level domains and the Address Supporting Organization which is to review and develop recommendations on Internet protocol address policies.

In addition to that, supporting organizations we have a number of advisory committees that provide advice to the ICANN Board -- the At-Large Advisory Committee, the Security Stability Advisory Committee, the Root Server System Advisory Committee and of course the Government Advisory Committee.

The next few slides we have an overview of the topics covered during this session. It might be worth pointing out that this is just a selection of activities going on in the different supporting organizations. At the end of the presentation, we'll direct you define further details and information either on the ICANN Web site or the respective support organization Web sites.

But we'll have presentations on GNSO by Rob Hoggarth, some Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy and other registrar abuse policies by Marika Konings, a Whois update by Liz Gasster, the RAA, that's the Registrar Accreditation Agreement update by Margie Milam and Vertical Integration by Margie as well, developments in the ccNSO including the top level domain TDP by Bart Boswinkel, the Delegation and Re-delegation Working Group activities and other activities in the ccNSO. And finally ending it will be a discussion by the Address Supporting Organization, Olof Nordling will tell us a little bit about the activities in that group.

With that, I would love to turn the program over to our next speaker, Rob Hoggarth, talking about GNSO policy issues. Rob please.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks a lot David and good day everybody. As David outlined, there are a number of different issues that we're going to be talking about on the call today. And if you look just at the GNSO issues, there are, you know, literally 20 working groups and work teams under way within the GNSO working on a variety of issues.

We're just going to focus in this presentation on seven of the most substantive ones that are going to gather the most attention in Brussels. But you're welcome to ask questions either in the Q&A box below in the Adobe Connect room or at the end of this question and answer session please feel free to raise questions about any other issues that we may not have covered during the session.

We're always interested in making sure that we're capturing those issues that folks want to hear or talk most about.

When you talk about GNSO improvements and we've had this debate from time to time as to whether to include it in this presentation. The real issue in importance of GNSO and the GNSO improvements is the fact that for the gTLD space, the GNSO is the primary policy making body. And literally the busiest body in ICANN in terms of that substantive development and discussion of issues that affect the gTLD space.

And so, any sort of reexamination, implementation of improvements or changes in that structure and the processes impact many, many members of the ICANN community. And so that's why we continue to provide the updates and talk a little bit about the GNSO improvements implementation efforts that are ongoing.

Just to remind some of you because it's been a while and others who may not be as familiar with the process, the reason that this now three year effort started back in 2007 and one of the reasons why it's continued to be of primary importance to a lot of members of the community is the fact that the Board and the community said it was very important for the community to maximize participation by the various stakeholder communities within ICANN in the GNSO, and that it was also critical that the policy development process, which has been in place for some period of time, be reexamined very carefully, assessed and improved, modified or changed to reflect a process in which we had a GNSO Council that was much more in a strategic manager role as opposed to a legislative body role to make sure that the processes were manageable, that they could be followed by the GNSO Council and other members of the community in a consistent, predictable and an effective manner.

And another critical important point of the GNSO improvements was not only to help GNSO community members communicate better internally within the

policy development process, within the various constituency groups and stakeholder groups, but to also help GNSO communications more broadly within the ICANN community between the various supporting organizations and advisory committees and between the GNSO and the Board.

So the effort and work for the past three years has really been focused on the five main areas, only one of which you see a checkmark there and that's a provisional checkmark. The Council of the GNSO went through its restructuring process, the new Council was seated at the Seoul meeting and operating procedures are now in place.

But a number of work team efforts continue to further refine the operating procedures and to make sure that the processes that were developed, you know, work effectively.

The other four areas are still under a tremendous amount of community work. In the top left quadrant, the need to adopt a working group model of policy development has developed a lot of recommendations. And that work team is moving forward for discussions in Brussels.

In the top right hand corner where we call it enhancing constituencies, but as, you know, as time has progressed, we may actually be looking at that constituency with a small C instead of a large C. And that is really the effort on the part of the community to make sure that regardless of what group of stakeholders or what constituency you happen to represent, that there's some measure of assurance that your group operates in a similar fashion to other groups in terms of observing guidelines regarding fairness, transparency, openness and representativeness in terms of how those different areas of the community operate and conduct their operations.

I've touched on the bottom right hand quadrant, an area of significant work over the past several months in revising the policy development process and a work team that's spending a lot of time and effort focusing on that.

And then of course in the bottom left hand quadrant, the concept of improving communications not only within the GNSO but between various ICANN structures in the GNSO and if I might add, the more broader air of communication between ICANN and potentially users of the Internet who are interested in what the GNSO or ICANN is doing.

The next slide I'm not going to spend a lot of time on because that's a two hour presentation in itself, but the newly structured GNSO Council is now based on a two house, four stakeholder group model essentially where the contracted parties have two stakeholder groups in which they can operate where the non-contracted parties have two stakeholder groups in which they can operate and where they are working right now on really developing their permanent foundational charters of how they'll operate.

In terms of the latest news or current status, right now as I mentioned, the stakeholder group charters were approved by the Board back in July of last year. For the registries and the registrars, they were essentially stable completed charters that the Board is going to be reviewing later this year.

But in the commercial stakeholder's group and the non-commercial stakeholder's group, the Board only approved temporary or transitional charters. And so both the CSG leaders and the NCSG leaders are currently involved in discussions with their communities about how to produce these final/permanent charters and discussing them with the Board and ultimately achieving and getting Board approval of those.

I hesitate to use the term permanent or final charters because as many of you know, the charters are living documents for the various communities. They can be revised and changed over time. But what we're looking for and I think what the Board is looking for is stability in terms of what those organizations are going to look like going forward.

We've also seen substantial progress as I mentioned on the work teams that are looking into the new policy development process and the working group model for policy development. And a lot of work continues to be done with respect to adding to the GNSO Council procedures, fine-tuning processes that were approved by the new Council back in Seoul.

As I noted, there's also been some substantial progress in the area of constituency and stakeholder group operations where a work team has literally spent the last year in intense discussions about what are some of the best practice guidelines, what are some of the benchmarks that various communities within the GNSO should be looking to achieve in terms of their operations, in terms of their dealings with their membership and their various operating practices.

And the work team that's responsible for developing those recommendations just on the 31st of May shared their recommendations with the GNSO's Operation Steering Committee. And so that committee's going to be reviewing that work and ultimately passing on recommendations to the GNSO Council. There will undoubtedly be discussions about those recommendations in Brussels.

There's also been a substantial amount of work focused on the GNSO Council work prioritization effort. And in Brussels, the Council is going to go through its first working exercise, taking its collection of current issues and processes and having a real strategic discussion about prioritization and how those work.

There was a work team within the GNSO Council that spent a lot of time developing that work product. And Brussels will be the first test case for how well that effort operates.

In terms of next steps, we're going to continue to see the various committees and work teams work through Brussels. Most of them have achieved

substantial progress, have set up various benchmarks and expectations so that they can complete their work by the Cartagena meeting. Most of them seem to be well on track to do that. And, you know, they'll all be having their various discussions and meetings in Brussels about that.

You'll also, if you're only attending the GNSO Council session in Brussels, probably hearing some updates or perspectives about those efforts.

In terms of constituency reconfirmations, this is one of those structural areas where there continue to be discussions within the various constituencies, particularly on the CSG side with respect to seeing what the ultimate structures are of the various organizations and then having the individual constituencies submit to the Board their charters.

One of the concepts that the Board looked at last year was having constituencies on a regular basis return to the Board and say hey, here we are, we're operating in this manner, we want you to affirm and reconfirm our ability to continue to operate because we are adhering to the bylaw principles of transparency, fairness, representativeness and openness.

And that was a concept that Board members developed to ensure that there was some form of regular review of the GNSO structures. It didn't seem that it would be appropriate for the Board though to go through that exercise until there's some resolution of the CSG and NCSG permanent charters and until the work team recommendations with respect to GNSO structural operations were concluded.

So an initial deadline of the Brussels meeting is likely going to be pushed forward by the Board to the Cartagena meeting where there's, you know, a significant period of time between now and then to do that work.

Of course including that effort will be, as I mentioned, the development of the permanent charters for the CSG and the NCSG. And there remain a number

of entities out there in groups who are very interested in coming forward and forming formal structures within the GNSO. Most of them currently have styled or thought of their concept as being new constituencies. But as the NCSG has been discussing, there's also the concept of interest groups and there may be avenues for those interested parties to define entry points into the GNSO that way as well.

So there continue to be a lot of efforts under way, many opportunities for members of the community to participate. There have been a lot of active and new members participating in these work teams and we hope that that is just a foreshadowing of the ultimate working group model of policy development at its best.

But if you have interests in either forming your own group, interest group or constituency, if you want to get involved in some of the work team efforts, there's still opportunities for volunteers to approach Glen de Saint Gery, the GNSO Secretariat to express your interest there.

We strongly encourage you to go to the public comment page on the ICANN Web site to look at the various work team recommendations because it's going to be very important to get community input and comment and feedback on those various recommendations.

And of course, you can always go to the GNSO improvements information page, and we're doing our best to keep that updated. And that's where you can find a lot of the foundational documents and a lot of other materials that can put all this stuff in context for you.

That's it for me Marika. I will turn it on to you for some more substantive issues discussions.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Rob. And now returning to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. So as most of you are probably aware, the Inter-Registrar Transfer

Policy, which is also known as IRTP, is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004. And the policy has its objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation process of this policy, it was decided to carry out a review to see whether the policy was actually working as intended or whether there were any areas that would require further clarification or improvement.

So as part of that review, a long list of issues was identified was then grouped together in five different policy development processes or also called PDPs, that were titled A to E which are now being addressed in a consecutive manner.

And so at the moment, a PDP working group has been considering the issues that are part of the so called group B, hence the name of this working group, the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group which the whole mouthful.

So this working group has been reviewing 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 of a conflict between the registrant and the admin contacts. And then the group has been reviewing whether a separate process or provision should be introduced to address such instances. In addition, the group has been discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

So the policy development process itself was initiated in June 2009. And based on the working group deliberations, a review of stakeholder group and constituency statements and a first round of public comments that was received, the working group has now published its initial report.

The initial report presents for each of the charter questions one or more preliminary conclusions and recommendations on which the working group is now looking for public input. For example, one recommendation relates to a proposed expedited transfer reversal policy that aids to address the question of urgent return in the case of a domain name hijacking.

Other recommendations look at a possible PDP on requiring (stake) Whois. And that proposed new language for denial reason seven that's in the current IRTP.

The working group will organize a public information consultation session at the ICANN meeting in Brussels on Wednesday the 23rd of May from 4:00 to 5:30 local time during which the working group will present the report and solicit community feedback.

Following that, a public comment period will open probably on the 5th of July and run for 20 days as is required by the ICANN bylaws.

So even though this working group is already well on the way, new members are always welcome although you might want to hold out for one of the other upcoming IRTP PDPs that will look at issues such as the latest to a dispute policy enhancements, penalties for IRTP violations and operational rule enhancements.

In addition, you'll find on this slide some links to additional background information such as the initial report as part of information on the session in Brussels.

So I'm moving on to a second GNSO policy development process that deals with Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery or also known as PEDNR. So this is actually an issue that was brought to the GNSO by the At-Large Advisory Committee 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 registration is actually about to expire.

So this working group has also just published its initial report. This report contains the result of a registrar survey that was conducted to review, renew on expiration practices of the top ten gTLD registrars.

The survey actually found that there's a lot of variation amongst registrars in relationship to renewal and expiration policies. And part of the working group discussions have actually focused on this question whether this variation is desirable or not or in which case it might actually be appropriate and in which case its predictability might be the preferred option.

And the report also includes a summary of the working group deliberations. Information that was provided by the ICANN Compliance Team on complaints received and audits that were carried out in relation to the existing Expired Domain Deletion Policy also known as the EDDP. As on most of the issues relating to the charter questions, there have been very different opinions in the group.

The working group decided to carry out a survey amongst its own membership in order to assess possible options for further consideration. And the initial report contains the results of this survey where in some cases you'll see that there's a very clear picture of the approached working group might support while in other instances opinions are more divided.

And part of the reason of putting the initial report out at this stage is that the working group hopes that the ICANN community will provide input on these

different questions as part of the public comment period as well as the information session that will be organized in Brussels and that will hopefully help to inform their deliberations in the second phase of the PDP.

It does mention that this working group will also host a public information and consultation session that will take place on the Thursday, 24th of June from 9:30 to 11:00 local time. And again on this slide you'll find some further background information including the link to the initial report.

So next up is the registration abuse policies working group also known as RAP. But this issue was an issue brought to the GNSO - or the question was raised and registries and registrars seemed to lack uniform approaches to deal with registration abuse, but does that matter.

Furthermore, the question was asked should ICANN play a role in addressing a registration abuse. And what issues if any are actually suitable for GNSO policy development and are in scope.

So in response to that, the GNSO Council cast a so called pre-PDP working group, know this is a pre-PDP working group so not an actually policy development process at this stage. And a group was passed to gather further information on questions such as what is the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse as distinguishing the two is important in order to determine whether consensus policies can be developed or not.

And what is the effectiveness of existing abuse policies and would there actually be any benefit to having more uniform provisions in registry and/or registrar agreements in relation to abuse.

And as you can imagine, these were not simple questions to answer. And the working group had quite extensive discussions and created a number of sub-teams to gather information and delve it into these questions.

So as a result of that work, the working group published in February of this year, an initial report and conducted a public comment forum, and following a review and analysis of the comments received, the working group updated the report accordingly and published its final report on the 29th of May and have submitted it now to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

So the report itself consists around 125 pages which detail deliberations and finding of the working group on the different issues outlined before. And as well as an overview and description of the different abuses the working group was able to identify.

And much of this information actually serves as a backdrop to the focal point of the report which add accommodations that are now - are being put forward for the GNSO Council to consider.

The recommendations included relate for example to issues such as cybersquatting where a recommendation is put forward to initiate a PDP to review the Uniform Dispute Resolution Process, also known as UDRP.

There's a recommendation in relation to Whois Access where further information is requested from ICANN compliance. There's a recommendation in relation to the development of best practices for the malicious use - to address malicious use of domain names for the monitoring and research is recommended in relation to a cross-TLD registration scam.

Again, possible enforcement action is proposed in relation to fake renewal notices. On some of the recommendations - most recommendations have unanimous consensus, but are some recommendations where there are divergent fuse or there's a split fuse such as the uniformity of contracts where one part of the group is of the opinion that a PDP should be initiated to look at a minimum base line for registration abuse provisions while another set of the working group actually disagrees and does not believe a PDP should be initiated on that issue.

In addition, there are some other recommendations in relation to more uniformity and the more structured approach in relation to reporting and development of best practices.

And at this time, the working group does not recommend any further action in relation to the issues of front running, domain name kiting and deceptive names.

So now the next step is for the GSNO Council to review these recommendations and to decide how to move forward on those. The Council will have a presentation by the working group. I'll define the report at the ICANN meeting in Brussels on the Sunday morning at 10:15 for those interested. And if you want to follow discussion from their issue, probably track the GNSO Council meetings where the report will be on the agenda for the discussion and decisions.

So with that, I hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika. I'm going to spend some time now in talking to you about two topics that I'm focused on. The first one relates to the issue of vertical integration between registries and registrars.

This topic has been the subject of a PDP, a Policy Development Process that's been initiated by the GNSO Council earlier this year. And the main focus of this PDP is to identify whether there should be GNSO policy recommendations related to whether there should be restrictions between a registry owning a registrar or a registrar owning a registry. And if so, if that is allowed, whether there would be additional rules and procedures that should apply.

This issue is important because as many of you know, the newgTLD Program implementation details are currently being developed. And in

connection with the launch of the new gTLD Program, it is anticipated that there'll be many new models of distribution that can be proposed and that it may be possible that applicants for new gTLDs may be interested in owning a registrar or relaxing the rules that relates to registries owning registrars or vice versa.

And what's interesting about this topic is that there has been no prior GNSO policy recommendations on this issue in the past. The current practice, as many of you may know, stems from the contractual relationships that ICANN has with the various registries.

So currently, for example, in the registry agreements, there are prohibitions on a registrar owning a registry in some cases or limiting the amount - the percentage ownership that is allowed. And so because there's no real uniform approach or understanding, the GNSO Council decided to go ahead and initiate a PDP to evaluate this issue and to determine whether a uniform policy should apply both to new gTLDs as well as existing gTLDs.

So this - if a policy recommendation comes out, it may be possible that it'll apply to the existing registries as well.

So there's been a lot of recent activity related to this. The policy development process, the PDP working group was formed earlier this year and has done significant interest. The group is over 65 members representing various stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And the reason for the interest is as you know is the timeline related to the launch of the new gTLD program. Currently there is an - there has been a recent publication by ICANN staff on Version 4 of the Applicant Guidebook. This guidebook includes implementation of a Board resolution that was adopted in Nairobi earlier this year.

And in the Nairobi meeting, the Board of Directors of ICANN essentially resolved that in the new gTLD Program, there should be strict separation between registrars and registries and that no co-ownership would be allowed.

And so the PDP working group is working very diligently. They're meeting twice a week and spending a lot of time analyzing this issue to determine if they can come up with a consensus option that would be less stringent than the Board resolution that is reflected in the Applicant Guidebook.

And the short term goal of the working group is to see if they can come up with a resolution that is different on this issue in time to affect the final Applicant Guidebook.

So there's a lot of activity related to vertical integration going in Brussels. There will be an informative session in Brussels on Wednesday where you can meet the members of the work team - working group and they will provide you with a status of their deliberations.

They are actually trying to come up with a consensus position hopefully before the Brussels meeting. And if they're successful in doing so, you'll see - you'll hear about it on the Wednesday session.

And if this issue's important to you, we encourage you to comment on the draft Applicant Guidebook Version 4. That public comment forum is currently open until July 21st. And as the PDP process issues initial reports or preliminary reports, there will be future comment periods so that you can comment if you like the proposals.

The next topic that I wanted to talk to you about is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And this is - we refer to as the RAA. As many of you know, the RAA is a standard agreement. It is executed between ICANN and the various registrars. And it's updated very rarely.

The last time that the agreement was updated was 2009 when a series of amendments were adopted and formed the 2009 agreement. As part of the process that approved that agreement, a joint working group between the GNSO Council and the At-Large community was formed to talk about whether there were additional improvements that could be made to the registrar accreditation agreement. Specifically there was a work that was approved mainly to identify a form of what is called a registrant rights and obligations charter.

And there was also work to identify additional amendments that might be appropriate to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And so what the drafting team has done is produced its initial report. The initial report describes the rights and obligations that are under the current 2009 accreditation agreement and it's drafted in a form that facilitates understanding by registrants.

Sometimes agreements can be very difficult to understand. And the idea behind a registrant rights charter was to clarify the rights and obligations that currently exist.

The report also talks about various additional amendments to the RAA that might be appropriate or might be further analyzed. And so if you read the report, you'll see that there are recommendations for better tools that might help ICANN in its compliance efforts.

There are suggestions for protections - additional protections for registrants. And there is also additional amendment proposals that might enhance the security and stability of the Internet. So I invite you to take a look at that report and to see whether those amendments would be appropriate.

The next step following the report is that we've opened a public comment period until July 9th. And if you have any input on that, we'd be happy to receive it.

There is also a session in Brussels that's going to focus on the law enforcement amendment. And this is going to take place on Monday, June 21st.

And essentially what happened is during the deliberations of the working group, various stakeholders submitted proposals for additional amendments. One of these groups was the law enforcement community where they thought that it might be appropriate to introduce topics for amendments that might enhance their ability to deal with cyber crime and malicious conducts involving the domain name system.

And so there will be representatives of the law enforcement community on hand to talk about those amendments and to talk with members of the working group to see, you know, what - whether those amendments would be appropriate to include in a new form of RAA.

The report also describes recommendations for procedures in converting these additional topics into a new form of RAA. And all of this will be discussed in Brussels. So if you have any interest in this topic, certainly take a look at the report and participate in the session in Brussels.

And with that I will hand it over to Liz Gasster who will talk to you about Whois studies.

Liz Gasster: Thanks so much Margie and good day, good evening everyone. Liz Gasster here. Going to just run through the latest on Whois studies which as many of you know have been very important to the GNSO Council in GNSO community for quite some time.

There have been concerns in the community about privacy and the lack of sufficient privacy protection for individual registrants, concerns about the

accuracy of Whois and concerns about some of the technical limitations of Whois given the broad utilization of Whois today.

So with that as a backdrop, the Council hopes that study data will provide an objective factual basis for further policy making. And they identified five broad Whois study areas that they felt should be scoped for feasibility and cost. And those areas really reflect specific topics or issue areas that are of greatest policy concern to the Council and to the GNSO community.

So, the rest of my presentation really focuses on those five areas and gives you the latest on where they stand. So the first is Whois misuse. There are really two studies here that would assess whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and also would look at the impact of various anti-harvesting measures.

And when I say there are two studies, there are really just two approaches to trying to assess that question. One is a survey approach where if we proceeded with this study, we would survey registrants, registrars, and also research and law enforcement organizations about past acts that they've identified as occurring and analyze those.

And the other study would be what we're calling an experimental study, a study that would measure a variety of acts aimed at Whois published versus non-published test addresses.

The cost of doing this study - so we did issue an RFP and got responses back that helped us identify the feasibility of doing this study and the cost of doing this study. The estimated costs were about \$150,000 and we've provided a report to the Council that it's currently considering that goes into greater detail about the feasibility and some of the benefits of the studies and maybe some limitations.

And in this case - so that report was provided to the Council on the 23rd of March. In this case we think the study can count and categorize harmful acts attributed to Whois misuse and show that data was probably not obtained from other sources although we think it may be difficult to determine whether the amount of misuse is significant or not.

The second area that the Council asked us to investigate is this registrant identification study. Essentially this study would look at how registrants identify themselves in Whois, to what extent domain names are registered by businesses or used for commercial purposes.

And we think that this would be helpful in looking at, you know, registrations that may not be clearly identified as such in Whois, perhaps it's unclear. And also be able to associate how people identify with the use of privacy proxy services, the extent to which businesses are using privacy and proxy services.

So the estimated cost of this study is also about \$150,000. Again it would give us some insight on why registrants are not clearly identified and frequency of privacy and proxy use by businesses. And there is, again, more detail in this report of the 23rd of March that I'll reference at the end of the presentation.

There is a third area of study that has to do with the proxy and privacy services. We actually originally had these combined. There's a privacy and proxy what we're calling an abuse study. And then on the next slide I'll talk about also a privacy and proxy reveal study.

But this privacy and proxy abuse study really looks at the relationship between use of proxies and abuse. It would study a broad sample of domains associated with the many kinds of abusive acts and compare that to the overall frequency of privacy and proxy registrations overall.

This RFP, the terms of reference were posted on the 18th of May. We are asking for interested independent researchers to respond by the 20th of July and then staff will repair - will prepare a report to the Council with information similar to what we did on the report that we did on the previous two studies on the 23rd of March.

This additional proxy and privacy services study is a reveal study that looks at proxy and privacy responses to information requests. This is somewhat of a challenging study. And so we've - we are working on the terms of reference for this study, again, to assess costs and feasibility. But those will probably not be released until July, end of July or possibly later. And I'll be providing more of an update on that as we proceed with that effort.

There is a fourth area of study that the Council also asked staff to look into having to do with the readability of non-ASCII Whois contact information. This study would involve a technical analysis of how various client site software displays non-ASCII registration information. And this study is on hold pending some work of a current working group that was formed at the request of the Board.

It's a joint affect GNSO internationalized registration data working group. That working group has been meeting, I think since last September or so and it will be sharing some preliminary ideas in Brussels I think Thursday at 9:30 am local Brussels time.

The fifth area of study was a particular report that the Council requested a little bit later in May of 2009. It differs significantly in what it really asked as compared with the previous studies I've been describing.

This is really a compilation of technical Whois service requirements that it was intended to be based on current requirements plus previously policy discussions that have been conducted in the past. So staff did prepare a first draft of that report for Council and SO/AC review in March, 26th of March.

And we have solicited and consulted with the SOs and ACs in addition to conducting a couple of webinars in April and May. We received input back from I know the registries, the ALAC and from some technical experts as well as some individual input. And we've produced a final draft final report on 30, the 31st of May.

We're calling that a draft final report just to give a chance for community discussion in Brussels and include anything else that others think we may have omitted and then we'll produce a final report just after Brussels on the service requirements.

This slide gives you an idea of what that compilation includes. And I won't take the time to read the slide on the webinar today, but you'll see it listed here and of course these slides will be available to you and the report of course is available to you to read as well.

In terms of next steps, in April of this year, the Council did request that ICANN consider including funding for Whois studies in the fiscal year 2011 budget and ICANN confirmed that as of the 17th of May there has been \$400,000 US allocated in this draft budget that's set for consideration by the Board in Brussels for studies.

That \$400,000 figure is not called out specifically. This was a question that came up on our earlier webinar today. I just will confirm though that for in fact \$400,000 has been currently set aside in the draft budget for these studies.

The Council is also actively discussing which studies to do and I expect that to be a subject of our upcoming Council call tomorrow in fact. There are these RFPs underway that I'm continuing to work on. And of course these discussions continue in the internationalized registration data working group as well, and you'll be hearing more about that in Brussels.

If you'd like more information on any of the details that I've covered, the pending RFPs, the two RFPs we've already completed, the analysis that staff's already done, the draft reports that I've mentioned, all of them are available on the link that I've provided.

Okay thank you. And I'm happy to answer any questions at the end of the call today. And I'd like to turn it over now to Bart Boswinkel. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Good evening everybody. I'll just want to touch upon some of the policy related - two of the policy related topics in the ccNSO so that's the IDN PDP and the delegation, re-delegation and retirement working group discussions, some internal issues just for comparison with what's happening in the GNSO, and very, very briefly touch upon other issues and topics.

Internationalized domain names country code policy development process, the contact sees of this process is it needs to provide the overall policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs. At this stage, the fast track is well under way, but this is a temporary solution and to meet pressing demands in some of the countries who use non-ASCII scripts. At this stage the Board has already delegated for IDN ccTLDs and of which three are already operational.

The PDP is focused in fact on two issues, not just on the overall selection and delegation policy but also on a change of the ccNSO to include the IDN ccTLD managers. Recent developments within the PDP is a very intense discussion on what the scope of the IDN PDP should be. Should it include the selection of IDN ccTLDs who will be based on a lesson script or is it just limited to IDN ccTLDs strings in non-lesson scripts.

This discussion is still continuing and we hope to resolve it at the Brussels meeting and continue our work. This is just one of the open issues. Another open issue is the discussion of the management of variance. Currently it is reviewed working group that there are too many technical issues open. And

they need to be resolved first before suggesting a policy to deal with the management of variance.

Please note that the management of variance is also part of the joint ccNSO GNSO working group as well are the topics.

The second part of the PDP, the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs within the ccNSO is under way. The working group to deal with these sets of issues has just been established. And this working group needs to amend the structure of the ccNSO to understand this decision as though it was established in 2003 and one of the underlying principles was one ccTLD per country territory, in fact is one vote per country territory.

With the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs this underlying principle needs to be adjusted because in some cases you will have just one IDN ccTLD or one ccTLD. That means some other countries or territories, you might end up with 22 IDN ccTLD and one ccTLD so in total 23. And this needs to be balanced.

A second issue in - within the ccNSO is the whole application mechanism and the definition of IDN of what is a ccTLD in terms of the ccNSO needs to be redefined as well. So that will work - will continue for another couple of months.

The IDN working group will have a workshop at the Brussels meeting on Monday afternoon and it will meet its - it will meet as a group on Sunday afternoon. The Monday afternoon workshop is open for everybody and is part of the whole ccNSO meeting. And background materials can be found at the URLs that are included.

Onto the second topic, the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs, delegation to give you a bit of background information delegation, re-delegation, retirement policies are fundamental to ccTLDs. And the ccNSO has decided because it's so fundamental to first appoint a working group

which will advise the Council whether or not to launch a policy development process.

The idea is that this working group would do some fact finding and based on that fact finding would advise the Council whether there are issues and whether these issues are significant enough to launch a policy development process.

In its work until now, it has at least it has come across one major issue is that there is no clear documentation of the policies related to delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs. So that's one of the first major issues.

And in its ongoing work since the Nairobi meetings, it went through all the underlying documentation that is RFC 1591. That's a document used prior to the establishment of ICANN and it's dated from '94 ICP 1 and the GAC principles to understand if there are any issues there and then to compare it with the current practices which is documented in for instance Board resolutions in the IANA report.

In order to do a rigorous and job, they've developed a classification methodology and classified the issues according to this methodology and the report of this work will be published shortly.

And the focus is not so much on the individual processes anymore, but on all - excuse me - the focus is on all three processes at once. And a formal presentation will be published together or just shortly after the progress report for public comment.

And the public comment period will remain open until mid-September. And based on the public comment and the input from the Brussels meeting, the working group will start working on its recommendations to the ccNSO Council on launching a PDP.

You can participate in this very fundamental debate for the ccTLD community in the, of course in the public comment period and you can participate in the public sessions at the ccNSO meeting in Brussels.

This occasion (recondition) discussion will be on the agenda at - on Tuesday afternoon as the final session, so with the possibility to extend currently scheduled for one-half hour.

The workshop, okay, the next section is not so much to do with the policy related topics within the (CO), but a comparison with GNSO improvement process as a process itself. The ccNSO is currently undertaking an effort to improve its structures and processes to deal with the - their increase in workload and increase in membership.

The ccNSO when it was created and still is, is constituted of members in the ccNSO Council and there is a large number of ccTLDs who are non-members to the ccNSO who participate as well. And one of the real issues of the last 1-1/2 year has been this sustainability of the purpose of the ccNSO and its activities. And that is due to the increased workload, the increase of membership and the anticipated increase in membership because of IDN ccTLDs and the increase in complexity of issues which we all are probably well aware of. The increase of membership may be just a small figure when it was established.

In - or - in the first year of its existence there were 34 members of 34 ccTLD members of the ccNSO. Currently there are 106 and there are two applications pending and hopefully by the Brussels meeting the ccNSO will have 106 or 108 members.

So you see the processes at the time were, you know, at the time the ccNSO was established, these processes needs to be adjusted just to cope with the increase of numbers. This was identified by the ccNSO Council itself at a

meeting they held in Nairobi and the topics for further discussion were increase in workload and duration of projects.

Some of these projects are very ccTLD focus, but there is also a growing awareness of the cross-constituency work which will have its own aspects to deal with and probably will again increase or will create an additional increase in the workload not just as a project but to coordinate the efforts as well.

One of the aspects they identified as well is that although there is an increase in membership, there is say the active participation of some of the ccTLD managers is not in line with the increasing workload both at a Council level and in the participation of working groups.

So, the workshop in Brussels is also to discuss how to increase active participation by the volunteers of the community. As I said, there will be a ccNSO Council workshop on Sunday and an open ccNSO members workshop on Tuesday - on Wednesday morning. And you're, of course, as with all the ccNSO meetings, you're invited to participate and exchange your views and your experiences from the other SOs, ACs.

Some of the background material that is available that are the summary of the outcome of the ccNSO workshop in Nairobi and after the meeting there will be again a summary of the activities. So if you want to keep abreast of what's happening, in with - with regard to the internal organization of the ccNSO, please have a look at the ccNSO Web site.

Other ccNSO working groups and activities - as you probably are all aware of, the ccNSO is not just created to recommend policies to the ICANN Board, but the major activities revolve around information sharing, best practices and contacts with other SOs, ACs to the extent that is relevant to the ccTLD community.

As part of this overall call objective of the ccNSO, you see that there are different working groups active because our working groups are the means about through which the ccNSO organizes its activities. I just will run briefly through them.

Technical working group, this working group is specifically focused on the operation on - on sharing operation on technical information among ccTLD operators and managers and they all include and other stakeholders and community members often attend these meetings like (DNSO-ark), other ICANN staff members, members from the some of the GNSO constituencies to share their experience or their technical and operational experience as well.

The incident response planning working group was created but after the (confika) incident, and hopes is planning mechanisms to respond coordinated on DNS-CERT attacks. And since Nairobi, since Nairobi, it is also the mechanism through which the ccNSO wants to coordinate its input on the DNS-CERT once we've passed this first phase of the DNS-CERT initiative.

A fourth working group which is very active currently is the Adhoc Work Wildcard Study Group to deal with the adverse impact of wildcarding and it is involving ccTLDs who use wildcards from - to understand that perspective and their reasons for using wildcards.

There was a presentation in Nairobi on this and it will be included in the draft final report which will be presented in Brussels.

Finally, there is the ccNSO strategic and operational planning working group. This is - this working group is planning the interaction between the ccTLD community and ICANN's strategic and operational plannings processes.

This working group will conduct a session at the Brussels meeting on Wednesday afternoon to identify and discuss strategic issues which are

relevant for the ccTLD community in a very broad sense and to understand if there is a what should be included in ICANN strategic plan what the ccTLD community should address or it should be monitoring themselves and what should be is more localized.

And, yes, the - finally and this is a bit more about the Brussels program of the ccNSO. Currently there is an independent review of the ccNSO. And the reviewers intend to produce a - their final report prior to the Brussels meeting. And at the ccNSO meeting, the - so that on Wednesday morning as well, the reviewers hope to present this - their report and finding to the community. And so again you're invited to attend this meeting because it is open as all the - as I said all the meetings are open to the other stakeholders and community members.

And the only thing I can do is invite you to attend the (TACK) day which is a Monday and the ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday. That's it for me and I'll now hand it over to Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart. And hello everybody. Now it's time to focus on the last N in the ICANN name, notably numbers and meaning then IP addresses and autonomous system numbers.

They certainly need policies as well as to the allocation of locks, the size of the locks, when to allocate them and on what grounds. And that's the (rearm) of the address supporting organization. And that organization relies heavily on other organizations already existing outside ICANN in the limited sense, so let's have a look at those.

Notably the regional Internet registries or RIRs, the RIRs receive giant blocks from the IANA faction of ICANN, sort of typically for IPv4 it's slash eight blocks that are called and there's 16 million addresses in each. So that's a big chunk they receive which they then chop up in smaller pieces and hand out to

for example your ISP which in turn provides you with an IP address and then the Internet works, very nice, and very, very useful and very important.

And there are five of those regional Internet registries - that's AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North American region and part of the Caribbean, LACNIC for Latin America and the major part of the Caribbean and finally RIPE for Europe and the Middle East.

And these organizations they have their own over-bridging organization called the NRO, the Number Resource Organization and now we can ask our question what is the ASO then?

The Address Supporting Organization is actually a memorandum of understanding between ICANN and the NRO and the RIRs in fact, which - and those NRO with the task of performing the ASO functions.

And one of the major ASO functions is to handle global policy proposals. And we have a look more closely at those as well. There's also global policy that sounds pretty grand and it is pretty grand but we have to keep in mind that the RIR developed many regional addressing policies for the region of use, and the size of locks, when to hand them out and on what grounds and so on in support.

But a few of those policies do affect IANA. And IANA fell location of addressing resources and only those are called the global policies. So remember that. There may be policies which are exactly identical across the globe from one RIR to the next and they are not called global policies they are globally coordinated policies. And only the global policies actually are within the auspices of the ASO.

So let's have a look on what's on the table right now for the ASO when it comes to global policy proposals. There is one regarding Autonomous

System Numbers, ASNs for short and another one for recovered IP or for address space, so a closer look at each in turn.

First of all, Autonomous System Numbers, well ASNs, well not very many talk about them but there is so important for the communication between ISPs. They have their own little addressing system for you could call it trunk trafficking of IP traffic between them. And a special set of addresses for that called ASMs.

And, well, low and behold, they are running out as well. We used to have 16 bit ASMs and an increase to 32 bits ASNs for - well clearly obviously necessary quite some time ago. And there is already a policy for a gradual transition back toward compatible for that. But the recent proposal is only a little adjustment of that fund which is to defer the transition - complete transition to 32 bit ASNs.

One year, in order to cope with the problems of some Legacy software and systems, and give them some leeway to adapt themselves. Now the current status of this proposal is - well it's very, very clear all the RIRs have adopted that proposal which is a pre-requisite for it being adopted finally. It has to be the same text everywhere.

And next the proposal is tabled for the NRO Executive Committee and the ASO Address Council for review that the procedures have been correctly followed and such and then it's forwarded by the ASO Address Council to the ICANN Board directly for ratification within a limited period of time and the subsequent implementation by IANA.

So this is pretty much a done deal. It's in the home stretch and smooth sailing which is rather the opposite for - to what one can say about recovered IPv4. And what's that then?

Well as you know, we're running out slowly but surely of IPv4 addresses. In the IANA free pool there's today 16 blocks of slash eights. Each 16 million addresses and it will last for another something like two years. And then there's nothing left in stock.

So this proposal is how to - about how to handle recovered, recuperated, IPv4 address blocks that are returned to IANA and can be redistributed, reallocated from IANA. Obviously in smaller pieces than in slash eight.

And the current status here is pretty much a stalemate because in the process, two different proposal's text have emerged and been adopted in different RIRs. And they differ on one important aspect on the regional level whether return of recovered space should be mandatory or not.

Now, so the main issue is really could those two different proposals be one way or another consolidated to a joined global policy proposal or not. This is by no means obvious and actually there are discussions in the addressing community for launching a new proposal to replace this one, or rather forget out this one, launch a new one which eliminates the regional aspect which is the sticky point.

So that's where we stand in policy development. But if you're interested, how can you get involved in this? Well it's a simple answer to that and that is to get involved in your local regional RIR serving your region because they all have open meetings where policy issues are discussed and they all have open mailing lists for such matters as well.

So it's very, very easy. There are five of them. Take your choice depending on where you happen to be located and have a go with that. And also, in Brussels there will be on Tuesday the 22nd of June, a meeting open of course of the ASO address council so there you have an opportunity to meet some of, well let's call it the sopranos and the tenors of this particular choir in person.

And with that, it's all from my side and I hand you over to Scott Pinzon for - to conclude this session.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much Olof. We are heading toward the conclusion here but we have a couple of quick reminders to give you before we open the floor to your questions.

Most of you on the call track issues closely or at least one or two issues closely. And it's not always that we have an opportunity to cover generally everything like this. If you find that you like that, you might enjoy reading the policy update where we also update what every working group is doing once a month.

It is available at the URL on your screen and we publish it each month in several languages. So if you aren't already taking advantage of that, you might want to look into it.

In addition, we have a relatively new resource for you. This is better designed for people who are new to ICANN's policy processes or new to a given issue. It's our podcast, ICANN Start. And each episode is under 20 minutes so that you can listen to it on a coffee break or a lunch break.

And we also transcribe the episodes. So if you prefer to read rather than listen, you can take in the information that way. And we take one issue, answer some very basic questions about it, and the idea is to give you a starting point for an issue that you didn't previously understand so that you can join the discussion with the rest of the community.

So again that is available from the e-learning page that you can see on the ICANN home page or in many of the iTunes stores around the world, you can go to their podcast section with a string ICANN Start and you'll find it.

The presentation today was brought to you by a lot of people besides the ones that you hear. I just wanted to point out that the policy staff is from many different places in the world. And it's our privilege to support you and try to facilitate on these different topics.

I mean one last item before we open the floor to your questions. We are sincere in wanting to make these presentations continuously improve. We present them in front of each of the international meetings and we'd like to know how we can help you better.

So we have attached a poll to this particular presentation. And if you can fill it out before you go, the responses are anonymous and it will help us understand how the webinar is hitting you and perhaps what we could do to improve it.

(Unintelligible) I am unable to advance the slides. Can someone else on the team assist (unintelligible).

And you should see the poll beginning to come up. It has some of the contributions from our previous session. We presented this also about 5-1/2 hours ago. So don't be dismayed by seeing the input. You are free to answer however you want.

And while you're working on that, we will answer the - open the floor to questions and we have a couple different ways you can submit them. If you look in the lower left corner of your screen, you will see a small icon of a person with their hand up. If you click on that, it pops your name to the top of the attendee list and we'll know that you would like the floor and then you're - after you're recognized you're free to speak or you can just type your question in the chat box at the bottom.

And with that we're opening the floor to your questions.

Recording: Welcome to ICANN Start.

Scott Pinzon: Somebody's playing the podcast. Thank you for muting yourself, but that was great. You got a little preview of the opening of ICANN Start.

Liz Gasster: And for - this is Liz. For those of you who think the presentation was mostly understandable and clear, we'd also very much appreciate your thoughts about how we would make it very understandable and clear. If you think we should speak more slowly or explain things, perhaps we failed to anything like that you'd like to share with us, we'd appreciate your comments.

Scott Pinzon: We will give just another minute for people to form their questions. We're coming up on the formal end of this webinar. However, if questions begin to come in we can stick around to answer them.

Also, if things occur to you outside the webinar, we are always watching for your input at the email address policy-staff@icann.org. I don't know if people realize that anytime you have a question about policy issues, you can write to us and we all see that address on the policy team and your question will be routed to the person who's working most closely on that topic.

All right. Hearing no questions, we're going to conclude the formal part of our presentation.

Marika Konings: Well there is a hand raised in Adobe Connect.

Scott Pinzon: Ah okay. We recognize Chris Chaplow. Thank you Marika.

Chris Chaplow: Hello Scott. Chris Chaplow here. I found the audio very clear today, more so than normal. I don't know whether people have been obedient and left the phones on mute. That was very good.

Of course there's a wide range of people with different knowledges. And I think that's probably the most challenging part of these webinars. And for me it was set about the right level.

You did mention that there had been another basic webinar beforehand and I think that's the secret into actually transmitting in advance the sort of level of the webinar. That was just a point I wanted to make.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much Chris. Just a few moments for anyone else who may want to comment or ask a question.

All right. We thank you very much for your time. This should be posted soon on the Web site. We have to do a little bit of a conversion process to match the audio and the video. But if you would like to review it in more leisure, we hope to have it up soon.

Thank you for your time and we look forward to seeing you in Brussels whether in person or remotely. Thank you very much.

END