Introduction

David Olive
Goals for this session

- Update you on current Policy work and encourage you to participate
- Review issues to be discussed at the ICANN Meeting in San Francisco
- Inform you of upcoming initiatives and opportunities to provide input
- Answer any questions you might have
ICANN Meeting in San Francisco

• Highlights include:
  • Newcomer Corner
  • New gTLD sessions
  • Security & Stability
  • Abuse of the DNS Forum

• Further information
  http://svsf40.icann.org/
Policy Developed at ICANN by:

ICANN Supporting Organizations

- GNSO - Generic Names Supporting Organization
- ccNSO - Country-code Names Supporting Organization
- ASO - Address Supporting Organization

Advice provided by Advisory Committee
- ALAC - At-Large Advisory Committee
- SSAC - Security & Stability Advisory Committee
- RSSAC - Root Server System Advisory Committee
- GAC - Governmental Advisory Committee
Topics covered in this session

- GNSO Improvements (Rob Hoggarth)
- Registration Abuse Policies (Marika Konings)
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (Marika)
- Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (Marika)
- Registrar Accreditation Agreement (Margie)
- WHOIS (Liz Gasster)
- Other Issues (VI, MOPO)
Topics covered in this session

- Use of Country Name Study Group (Bart Boswinkel)
- Delegation - Re-Delegation WG (Bart)
- Recovered IPv4 Post Exhaustion (Olof Nordling)
GNSO Policy Issues
Current issues being discussed in GNSO

- GNSO Improvements
- Registration Abuse Policies (RAP)
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP)
- Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery
- Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)
- WHOIS
- Others - currently there are over 20 projects underway
GNSO Improvements

Rob Hoggart
Why is it important?

• As main policy making body for gTLDs, GNSO is subject to periodic independent review

• Key objectives of 2007 GNSO Review:
  – Maximize stakeholder participation
  – Ensure policy development is based on thoroughly-researched, well-scoped objectives **AND** operated in a predictable manner to ensure effective implementation
  – Improve communications and administrative support
GNSO: Five Main Areas for Improvement

Based on input from the independent reviews, a Working Group of the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC-WG) identified these areas for improvement:

- Adopt Working Group Model
- Improve Communications with ICANN Structures
- GNSO Council Restructure
- Revise the Policy Development Process
- Enhance Constituencies

✔ GNSO Council Restructure
✔ Enhance Constituencies
Structure of GNSO

GNSO Council

Stakeholder Groups

Contracted Parties House
- Registries
- Registrars

Non-Contracted Parties House
- Commercial Constituencies
  - Business
  - Intellectual Property
  - ISPs
- Non-Commercial Constituency
  - Board Appointees

NCA, ALAC, ccNSO
Latest News - Process Developments

• Recommended PDP Improvements (WT) Posted For Public Comment
• Working Group Guidelines Finalized
• Community Outreach Recommendations (WT) Posted For Comment
• GNSO Council Standing Committee To Be Chartered
• Improved GNSO Web Site -content transfer in progress
Latest News - Structural Developments

- CSG Permanent Charter Developed; public comment concluded
- NCSG Permanent Charter Proposal Before Board/SIC; next step - public comment
- New process for Constituency recognition proposed; public comments requested
- Pending New Constituency Proposals - Consumers, NPOC
- Community Feedback Collected on Toolkit of Admin and Support Services
Next Steps - SVSF Discussions

- Revised New Constituency Process Public Comment Forum (Board Working Session)
- PDP Improvements Sessions (GNSO Working Sessions and Public Workshop)
- Permanent NCSG Charter Public Comment Forums (TBD)
- New Constituency Public Comment Forum (TBD)
- Community Toolkit Discussions
How can I get involved?

• Participate in Public Comment Forums
  http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/
• Get familiar with WG Guidelines
• Join an existing Stakeholder Group or Constituency
• Form your own Constituency
• More information at
  http://gnso.icann.org/en/improvements/
Registration Abuse Policies (RAP)

Marika Konings
Why is it important?

• Registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches to deal with domain name registration abuse

• What role ICANN should play in addressing registration abuse?

• What issues, if any, are suitable for GNSO policy development?
Background

- RAP WG published Final Report published on 29 May 2010 containing 14 recommendations addressing, amongst others, Cybersquatting, WHOIS access, Uniformity of Contracts
- RAP Implementation DT organized recommendations based on consensus level achieved by RAP WG, expected scope, dependencies, priority, etc.
- Recommended approach submitted to the GNSO Council on 15 November
Recent Developments

• GNSO Council considered RAP-IDT approach at Cartagena meeting

• Resolved during its meeting on 3 February to:
  – Forward two issues to ICANN Compliance (Fake Renewal Notices, WHOIS access)
  – Request an Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP
  – Request a Discussion Paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names
Next Steps

• GNSO Council to review feedback from ICANN Compliance and decide on next steps, if any
• ICANN Policy Staff to publish Issue Report and Discussion Paper for GNSO Council consideration (timing to be confirmed)
• GNSO Council to consider remaining RAP recommendations
Next Steps & How do I get involved?

Monitor GNSO Council mailing list

Attend GNSO Council discussion on RAP in San Francisco

Further information:


Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP WG

Marika Konings
Why is it important?

- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP)
- Straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars
- Currently under review to ensure improvements and clarification - nr 1. area of complaint according to data from ICANN Compliance
- IRTP Part B PDP Working Group - second in a series of five PDPs
Charter Questions

• Should there be a process or special provisions for urgent return of hijacked registration, inappropriate transfers or change of registrant?

• Registrar Lock Status (standards / best practices & clarification of denial reason #7)
Recent Developments

• Publication of Initial Report on 29 May 2010
• WG reviewed public comments, continued deliberations and updated report accordingly
• WG published proposed Final Report for public comment on 21 February 2011 containing 9 recommendations incl.:  
  • Registrar Emergency Action Channel
  • Issue Report on ‘Thick’ Whois
  • Issue Report on ‘Change of Control’ function
  • Modification of denial reason #6 & #7
  • Clarifying WHOIS status messages in relation to Registrar Lock Status
How do I get involved & Next Steps

- Presentation of the Report and recommendations to the Community in SFO (see http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22083)
- Public comment forum open until 31 March
- WG will review comments received and finalize report for submission to GNSO Council
Further Information

- IRTP Part B PDP Proposed Final Report -
- IRTP Part B Public Comment Forum -
- IRTP Part B PDP WG Workspace -
  https://st.icann.org/irtp-partb/
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG

Marika Konings
Why is it important?

• To what extent should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire?

• Issue brought to the GNSO by ALAC

• PDP initiated in June 2009

• PEDNR WG examines five questions relating to expiration and renewal practices and policies

• WG is expected to make recommendations for best practices and / or consensus policies
Recent Developments

- Initial Report Published in May 2010 - did not include any recommendations
- WG reviewed public comments and continued deliberations
- Published proposed Final Report on 21 Feb containing 14 recommendations
- Public comment forum open until 7 April
Proposed Recommendations

Total of 14 recommendations, including amongst others:

• Provide a minimum of 8 days after expiration for renewal by registrant
• All unsponsored gTLDs and registrars must offer Redemption Grace Period (RGP)
• Fees charged for renewal must be posted
• At least two notices prior to expiration at set times, one after expiration
• Website must explicitly say that registration has expired and instructions on how to redeem
• Development of education materials about how to prevent unintentional loss
How do I get involved & Next Steps

- Presentation of the Report and recommendations to the Community in SFO (see http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22107)
- Public comment forum open until 7 April
- WG will review comments received and finalize report for submission to GNSO Council
Further Information

- Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Proposed Final Report -

- PEDNR Public Comment Forum -
Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)

Margie Milam
Why is it important?

- RAA describes the registrar’s rights and obligations
- An enhanced RAA may provide ICANN with better tools to obtain registrar compliance
- Additional protections for registrants under consideration
- More security requirements could enhance the security, stability of the Internet
Recent Developments & Next Steps

- Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Charter Approved
- Final Report describes priority amendments and procedures for producing new RAA
  

- GAC Brussels Communiqué - Law Enforcement RAA proposals endorsed
- RAA issues to be explored in the GAC/Board Brussels consultations
  

- GNSO to consider next steps
WHOIS Studies

Liz Gasster
• WHOIS policy has been debated for many years
• Many competing interests with valid viewpoints
• GNSO Council hopes that study data will provide objective, factual basis for future policy making
• Council identified several WHOIS study areas to test hypotheses that reflect key policy concerns
• Council asked staff to determine costs and feasibility of conducting those studies
• Staff used an RFP approach to do so
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area/Topic</th>
<th>Specific studies defined</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. WHOIS Misuse Studies                              | 1. Experimental: register test domains and measure harmful messages resulting from misuse  | Council decided in Sept 2010 to conduct this study. Cost: $150,000 Time estimate: 1 year Contract negotiations are underway. We hope to begin in March 2011. | ▪ Can count and categorize harmful acts attributed to misuse and show data was probably not obtained from other sources  
  ▪ Some acts might be difficult to count  
  ▪ Cannot tie WHOIS queries to harmful acts, which makes it difficult to prove that reductions in misuse were caused by specific anti-harvesting measures  
  ▪ Difficult to assess whether misuse is “significant”                                                                                           |
| Extent to which publicly displayed WHOIS data is misused | 2. Descriptive: study misuse incidents reported by registrants, researchers/ law enforcement |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 2. WHOIS Registrant Identification Study              | 1. Gather information about how business/commercial domain registrants are identified     | 5 RFP responses received. Staff analysis to Council on 23 March 2010. Cost: 150,000 Time estimate: 1 year Pending decision by Council to proceed. | ▪ Can classify ownership and purpose of what appear to be commercial domains without clear registrant information, and measure how many were registered using a P/P service  
  ▪ Might provide insight on why some registrants are not clearly identified  
  ▪ Use of P/P services by businesses                                                                                                                |
|                                                     | 2. Correlate such identification with use of proxy/privacy services                      |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 3. WHOIS Privacy and Proxy “Abuse” Study             | Compare a broad sample of Proxy and Privacy-registered domains associated with alleged harmful acts with overall frequency of Proxy and Privacy registrations | 3 RFP responses received. Staff analysis to Council on 5 October 2010. Cost: 150,000 Time estimate: < 1 year Pending decision by Council to proceed. | ▪ Can sample many harmful acts to assess how often "bad actors" try to obscure identity in WHOIS  
  ▪ Compare bad actor P/P abuse rate to control sample and to alternatives like falsified WHOIS data, compromised machines, and free web hosting  
  ▪ Some kinds of acts not sampled due to irrelevance and/or difficulty  
  ▪ Cannot reliably filter out “false positive” reports                                                                                               |
|                                                     |                                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 4. WHOIS Privacy and Proxy “Relay and Reveal” Study   | Analyze relay and reveal requests sent for P/P-registered domains to explore and document how they are processed | RFP responses due Nov. 2010. No bids received. Staff recommends a pre-study survey to identify willing volunteers. Cost: $60,000-$80,000 Time estimate: 4 mos. | ▪ May be difficult to find diverse set of participants  
  ▪ Likely concerns by Registrars, Law Enforcement, privacy and business sensitivities  
  ▪ Others will have limits to the data they will disclose  
  ▪ Data collection aids may help                                                                                                                  |
For more information

• See: http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/

San Francisco Activities

• Other WHOIS activities (see http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22199)
• Internationalized Data Working Group ( http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22207)
Other Issues

- Vertical Integration
- Morality and Public Order Objections
ccNSO Policy Issues
Use of Country Name
Study Group

Bart Boswinkel
Use of Country Names Study Group

- Statement of purpose adopted by ccNSO council 25 January
- Co-chair Becky Burr, chair to be nominated by the members of WG
- Call for volunteers ccTLD community (members and non-members ccNSO)
- GNSO, GAC and ALAC invited to participate
  - Appoint members or liaison
Purpose and scope of activities

• Provide overview:
  • Current and proposed policies for allocation and delegation of gTLD and (IDN) ccTLD strings associated with territory names
  • Type and categories of strings reflecting the name of territories
  • Examples: .IDNccTLDs, .Angleterre, .Holland, .Norway in Greek,
  • Issues arising of applying the proposed policies to categories of names
• If appropriate, the study group will advise on a course of further actions, if any, to resolve issues identified
  • Example of actions: Launch ccPDP, Reserve territory names under IDN ccPDP and/or new gTLD process, other action)
Background Study Group

• Use of country and territory names as gTLD string debated in ICANN for long time
• Territory names can be (conditionally) registered according to new gTLD Policy
• Exempted from first round of applications by the ICANN Board awaiting input from ccNSO
  • Note this is according to Board decision and reflected in draft Final Application Guidebook
• Scope IDN ccPDP limited, does not address all types and categories of use of territory names
Delegation Re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs

Bart Boswinkel
Purpose and scope of activities

• Advise the ccNSO Council to launch a PDP to change the policy for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs or not
• Report on any issues or matters of concern that it believes exist relating to current policies.
• Consider possible solutions to any issues or matters of concern.
• Note: IANA functions contract is considered outside the scope of this working group.
Current status

- Final Report for public comment and discussion by ccTLD community (open until 15 March)
- Update full reports:
  - Retirement report
  - Delegation report
  - Re-delegation with consent of incumbent operator
  - Re-delegation without consent of incumbent operator
- Final report will refer to full reports as basis for next steps
Next Steps DRD WG

- Submit report to ccNSO Council
- Closure of DRD WG, after submission of reports
- ccNSO council decides on next steps
DRD WG identified Key issues

- Not publicly available
  - authoritative policy document that reflects all relevant policy inputs
  - publicly available documentation of the current practices or procedures.

- General and specific key findings relating to delegation and re-delegation process

- Specific issues relating to retirement of ccTLDs
Recommendations of DRD WG

- CCNSO advised to undertake a PDP to develop policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs
- Development of a “Framework of Interpretation” (FoI) for delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs and monitor use of framework once developed.
- If FoI fails launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.
Advise & views of DRD WG on recommendations

- Use ccNSO WG mechanisms to develop FoI (include members and non-members of the ccNSO)
- Priority on Framework of Interpretation efforts
- Goals of FoI and PDP:
  - resolve issues identified and
  - create environment for making consistent and predictable decisions on delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.
- Recommendations also relevant for IDN ccTLDs
Other Issues

• DSSA WG
  – Appointing members
  – First f-2-f meeting in San Francisco

• Finance WG: review financial contributions
  – Understand allocation of costs to ccTLD
  – Develop model for fair and equitable contribution

• New WG: incident response implementation
  – Implement recommendations Incident response
  – Buy or make, operation and maintenance, funding
ASO Policy Issues

Olof Nordling
Background: RIRs, NRO and the ASO

• What is an RIR?
  – Regional Internet Registry. There are five RIRs; AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC and RIPE and they cooperate thru the NRO, the Number Resource Organization.

• What is the ASO?
  – The Address Supporting Organization, set up through an MoU between ICANN and the NRO.
  – One major task of the ASO is to handle Global Policy Proposals.
Background: Global Policies

- What is a “Global Policy”? 
  - The RIRs develop many regional addressing policies.
  - Only very few policies affect IANA and only those are called “Global Policies”.
- Global Policy Proposal in “pipeline”:
  - Recovered IPv4 Address Space, ”Post Exhaustion”
Recovered IPv4
“Post Exhaustion”
Global Policy Proposal: Recovered IPv4 “Post Exhaustion”

• Why is it important?
  – The proposal enables IANA to handle recovered IPv4 address space and allocate smaller blocks than before.

Current status:
  – Introduced in all RIRs, adopted in ARIN and in discussion in the other RIRs.
  – Replaces a previous proposal for Recovered IPv4 that didn’t reach global consensus and was abandoned.
How do I get involved?

• For all addressing policies: participate in the bottom-up policy development in “your” RIR.
• All RIRs conduct open meetings where policy proposals are discussed and all have open mailing lists for such matters.
• Don’t miss the **ASO session on Wednesday in San Francisco**! All RIRs will be there and present their current policy work!
How to Stay Updated
Policy Update Monthly

• Published mid-month
• Read online at: http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/
• Subscribe at: http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/
• Available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish
Improved ICANN Web-Sites

• New improved site launched for ccNSO
• New improved site to be launched for GNSO
• New Community Collaboration Wiki - Training sessions in San Francisco
• Re-design of icann.org
ICANN Policy Staff
ICANN Policy Staff

- David Olive - Vice President, Policy Development (Washington, DC, USA)
- Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor, GNSO (CA, USA)
- Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor, GNSO (ID, USA)
- Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director (Washington, DC, USA)
- Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director, GNSO (Brussels, BE)
- Glen de Saint Géry - Secretariat, GNSO (Cannes, FR)
- Bart Boswinkel - Senior Policy Advisor, ccNSO (NL)
- Gabriella Schittek - Secretariat, ccNSO (Warsaw, Poland)
ICANN Policy Staff

- Dave Piscitello - Senior Security Technologist, SSC (SC, USA)
- Julie Hedlund - Director, SSAC Support (Washington, DC, USA)
- Heidi Ullrich - Director for At-Large Regional Affairs (CA, USA)
- Matthias Langenegger - Manager for At-Large Regional Affairs (Geneva, Switzerland)
- Gisella Gruber-White - Administrative Support ALAC/GNSO (UK)
- Filiz Yilmaz, Sr. Director Participation and Engagement (NL)
- Steve Sheng - Senior Technical Analyst (CA, USA)
- Marilyn Vernon - Executive Assistant (CA, USA)
Thank you
Questions?

Subscribe to the monthly Policy Update:
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/
Contact us at policy-staff@icann.org