

**ICANN Policy Update  
WEBINAR**

**3 March 2011 at 13:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 3 March 2011 at 13:00 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 on page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>  
<http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p53698707/>

David Olive: Again my name is David Olive. I'm Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN and I'm pleased to welcome you to our update Webinar with the Policy Team.

As you may know this is a recurring event which we started initially before the Nairobi meeting in order to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help you prepare and focus your effort in ICANN meeting, and so we're pleased to do this again before the Cartagena meeting.

There is a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone can have an opportunity to review the information at your leisure.

In addition

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. This conference is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Mr. David Olive, you may begin.

David Olive: Okay. Thank you very much. Hello. My name is David Olive and I am Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN. I'm very happy to welcome all of you to the ICANN Policy Update Webinar, which is now a regularly scheduled event prior to ICANN meetings in order to provided interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help us all prepare and focus our efforts at the next ICANN meeting in San Francisco.

There's a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and the recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information at their leisure.

A few housekeeping items. To reduce interference we will mute the lines. There'll be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the session. And at that point we will un-mute the lines for this purpose. Others may wish to turn the sound down on your computers and this will help as well.

As you know, this is an Adobe Connect room for the session in which the slides can be viewed and questions can be posted on the chat to the right. This link of course was included in the email sent to you about the meeting details.

And while there'll be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the meeting, during the session you can submit your questions in the chat box in the Adobe Connect and the policy staff will do their best to answer your questions.

In case questions arise after the meeting, you may want to follow up with any of the issues discussed today. Please feel free to contact the policy staff at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

The goals for this session are to provide you with an update on our policy work, review those issues that we expect to be discussed in San Francisco, inform you of initiatives and opportunities for your involvement and of course answer any questions you may have.

Now many of you are planning to participate in the Silicon Valley meeting either in person or remotely. And for those who will be participating remotely, we have paid special attention to our enhanced remote participation. Further details on these facilities are available at the ICANN meeting Web site.

The highlights for the San Francisco meeting include the newcomer's lounge for those who are first time participants at ICANN meetings. There'll be discussions on the new gTLD program and efforts to move that forward toward launch.

Also session on the security and reliability of the DNS and of course abuse on the DNS forum. We will also have a (nurolu) showcase and they have publications about who will be speaker and the events there on the meeting Web site and the ICANN Web site. And that site is mentioned here for your use.

The focus of this presentation is on the policy development at ICANN. And as most of you will be aware, the following bodies are responsible for such policy development; the GNSO, the ccNSO and the ASO.

In addition to the support organizations that have the capability to develop policy recommendations, there are a number of important advisory committees that also provide advice to the ICANN Board. And you have them listed here; the At Large Advisory Committee, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Root Server Advisory Committee and the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Topics covered in this session today are specific highlights of some of the activities in the various SOs and Rob Hoggarth will talk to us about

GNSO and GNSO improvements. Marika Konings will talk about activities on registration abuse policies, inter registrar transfer policy and post expiration domain name recovery activity.

Margie Milam of our policy staff will talk about the registrar accreditation agreement. And Liz Gasster will talk about activities in the Whois area. We will also have some updates on other areas for you that will be provided by Margie and Liz.

In addition to that of course we'll have the ccNSO activities covered by Bart Boswinkel talking to us about the use of the country name study group and the activities of the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group. And finally we can't forget the numbers and Olof Nordling will tell us about the activity on recovered IPv4 forced exhaustion working group.

With that, I want to thank you for your attention and your time to be on this call and I turn it now to Rob Hoggarth to talk about GNSO policy issues. Rob, you have the floor.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you very much David. Good day to you all and welcome to the Webinar. As many of you may have noted in the last few slides that David showed, a lot of the current issues being addressed by ICANN and that we're discussing today are being addressed within the GNSO.

We presently have within the GNSO community over 20 projects currently under way and the Council is managing, you know, a reappotpourri of priorities and facing a lot of management challenges in terms of allocating resources to those areas' matters.

In addition, as many of you know as I see the attendee list, many of you are participating on a variety of cross community working groups that involve not just the GNSO but the ccNSO, at large community, GAC and basically every organization within the ICANN universe.

So there's a lot that we could cover during this session but we're limiting the primary part of the discussion to the current issues you see on this slide particularly with respect to the GNSO.

We'll have a question and answer session at the end of our presentations and invite you to in the chat pod over on the right hand side there indicate if there are additional issues you'd like to get some perspective on, updates or status information. We'd be delighted to provide that to you.

We tee off these presentations with the GNSO improvements because the changes to the GNSO processes and operations really impact a wide variety of members of the ICANN community particularly those of you participating in the cross community working groups, those of you who may be participating in a variety of the other working groups that are taking place within the GNSO.

So we try to focus on this at the beginning of the presentation because there's a number of you have observed to me how ICANN works as a community is often as important as many of the issues that you all grapple with.

And so it's quite important from a community perspective that the GNSO be able to operate by maximizing the participation of its various stakeholder groups to make sure that the various processes, in

particular the policy development process, is operating in a predictable manner, that it's effective, that it address the practical concerns of all of you who had many other jobs that you're doing in addition to volunteering and participating in the ICANN work.

And also to make sure that the communications that take place within the GNSO and between the GNSO and other groups and other bodies within ICANN are effective, share the information that's necessary and really work the way that all of you expect.

So since 2007 the GNSO has been working though this improvements process and it's been a long one. A number of you have participated in various aspects of it because it has involved much of the community. And the good news is we're close to conclusion in number of the areas that we've been working on.

There are five main areas of improvements that the GNSO focused on. A number of you have been through reviews in the at large community. You're going through it in the ccNSO community. From the GNSO perspective, there were these five primary areas that I have on this slide.

The real linchpin being a restructuring of the GNSO Council, which took a considerable period of time to bring about. And once that restructuring was completed, the community was really able to focus and begin to generate some tremendously substantive work product in the other four main areas enhancing constituencies. In other words, making sure that there's a level playing field among the different ICANN communities.

Working to revise the policy development process itself to make sure that it worked much more effectively. Adopting a new working group model of policy development that made sure that all members of the ICANN community had a voice in discussion and deliberations. And as I previously noted, improvements to how the GNSO communicates within itself and with other members of the community.

The structure of the GNSO Council generally is reflected in the slide I have posted right now which shows the bilateral approach - bicameral approach, excuse me, between contracted parties and non-contracted parties and more specific layers of gradation within each of the communities particularly in the non-contracted parties house where the commercial stakeholders group and the non-commercial stakeholders group are working. And you see the various constituencies there.

A review of the GNSO Council structure and its history would take a lot more time than we have today. But suffice to say that this structure has now been in place for over a year. And members of the community have been working very hard to make it work. And I think a number would observe that so far so good. It's working quite effectively.

The latest news I have to share in terms of implementation of the GNSO improvements I've broken down into two areas. The first is process development and the next you'll see is structural development. On the process front there's been considerable progress over the last couple of months on the modifications of the policy development process.

And a final report has been generated by the PDP work team in which it recommends 46 areas for improvement and changes to the policy

development process including a new Annex A to the bylaws and a manual that will be used by the Council members of the community for guidance on the policy development process.

There's currently a public comment forum open on these recommendations that you can find at the [icann.org](http://icann.org) public comments page and that's open through the 1st of April. There'll actually be a session in San Francisco on Wednesday that will get into the details of the recommendations and the future that that work team foresees for the policy development process.

There's also been significant progress on the working group guidelines. Our slide says they've been finalized. One of my colleagues pointed out that it's nearly or almost finalized in that the work team and steering committee that had been responsible for putting together those guidelines and their recommendations are doing a final review right now to try to reflect some of the public comments that have come in on that proposal.

And if all goes well and smoothly, we could see the GNSO Council actually reviewing and perhaps adopting these proposed guidelines at its meeting in San Francisco.

Another area where we've had some considerable progress in the last couple of months is on community outreach recommendations. There was a specific work team that was developing that. Their work was focused on developing recommendations for outreach within the GNSO and about GNSO structures and participation.



Those recommendations have been posted for comment. I believe that comment period goes through the 10th of April. And so the folks who have been working on putting that together will be looking for some substantive and robust community comments on those recommendations particularly in the areas of multilingual and translation.

It would be very helpful to have comments from a number of you on this call and for members of your community to help the GNSO develop some really good changes there.

Additionally, because it's such a major process, the GNSO Council is forming a standing committee. Right now there's a team that's drafting up the charter for that group. And that standing committee will go forward to basically monitor and have some oversight about the various implementation efforts, provide guidance to the Council on what's working, what may not be working as effectively and potentially make changes to that.

And then a significant matter that a number of you will be seeing over the course of the coming months is an improved GNSO Web site. Right now the content transfer for that site is under way within the staff. We are having to generate some additional content as you can see from the slide that I'm exhibiting right now.

It reflects a substantially different graphic interface than the existing GNSO Web site. It's structured in a way to not only assist all of those in the community who are familiar with the GNSO but also for newcomers who may, you know, just be learning about the GNSO and wanting to participate more actively.

In terms of structural development, a number of things if you've been observing the public comment page that you have seen or will be seeing shortly are first of all, discussions about the permanent charters of the commercial stakeholders group and the non-commercial stakeholders group.

Both of those groups right now are operating under transitional charters that the Board approved about a year and a half ago. The CSG charter has been through a public comment period. We expect that an NCSG public comment forum will begin shortly.

And so there'll be opportunities for community feedback on those proposals and we would expect that the Board would be able to move forward fairly quickly after those public comment periods are finished.

A new public comment period that opened a couple of weeks ago that goes through the end of this week talks about a new process for constituency recognition within the GNSO.

There's been an existing process for which we've received six proposals from various communities to form new GNSO constituencies that the Board has had some experience now with that process and they've got several modifications and tweaks to that that they hope will improve the process, make it smoother, put more review responsibilities in the stakeholder groups' hands. And so we're looking forward to some good public comments on that process. As I said, that's open through the rest of this week.

As many of you know, there are still two pending constituency proposals within the GNSO for a consumer's constituency and a not for profit organizational concerns constituency. They're operating under the old recognition process. And there may be action on those two proposals in the coming weeks and months.

Finally, we've been working with stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO to develop a toolkit of administrative services and support services. This is part of the goal of enhancing constituencies, leveling the playing field between the various groups. We got a lot of great feedback from members of the community in terms of what they'd like to see, what toolkit menu items that they're looking for staff to provide.

We're already providing some of those and we're looking forward to working with members of the community to clarify areas like Web site support, membership database support and the rest of the coming weeks.

In terms of the San Francisco meeting, I've touched on a number of these items already. There will be a lot of discussion on the various public comments. There's going to be some Board discussion.

We expect depending on how much new gTLD conversations are taking place at the Board level in San Francisco but a lot of good dialog on the various changes and charters and other processes. So a lot of that will be taking place in San Francisco.

There's still an opportunity for many of you to be involved in these processes. As I noted, please look at the ICANN public comment page

on icann.org. We've got a number of open proceedings that we'd like to get input on. When the GNSO Council acts, there will be a set of working group guidelines and for a number of you it may be your first opportunity to actually participate in the policy development process within the GNSO.

So you'll want to familiarize yourself with those guidelines. And the community has asked staff to put together a summary of those guidelines to make it easier for folks to make the transition and participate effectively in those groups.

And of course you can always look to join an existing stakeholder group or constituency or form a new constituency particularly if you're part of the community who's at the point where some more structure and some more support or something that you think you really need.

Finally, we are actively and regularly updating our GNSO improvements Web page at the URL that I've got there on the slide. And that's a good resource for background documents, for the latest proposals and other things. And so we hope you'll take an advantage and take a look at that.

Well I think we've had enough discussion Marika about the hows. It's now time to talk about the whats in terms of policy development. So I'll turn the mike over to you to start some substantive conversations and we'll start off with registration abuse.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Rob. As Rob said we're now going to talk about registration abuse. So the GNSO created a Registration Abuse

Working Group also known as RAP in 2009 to address the issue of registration abuse.

It was noted by some that registries and registrars seemed to lack uniform approaches to deal with registration abuse. But the question was also raised does this actually matter.

Another question that this group was tasked with was to determine what roll ICANN actually had in addressing registration abuse and what issues if any fall within the scope of GNSO policy development.

So the working group itself is not a policy development process working group but its task was to really determine which issues if any will be suitable for GNSO action either in the form of policy development or other steps.

So the working group delivered its final report to the GNSO Council in May of 2010. And the focal point of the report are the 14 recommendations which address a number of issues, amongst others cybersquatting, Whois access and malicious use of domain names, fake renewal notices, uniformity of contracts and collection and dissemination of best practices.

As said before, the working group's task was not to identify, you know, what policies or changes to policy should be made but their task was to identify the appropriate way to address the different issues.

So following the submission of the final report, the GNSO Council decided to create an implementation drafting team which was tasked to develop a recommended approach for the GNSO Council on how to

deal with the whole list of recommendations. And this drafting team presented the Council with a proposed ranking and identified next steps for each of the recommendations to consider.

So following review by the GNSO Council of this proposed approach and ranking, the Council decided to move forward last month on two of the recommendations relating to fake renewal notices and Whois access for which further input from ICANN compliance has been requested.

In addition, it also requested an issue report on the current state of the UDRP, which was one of the working group's recommendations in relation to cybersquatting. And it has requested staff to prepare a discussion paper on non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address abuse of registrations of domain names.

In relation to the request for further information from ICANN compliance staff in relation to Whois access and fake renewal notices, compliance staff actually provided a response to the GNSO Council on the 23rd of February.

And the Council now plans to review this response in further detail and have an exchange of views with ICANN compliance staff at the ICANN meeting in San Francisco. And this exchange of views is currently planned for Saturday from 11:00 to 12:00 for those of you who are interested. And in addition, staff is working on the issue report and a discussion paper.

A first exchange of views on the outline for the issue paper is also planned for San Francisco during the same time slot as I just

mentioned. And going forward the Council will also need to consider how and when to address the other recommendations.

So on this slide you can find a couple of links to the proposed approach by the drafting team as well as a final report. And as mentioned, if you're interested in these issues and want to learn more, you should call it - (monitor) the GNSO Council may be that's where further discussion is likely to occur and attend the session on Saturday where the Council will further discuss the registration abuse policies recommendations.

So next on my list of items is the inter registrar transfer policy. So the inter registrar transfer policy which is also know as IRTP is a consensus - GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 with the objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of its implementation, it was decided to carry out a review of the policy in order to determine whether it was working as intended, whether there were any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvements. It might be worth pointing out as well that this is actually the number one area of complaint when it comes to issues raised with ICANN compliance staff.

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

So the Part B 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 conflict between the registrant and admin contact.

And the working group is reviewing whether separate processes or provisions should be introduced to address such instances. In addition, the group has also been discussing a number of questions that related to the use of registrar lock status.

So the working group published its initial report in May of 2010 in conjunction with opening up a public comment forum. Some of the proposals and initial reports generated significant comments. So as a result of the review of those comments and continued deliberations, the working group decided to modify a number of its recommendations.

And as a result thereof, the working group agreed to publish a proposed final report with an additional opportunity for the community to provide input at prior to finalizing the report for submission to the GNSO Council.

So the report contains nine recommendations which include amongst others recommendations to require a registrar emergency action channel to deal with hijackings, requests for an issue report on thick Whois, a request for an issue report on the change of control function, a proposed modification of denial reason Number 6 and Number 7 of the IRTP and a proposal to clarify Whois status messages in relation to registrar lock status.



So if you would like to learn more details about these recommendations and the others that are contained in the report, I would like to encourage everyone to attend the meeting that the working group is organizing at the ICANN meeting in San Francisco is scheduled for Monday the 14th of March from 11:00 to 12:30 local time.

You're of course also encouraged to submit your comments to the public comment forum, which will remain open until the 31st of March. And following that, the working group will review the comments received and update the report if deemed appropriate and submit it to the GNSO Council for further consideration.

And here you can find some links to further information including the proposed final report and the link to the public comment forum.

So a second GNSO policy development process deals with the post expiration domain name recovery. So this is 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.

But 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 about to expire.

The working group published its initial report in May 2010. The report itself did not include any specific recommendations but provided amongst others an overview of the working group deliberations,

research the working group conducted and a survey that was held amongst the membership.

This report was also put out for public comment and the working group then reviewed the comments received but also continued the deliberations on potential recommendations.

So following that process, the working group has now published a proposed final report for community consideration allowing an additional opportunity to review the recommendations in there before it will finalize its report.

So this report was published on the 21st of February and contains 14 proposed recommendations. And in conjunction with the publication of the report, a public forum was opened that will remain open until the 7th of April.

So to give you an idea of the recommendations in the report and as I mentioned, there are 40 in total just the selections. The working group proposes to provide a minimum of eight days after expiration for renewal by the registrants.

It also proposes to provide all un-sponsored are to - that all un-sponsored gTLDs and registrars must offer the redemption grace period. And those are - 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 registration - upcoming expiration and one notice following expiration.

It also recommends an expiration - once the Web site expires, it must expressly say that the domain and registration has expired and provide instructions on how to redeem the registration. And it encourages the development of educational materials aimed at registrants that explains how to prevent - how unintentional loss of a domain name registration can be prevented.

So if you are interested to learn more details about the recommendations that I just mentioned or the other recommendations in the report, this working group is also organizing a presentation of the report and recommendations in the ICANN meeting in San Francisco. This meeting is scheduled to take place on the Monday, the 14th of March from 4:30 to 6:00 local time.

The forum is open until the 7th of April so you're also encouraged to submit you views there. And following that the working group will review the comments received and attempt to finalize its report for submission to the GNSO Council.

And again here are some further links to the report and the public comments forum. And with that, I'll hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika. I'm going to spend a little bit of time and provide you with an overview of the activity related to the registrar accreditation agreement. We refer to it as the RAA.

The RAA is a standard agreement that all registrars sign with ICANN and the document includes terms and conditions that relates to the registrar business. That document - that contract is rarely updated and was last updated in 2009 around the time of the Mexico City meeting.

And at that time of the amended RAA, there were concerns in the community that the amendments had not gone far enough. And a joint working group, which comprised of members of the GNSO Council and the at large community teamed together to identify additional amendment topics and really take a look at the RAA to see if it could be improved because the RAA does include the registrar sections that affect registrants.

The RAA can serve as an enhancement and allow ICANN to have better compliance tools. And there were concerns that perhaps the RAA could include additional security requirements that would enhance the security and stability of the Internet.

So this working group put together a final report that included two main topics. The first one related to the registrant rights and responsibilities charter which was an idea that originated from the at large community and the idea was that there should be a document that is easily acceptable to registrants that outlines rights and responsibilities that related to the RAA.

And this was viewed as an educational piece that would be helpful for registrants to be able to look at as they try to understand the rights and obligations that they have as a relation to their domain name registration.

The second part of the report identified amendment topics; topics that could be considered for amendments to the RAA. And the working group actually prioritized them into three categories, a high category, medium category and a low category. And this is all information that

you can reach if you look at the URL that I posted here. That's - all this information is included in the final report.

When the working group was doing its work, the working group solicited input from various sources. And one of the inputs into the process was some things that came from the law enforcement community where they felt that the RAA could be enhanced to include additional security protections that would help them with domain related issues.

And in Brussels the Government Advisory Committee, the GAC, endorsed the law enforcement proposals and encouraged ICANN to take a good look at them and to try to include some of the provisions in the RAA.

It's interesting to note that that topic was one of the topics that was explored in the recently concluded meeting between the Government Advisory Committee and the Board in Brussels this week.

If you look at the link that I provided here, you can get more information on the GAC's viewpoints with respect to the law enforcement recommendations. But that is currently a topic that is of concern to the Government Advisory Committee. And in San Francisco you should hear more related to the outcomes of that meeting that took place in Brussels this week.

Staff is currently working on a summary of the issues to try to highlight the differences between the GAC viewpoints and the Board viewpoints with respect to that issue and other issues that were explored in Brussels.

Finally, the GNSO Council has taken some steps with respect to the final report. The GNSO Council did approve the form of the registrant rights and responsibilities charter that I referenced earlier.

And ICANN's registrar liaison team is currently working with the registrars to evaluate the terms of the charter and to eventually implement it so that it will be posted on a link that all registrars could link to and registrars would have access to that information.

The other outstanding item is that the GNSO Council is trying to consider what the next steps are related to taking these amendment topics and producing a new form of RAA. And it is expected the GNSO Council will vote on that over the coming weeks.

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

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much Margie. I'm just going to be giving you a quick update on what to expect in San Francisco on the subject of Whois and in particular Whois studies that have been requested by the GNSO Council. As I'm sure you all know, Whois policy has been debated for many years. There are many different interests and it's very hard to reconcile those in the past.

So the GNSO Council hopes that study data from various studies would provide objective factual basis for further policy making. And they identified several study areas that reflect key policy concerns where they asked staff to determine the cost and the feasibility for doing each of the studies.

So the first part of my update is going to just describe where we stand with those four studies. Staff did use an RFP approach to solicit feasibility and the estimates from independent researchers on these four areas that are listed to the left on the slide you have on the screen.

And on the first one, Whois misuse which is exploring the extent to which publicly Whois data is misused. The Council did decide in September, excuse me, to conduct the study and we are hoping to begin this in earnest in the next couple of weeks.

The remaining three study areas listed on the left, two, three and four, Whois registrant identification; also the study of Whois privacy and proxy abuse where we are looking at comparing a broad sample of proxy and privacy registered domains associated with alleged harmful acts and comparing those with the overall frequency of proxy and privacy registrations more broadly.

And then lastly a Whois study on relay and reveal with regard to proxy and privacy services where we would analyze really a review request set for proxy and privacy registered domains to explore and document how they're processed.

Staff has completed the analysis on the feasibility and cost in all three of those areas and the Council is now going to be discussing which studies to do; whether to do all of the remaining studies, some of the studies or perhaps none of those remaining studies.

At this time there's been no specific motion introduced. The deadline is the 8th of the month. So we - but we do expect for them to - for there to be some discussion of these studies in San Francisco.

And for more information on the status of the studies and the work that's been done, some of the details associated with what's envisioned on each of the studies, all the information I've covered and more is on that link that I provided.

And then I also wanted to highlight two other activities in San Francisco related to Whois. The first reference there is a workshop continuation of a discussion that was first launched in Cartagena on the technical evolution of Whois.

This discussion will be local time 4:30 to 6:00 on Wednesday and will really be a technical discussion of the current Whois protocol and other protocols that have been discussed as possible replacements to the current protocols, the Internet registry information service protocol or IRIS and also restful Web based potential protocol.

And then secondly another session that will be held in San Francisco is an update on the interim report of the SSAC GNSO Working Group that's looking at the feasibility of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data. And that working group update will be Thursday at 9:00 am local time. And you'll see the references for those two activities there on the slide.

So now I'm going to turn it - back to Margie and she'll be covering a couple of other issues for you to note. Thank you.



Margie Milam: Thank you Liz. There's just a couple issues that I'd like to highlight as these have been topics that have been heavily analyzed in the GNSO Council over the last year. But a lot of the work related to these topics has concluded at the GNSO Council level and is now being focused on - with respect to the new gTLD program by the Board.

And those relates to the vertical integration issue and the morality and public order objections. And the vertical integration issue is the issue of whether there should be a policy related to whether a registrar can own a registry or vice versa and whether there should be any rules that relates to situations when there is a cross ownership between the registrars and the registries.

And at the GNSO Council last year, there was a policy development process, a PDP, conducted throughout the year to try to see whether there could be recommendations with respect to this topic. After a lot of intense work in the community, it turned out that the working group was unable to reach consensus and the PDP was terminated in Cartagena.

So that the ICANN Board adopted a resolution essentially allowing cross ownerships between registrars and registries for the new gTLD program. And this is a topic that was explored in the GAC Board consultations that took place this week in Brussels and is expected that there'll be some information provided related to this topic when documents are released by staff summarizing the outcome of that meeting.

The other issue is the issue of morality and public order objections and how to deal with them in connection with the new gTLD process. And

again, this was an issue that was explored through a (clock) community group involving the GNSO Council, the at large community and the Government Advisory Committee.

And the working group had published a report in December with recommendations on how to improve the implementability of a recommendation that came from the GNSO Council related to how to deal with morality and public order objections.

And this topic was also of keen interest to the Government Advisory Committee and this was a topic that was explored this week in Brussels because governments wanted to understand how they could bring objections that relates to public order and objections.

And so if you have an interest in any of these topics, you should participate in some of the new gTLD sessions that are scheduled in San Francisco and you'll hear the latest of thinking on these topics.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Bart who will talk to you about ccNSO policy issues.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Margie. I hope you can hear me. Welcome to this part of the Webinar on the sum of the topics which are currently discussed and will be drive the agenda of the ccNSO over the next couple of weeks and months. And I've picked out two of them, which mainly will impact policies or are policy driven.

The first one is a new working group, which will start hopefully at the San Francisco Silicon Valley meeting. That's a study group on the use

of country names. This time the ccNSO Council wanted to establish a study group which is a little bit different from a working group.

The study group is a very, very lightweight structure and it is mainly - it's main goal is to review existing policies and come up with some smart recommendations. But I'll highlight this part of the study group.

The current, excuse me, current status of that working group is that the statement and purpose - statement of purpose and scope of activities has been adopted by the ccNSO Council. We have currently a call of volunteers. The call for volunteers from the ccNSO side has been concluded.

The ccNSO Council appointed its members to the working group and the GNSO, GAC and ALAC are invited to appoint members and liaisons to this working group as well. And as soon as we got the volunteers - the names of the volunteers, the working group can start. And we hope it will have its first face-to-face meeting in San Francisco.

Now a bit on the purpose and scope of this working group; so scope of activities. It is - the goal is that it will provide an overview of the current and proposed, so the future policies relating to the allocation and delegation of TLD strings which are contained or are associated with the name of a country or territory.

So this could be for example - which is very clear that new gTLD process or policy as a future policy, the overall idea on ccPDP policy but also the Fast Track and the current policy for the delegation of ccTLDs. So it's to provide the allocation mechanisms according to

these - and overview of the allocation mechanism according to these policies.

Secondly it is - it's one of the goals is to try to create a topology or categorizations of the different types of country and territory names. Say under the Fast Track for instance, the requirement is that the string needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of a country in a official language of that country or territory.

So that's a very narrowed down definition say at least conceptually from the names of country and territories. What its impact is is another story. But for instance, under the overall IDN ccTLD policy, this is already changed a little. So you'll have some country names which either are Fast Track country names or overall policy country names, which might be different. And the working group is - has to look into this and try to categorize them.

Another example for this one and unfortunately (and not) for most of you so therefore I know my examples will be a bit biased to the Netherlands is for instance (Doc Holland). Can you consider this a meaningful representation of the Netherlands or not? Some would argue for it and some will argue against it.

The same is, and this is again a yeah, I think a very clear example is for instance if you take the official name for Belgium, it can be Belgian so that's in German, Belgique in French or Belgie in Dutch. And Belgie in Dutch would be according to the overall IDN policy could be treated as an IDN ccTLD.

But at the same time Belgique or Belgian would be just a name. And you can see already depending on the type of rules you apply that say the representation of a country name would fall either under the IDN ccTLD policy, under the Fast Track policy or just under the new gTLD policy or maybe under all of them.

So it is clarifying this say the application of the policies to the different categories of country names, which is say one of the underlying purposes of the working group. And if appropriate, once this is done say identify issues arising out of this qualification and if appropriate come up with, you know recommendations to resolve it.

And these recommendations will be very -- that's the basic idea -- will be very high level. So example of such an action could be launch a ccPDP or another type of action is advise to reserve territory names under the IDN ccPDP or any other type of action. But very, very high level and not to resolve the individual issues. So this will - yeah hopefully will be concluded in a few months.

Background of this study group is the debate going on under the gTLD process regarding the use of country and territory names and it has been going on for a long time. And the second one is that - and that is probably the main reason why the ccNSO Council decided a resolve to establish this working group. The IDN ccPDP itself. So on the selection of IDN ccTLDs is limited and does not address all types and categories of use of country names.

So this will start hopefully at the San Francisco meeting and will drive the agenda of the ccNSO and the others - and the GAC, GNSO and ALAC volunteers for quite some time for a couple of months.

A second topic, which is reaching its conclusion now is the Delegation, Redelegation, Retirement of ccTLDs Working Group. Again purpose and scope of this working group is advise the ccNSO Council to launch a PDP or not and report on issues and consider possible solutions.

Please note that although associated with delegation, redelegation and retirement issues, the (yaha) functions contract between ICANN and the USG is out of scope of this working group. They - so that is not considered policy.

Current status. The working group has published its final report and it will be followed by an updated full report on the full areas that have been identified by the working group. These full reports are very detailed, fact finding of - yeah, reflect the fact finding mission of this working group. And they are about 80 or 90 pages long, each of them.

The final report is I think if you're interested in the topic worth reading. It's about ten pages, the substance of it. And the final report, as you can see, refers to the full reports as a basis for the next steps.

So next step is for the DRD. Submit the final report to the Council and after submission the DRD Working Group will be closed and the ccNSO will decide on next steps.

Now what has the DRD done over the past 1-1/2 years? It started in around Sydney meeting, so in 2000 - June 2009. First of all it has identified some key issues.

The two main ones are that - and that was the starting point for the activities of the working group is that there is no authoritative policy document available. Nor is a publicly available documentation of the current practices and procedures relating the delegation, redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

Now with this as a starting point, the working group went over all the IANA reports and the report decisions, the ICANN Board decisions, relating to the delegation, redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs and tried to identify some general specific issues and findings.

These findings are listed in the full report and the final report. The full report is more or less a high level summary of the individual reports. And as you note, say there are specific and general findings relating to delegation, redelegation and specific issues relating to retirement.

The working group has distinguished between these two areas. That is because the recommendations to the ccNSO Council are different relating to these processes.

The working group will advise the ccNSO to undertake a ccPDP on the development of a policy for the retirement of the ccTLDs and retirement is - of ccTLDs means in fact removal from the root.

And the recommendations we got in the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs is - first step is develop what is now called a framework of interpretation of the policy statements that have been identified and the policy statements are first of all, (ROC 5921) which dates back to the early 90s and - or mid 90s, excuse me.

And the second one is - main one is the GAC principles adopted for the delegation of ccTLDs which was adopted by the GAC in 2005 but never been - which are relevant for the delegation, redelegation but it's status with regard to the - from an ICANN Board perspective at least from the - that's the idea of the Delegation Working Group is unclear.

So the framework is to try to resolve some of the issues identified with regard to the different interpretation and the interpretation over time of these two main policy statements. If the framework of interpretation will fail, the ccNSO is advised to launch a PDP.

Some working group also advised and has some views on these - on its recommendations. First of all, regarding to the framework of interpretation. It is the understanding of the working group and it has - will advise the ccNSO Council to use ccNSO Working Group mechanisms to initiate this work and to develop the framework of interpretation.

This will mean it will include members and non-members of the ccNSO. But the GAC will also be invited to participate in that working group given the importance of delegation, redelegation of ccTLDs to individual GAC members.

Secondly is the priority of the work of the ccNSO. And the ccNSO should focus on the development of the framework of interpretation. Although retirement is important, framework of delegation and redelegation occurs many, many, many more times than retirement and so therefore it's important.



I've already discussed the goals of the FOI and the PDP. And what is also important to keep in mind, the recommendations in particularly with the coming out of the framework of interpretation are also relevant for the delegation of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track and in future under the overall policy because both the Fast Track and the policy are and will be build upon the current delegation and redelegation practices.

Just some other issues that will be discussed at the San Francisco meeting; first of all the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group. We're still in the process of appointing members both to the ccNSO and the GNSO. Hopefully that process will be concluded by San Francisco. So this working group will have its first face-to-face meeting in San Francisco.

Second topic that will be initiated and will get some traction in San Francisco is the activities of what is called the ccNSO Finance Working Group. Its purpose is to review financial contributions of the ccTLD community to ICANN's cost of operation.

First topic is to understand main steps of that process are, understand allocation of cost of ccTLDs. So allocation of the ICANN expenses to ccTLDs. And based on that understanding, develop a model for fair and equitable contribution to ICANN's cost of operations.

And finally I just want to - just as a showcase how the ccNSO works. I want to highlight the creation yet another working group that was established - initiated at the ccNSO Council call last week. That's the Incident Response Implementation Working Group.

This working group will take - build upon the recommendations of what was called the Incident Response Planning Working Group and that was one of the recommendations or main recommendations was to create a repository of contact details.

And this working group will look into say the more practical aspects of these recommendations whether it should be - yeah, whether you should - the cc and the cc of the community should apply or seek an external provider so that's more the buy decision or have it create by themselves.

The question is who needs to operate such a contact list and repository and who should maintain that repository. And very important as well, how should say the creation, operation and maintenance of other repository and contact lists be funded?

That's all for me. I want to hand it over now to Olof. Olof, over to you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and hello everybody. So it's time for the ASO and well that stands for Address Supporting Organization. And with that, we approach the (re-arm) of policy development for numbers meaning IP addresses, IPv4, R36 and (unintelligible) the system numbers.

But ASO is perhaps the least well known of the ICANN supporting organizations. This serves a little bit of a background. It's all happening in the RIRs. And what's that then you may ask. It's a Regional Internet Registry. Those are the organizations. (I wrote them) one in Africa, AfriNIC; on in Asia Pacific, APNIC; one in North America, ARIN; one in Latin America, LACNIC; and one in Europe, RIPE.

Those are the organizations that receive huge chunks of address space from the IANA function in ICANN and in turn hand over smaller address chunks to your favorite Internet service provider which in turn serves you Internet addresses so you can access the Internet. Very useful.

Now those five RIRs as they're called, they also cooperate through an over bridging organization called the NRO or the Number Resource Organization. And that brings us to what is the ASO actually.

Now the Address Supporting Organization was set up through an MOU, memorandum of understanding between ICANN and the NRO and in fact all the five RIRs as well. And from that perspective, that is one could say an alias to - of the NRO seen from an ICANN perspective or the bridge between ICANN and a centric fashion and the (Addison) community in a wider sense.

Now the ASO has one particular task of major importance when it comes to policy development and that is to have the so-called global policy proposals. Very grand name of course, global policy proposals. And what does that mean?

Well, it is - has a very particular meaning because the RIRs develop many regional addressing policies on how to allocate the address chunks and the AS numbers to the ISPs. But a few of those do affect the IANA allocations and only those are called global policies. So it has a very, very narrow meaning global policy proposals from that perspective.

And well, what's happening on that front right now? Well there is one global policy proposal in pipeline. And you may be well aware that we have just run out of IPv4 address space in the IANA function. That was pretty well covered by the media about a month ago. And here we go. We have a policy proposal to handle recovered IPv4 address space post exhaustion. And we'll have a closer look on that one.

Now as a background, IPv4 policy and the global policy it only allows the IANA to hand out really huge chunks, so called slash 8s, 16 million IPv4 addresses through the RIRs. Nothing more, nothing less. So it has to be units of so-called slash 8s. And this policy proposal would enable IANA to take care of recovered IPv4 address space return to it from the RIRs and allocate smaller blocks than the slash 8.

So it's really potentially very, very useful because if there's anything handed back, it won't be bigger than slash 8; probably substantially smaller and well, IANA needs - the IANA function needs a way to deal with that and to allocate smaller pieces.

Now the current status of this proposal is that it has been introduced in all the RIRs. That's where the policy development and policy discussions take place; even been adopted in ARIN meaning North America RIR and it remains in discussion in the other RIRs.

It - there is a twist to the tale though because if you attended previous Webinars some time ago, you've already heard this before. There was a proposal once but it ended up in deadlock since two version and different in small but important aspects were adopted in different RIRs leading to a situation where the NRO (accepted) Council finally

decided to abandon the proposal. And essentially this one can be seen as replacing those versions.

But there is an additional twist to the tale because recently another policy proposal for the same purpose has been introduced in the RIRs. So we do have all over again two competing proposals. So this should become really interesting in the months to come.

So if you're now duly interested, how do you get involved? Well, there's a simple rule for all addressing policies. The policy development takes place in the RIRs and well, you can very easily participate in the bottom up policy development in your Regional Internet Registry, the one closest to you, and in fact in any Regional Internet Registry. You're all welcome.

They conduct open meetings to develop the policy proposals and to adopt them. And they have open mailing lists for those as well. So if - you're very, very welcome to attend those.

But if you want a real overview or not only what's happening on the global policy development - global policy proposal development but also in the regional policy proposal development, well, there is an ASO session on Wednesday afternoon in San Francisco. And they will all be there and present their current policy work. So don't miss that one if you're the least interested in all this.

And with that, I conclude my little part in this and thank you for your attention and hand over to Marika who will tell you how to stay updated in a much wider sense. Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Olof. And now it's time for everyone to start thinking of their questions for us as we're nearing the end of the presentation. And feel free to post your questions in the chat or start raising your hand because we'll soon start un-muting the lines so you can speak up as well.

So very briefly on other ways to stay updated with policy activities and other ICANN related efforts. So first of all we have a monthly policy update and in that we try to cover the different activities of the supporting organizations but also the advisory committees.

Those who are interested in staying up to date and receive this on a monthly basis, you can sign up at the link that's provided here. It's also provided in translated version and in the five UN languages. So a lot of information in there on a monthly basis and you can review it at your leisure.

Rob already spoke about this earlier. We're also trying to enhance our different Web sites. You might have noticed that recently a new and improved Web site has been launched for the ccNSO. We hope to launch shortly the new site for the GNSO, which is currently under construction.

And some of you might already be familiar with the new community collaboration tool that we have which is called a Wiki. And the At Large organization has already transferred to that new system and they will already be familiar with that. Some other communities are slowly transitioning there. It's a different workspace where people can collaborate online and work on documents and text together.

Several training sessions will be provided in San Francisco. So for those interested in learning more about that tool, you're encouraged to attend one of those meetings. And they're also in the process of redesigning the name icann.org Web site. So more news on that will follow hopefully shortly.

So just to briefly mention and, you know, we have a few of us on today's call but we're many more in many different regions and parts of the world supporting the different structures within ICANN. So here you see a few of us listed.

And as Dave already mentioned in the beginning of this presentation, if you have any questions for us, not today, but maybe at a later point in time, you can always contact us by email at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

So with that, I would like to ask the operator to un-mute the lines and people should feel free to pose their questions.

I'm hearing silence. I hope that means that we've explained this all very well or it just might mean that we've put everyone to sleep.

Woman: I think we're asleep.

Marika Konings: Good. I hear Cheryl. Sebastien, you have your hand raised. Go ahead please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah. Maybe it would be interesting to have some information about (ground) schedules for the new gTLD meeting strings as - the ICANN San Francisco link in addition to all the meetings you already talk about. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you Sebastien for the question. I would love to be able to tell you about that but that doesn't fall within our scope of responsibility, as we are very focused on the policy activities. So I would encourage everyone to look at the San Francisco schedule. I think there are a bunch of meetings that are taking place on the Monday. And I think there will be a GAC for consultation addressing new gTLD issues on Thursday, possibly also on Tuesday.

And I know a lot of those meetings are still being scheduled. So the best source of information for that is the San Francisco meeting schedule and I'll post a link (unintelligible) so everyone can have a look there and keep an eye on that, so. I'm sorry not being able to provide you with more details on that.

Are there any other questions? (Krista), please go ahead.

(Krista): Hi Marika. Thanks. I'm just back to - this might be a question for Rob. The discussion on the ccNSO Standing Committee and it's still being decided who's going to participate in that and how that's going to work. Is there - how are we deciding - are we working - let me start over.

Is the decision to have a certain limited number of people on that and how is that coming together - being determined?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Rob actually had to leave the call but I can answer that question. Currently there is a Standing Committee Drafting Team that has been tasked to develop a charter. And that Drafting Team is actually looking at those specific questions and be - how should that Standing Committee be structured? Should there be a limitation to the



number of representatives that can participate in that or should it be open? Should there be observers?

So if you're interested in that issue, that Drafting Team has actually just started and, you know, would still welcome volunteers. So you're more than happy to join that group. It's - the current Chair is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and there's a small group of volunteers that's looking at the different questions also relating to how should such a Standing Committee take decisions.

How should issues be raised? Can they - should they be doing the work themselves if they've identified issues or should it be chartering different work teams that then address certain issues. So there's still a whole lot of questions that this group will need to consider.

And following that, once they've developed the charter, they will take that proposal back to the GNSO Council for its consideration and, you know, for hopefully a vote on the charter. And after that then, you know, call the volunteers or appoint them depending on what structures is chose will go out.

(Krista):           Okay.

Marika Konings: Does that answer your question?

(Krista):           Yes it does. Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Any other questions?

(Kris), I presume your hand is still up from the previous question or you have another question.

(Krista): Sorry about that. I'll take it down.

Marika Konings: No problem.

So if there are no further questions, I think the only thing needs to be done is to thank you all very much for participating and attending this Webinar. Looking forward to seeing you all in San Francisco or at the next Webinar, which we will be planning for the next ICANN meeting.

So with that, I'll say good night, good evening, good afternoon, good morning wherever you are and see you soon.

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: Thanks for participation in today's conference. You may now disconnect.

END