

**Pre-Dakar ICANN Policy Update  
WEBINAR  
13 October 2011 at 12:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 13 October 2011 at 12:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-update-webinar-1-20111013-en.mp3>

on page:

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

David Olive: Thank you. Welcome to ICANN's Policy Update Webinar. My name is David Olive and I'm Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN.

This is the Policy Team's regularly scheduled event prior to an ICANN meeting, and we hope to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities so that we can prepare and focus our efforts as we go into the ICANN sessions in Dakar.

The Policy Team will be very active supporting the various Support Organizations and Advisory Groups in their work in Dakar, and we will also focus attention on newcomers to the ICANN meeting, providing an introduction then to how policy development takes place and how one can get involved and participate.

As you can see there will be a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and recording will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the detailed information at a time of your choice.

Just a few housekeeping matters - if you see right under the slide presentation there is a note box that talks about various ways to work with the Adobe Connect.

To reduce interference we will mute the lines, but there will be an opportunity for you to ask questions at the end of the session where we'll then unmute those lines, and of course you can use the chat to post questions.

We also remind you to turn the sound on your computers down or off so that it'll be easier for everyone to hear the presenters. Again you'll have an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the meeting as well, but if you submit them in the chat box we'll also attempt to answer them either by the presenter or through the chat format.

In terms of moving to the ICANN meeting in Dakar, many of you are planning to participate in the Dakar meeting either in person or remotely. And for those who will be participating remotely, special attention has been paid to enhancing that remote participation.

Further details of the services provided are available on the ICANN Web site with meetings, and there's a special page on remote participation. The highlights of the Dakar meeting are as follows: you see on the screen.

Of course we'll again have Newcomers Track program. There'll be further discussions and briefings on the New gTLD program. There'll be a focus on security and stability with DNSSEC, various meetings there including of course an - seminar on the abuse of the DNS.

Other topics either through Working Groups or through other sessions will be reviewing domain name issues, dispute settlement mechanisms like UDRP, progress on the WHOIS enhancements and the latest rules for interregister transfers.

And our presenters will be talking about many of these issues, and there will be usually sessions or forums linked to them in Dakar. On to the policy development at ICANN, the focus of this presentation is on our support for the policy development.

And as most of you are aware the following bodies are responsible for such program development: the Generic Names Supporting Organization develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top-level domains; the Country Code Supporting Organization, which has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to country code top-level domains; and the Address Supporting Organization reviews and develops recommendations on IP protocol address policies.

In addition to these Supporting Organizations, advice is provided at ICANN through the Advisory Committees and you see the listing of these here. And there are a number of them that do provide advice to the ICANN Board, and they will also be meeting in Dakar at the sessions.

The next few slides talk about an overview of topics covered for this particular session. It might be worth pointing out that this is just a highlighting of the activities going on at the different Supporting Organizations.

And of course further details and information - please check on the SO Web sites or the ICANN Web site in general for more additional information. And with that we go to our first presenter talking about the work and activities of the GNSO.

I now turn it over to my colleagues. Thank you for listening and welcome again.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you David. Greetings everyone. This is Rob Hoggarth. I'm the Senior Policy Director on the Policy Team at ICANN. We're going to start off with a

review of the current issues being discussed in the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

There are over 20 projects that the GNSO Council currently has under its management function, and what we've tried to do for the presentation today is to select several of those issues with the broadest implications and interest for members of the ICANN community that are going to be subjects of discussions in Dakar.

You see a list of those here. David's reviewed some of the - some of my colleagues and myself who are going to be going over these issues. The one I'm going to focus on first is geographic regions review.

We've had a consistent sort of movement over the last several years within the policy development arena where we've seen many more issues in which the community engages in cross community collaboration on a variety of issues, particularly ones that have broader implications beyond just the GNSO.

And the geographic regions effort is a really good example of that. As many of you may know one of the fundamental principles of ICANN's existence is to provide the opportunity for all members of the Internet community to participate in the policy development effort, and geographic diversity is a key component of that.

Presently the ICANN Bylaws define geographic regions and create five separate ones across the globe. It's important issue for us because as part of the ongoing review of ICANN's various processes, the review of the geographic regions concept is anticipated in the Bylaws.

There was a recognition from the founders that it was important to revisit some of these allocations, revisit some of these processes that ICANN has built on on a regular basis to ensure that they continue to be valid, that they

continue to be applied in the - in an appropriate manner and that they meet the needs of the community.

So in terms of the history of this effort, the ccNSO Council came to the Board in 2007 and said, "It's been a long period of time since the geographic regions concept was reviewed, so let's get started."

And the Board agreed on that and established a Working Group whose charter was approved just about two years ago. And in the intervening time a Working Group comprised of members of the ASO, NRO, members of the At-Large community, the GNSO and the ccNSO have collaborated on the fundamental research to review the history of the geographic regions concept.

They've looked very closely at how the concept of geographic diversity is being applied throughout ICANN from the Board right on down to various Working Groups and different structures within the various ICANN organizations.

And they are very close to providing final recommendations now to the ICANN Board of Directors. What they've essentially said in their draft Final Report, which is now published for community comments on the ICANN Web site, is that they've recommended that ICANN adopt its own independent standard for geographic diversity.

And they are recommending that the Board look more broadly at the concept of geographic diversity to also incorporate the concepts of cultural diversity, as well as language diversity and also noting that there are other types of diversity based on geography or economies or the rest that are very important for ICANN to consider.

They've - their preliminary recommendation suggests in the draft document that the Board look at the Regional Internet Registry System for dividing the

world as a foundation for the ICANN framework of diversity, but with a very, very important critical element.

And that's essentially to permit individual communities and structures within ICANN to have the option to either adopt the recommended RIR structure or to develop their own procedures, and to be able to explore and investigate many different opportunities for cultural and language diversity within their communities.

So the recommendations that the Group has made are in draft form on the public comment page of the ICANN Web site. That forum is going to be open for community comments through mid-December.

The primary reason for that is to give the community ample opportunity when we gather in Dakar in several weeks to have some discussions on this topic.

The Working Group's actually going to be having an open public session and workshop on Thursday in Dakar that'll be open for all the in-person participants in Dakar as well as remote participants, and the hope and expectation is that once the comment period is completed the Working Group will be in a position to review the comments, make potential adjustments to its recommendations and publish its final formal report early next year.

We raised the issue on this Webinar because although it's been a 2-1/2 year process now, now that we're in the final recommendation phase it's really important as been expressed by members of the Working Group to make sure that the community is aware that this is coming to a close.

As part of its charter the expectation is that all of the ICANN community Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees will have a formal opportunity to comment on the recommendations of the Working Group.

And after a presentation to the Board in mid-2012 I would expect the timetable to be a Board review and action and potential changes to the framework late next year.

So we wanted to alert you all to this because it's going to have implications potentially throughout the ICANN community - has some very important fundamental principles that go back to the founding of ICANN, and something that we hope a number of you will either submit comments or share your points of view within your own communities in the coming weeks and months.

I'm going to stop there and turn things over to Marika Konings. Marika, it's over to you. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you very much Rob. Hello everyone, and my name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director. I'm based in the Brussels office of ICANN and together with several other colleagues responsible for supporting the GNSO and its policy development activities.

So the first topic on the list of items I'll be talking about is a new GNSO policy development process or also known as PDP. This is actually one of the last elements of the GNSO improvements project, which started back in 2008.

An objective of developing a new PDP was to ensure that the Working Group model will be incorporated, which is now the standard approach for developing policies in the GNSO, compared to the previous use of Task Forces.

In addition the new PDP would need to be responsive to ICANN's policy development needs, meaning that it should allow for sufficient flexibility, to allow for a robust and bottom up policy development, in addition to ensuring that those issues that are raised for policy development are well scoped and narrowly focused to ensure effective and implementable outcomes.

So the Policy Development Process Work Team, which has been tasked with developing this new policy development process, has now submitted its updated Final Report to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

The report itself contains 48 recommendations, a proposed new Annex A which is to replace the existing Annex A in the ICANN Bylaws that describes the GNSO policy development process, and the proposed PDP Manual.

Some of the examples of the recommendations in the report are a recommendation to standardize the request for an Issue Report by using a template, which needs to be completed by the requesting party with the objective of obtaining as much information concerning the issue as possible at the start of the process, publishing a preliminary Issue Report for public comment followed by a final Issue Report, which is then considered by the GNSO Council to allow for community input on the information included in the preliminary report and then - and allow for any correcting and/or additions to ensure that all elements are covered and allow the GNSO Council to make an informed decision on whether or not to initiate a policy development process.

Another recommendation - to ensure sufficient time to obtain community input by requiring a minimum of 30 days of public comment on the preliminary Issue Report and the Working Group's initial report.

There's a recommendation to ensure that the - that there's a review of the Council report to the Board prior to submission of that report to the Board by the GNSO Council or the Working Group, and using Implementation Review Teams to assist Staff in development of the implementation plan once a policy has been adopted.

And these are just a couple of examples of the recommendations that are contained in the report. So the GNSO Council is now expected to consider adopting the updated Final Report at its meeting in Dakar, and once

approved a public comment forum will open before the Board will consider these recommendations for adoption.

So this is just some additional information. It just refers as well back to the geographic regions that Rob was talking about before, and you'll find here the updated final - link to the updated Final Report.

And if you're more interested to learn about the GNSO improvements in general, there's also a link to the page where you can find further information on that effort.

So the next issue on my list is the interregister transfer policy, also known as IRTP. So the IRTP is a 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, or whether there are any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvement.

It might be worth pointing out that this is actually the number one area of complaints when it comes to issues raised with the - ICANN's Compliance Department.

And as a result of that review a number of issues were identified and then grouped together in five different policy development processes or PDPs that were titled A to E, which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

And then the next few slides I'll just give you a brief overview of the status of the different projects that relate to this issue. So the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group was tasked to address a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain name registration that has been inappropriately

transferred, as well as a number of questions relating to the use of Registrar lock status.

The Working Group submitted its Final Report and that Final Report and recommendations were adopted by the GNSO Council in June 2011, and subsequently by the ICANN Board in August of this year.

So two of the recommendations actually requested Staff proposals, and those related to a new provision to address locking and unlocking of domain names and clarifying WHOIS status messages in relation to Registrar lock status.

In this regard draft proposals are currently under discussion with the IRTP Part B Working Group, and we actually hope to publish the final versions of these proposals for public comment shortly before submitting these to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

The other recommendations are in the process of being implemented including a - the provision of a transfer emergency action contact, which requires Registrars to respond to the request of another Registrar in the case of an emergency such as hijacking within four hours.

And an update on the status of implementation will be provided at the ICANN meeting in Dakar. You know, we'll give some further details on that in a little bit.

So in addition the GNSO Council has now initiated a policy development process on the third PDP in this series titled the IRTP Part C, which will address three issues, namely the first, whether there is a need to define the term change of control and how this relates to existing reasons for denials of a transfer, a second issue related to whether forms of authorization requesting a transfer should be time limited, and the third issue in this PDP area relates to whether there should be a requirement for Registries to use IANA IDs for Registrars.

So this Working Group is actually in the process of being formed and volunteers are invited to join. So for more information you'll see here a link to the call for volunteers, and if you're interested we'd like to encourage you to have a look at that and contact the GNSO Secretariat if you would like to volunteer your time.

So then one of the recommendations that has been adopted by the GNSO Council that came from the IRTP Part B Working Group relates to an Issue Report on the requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs.

And the objective of the issue paper is to not only consider thick WHOIS in the context of IRTP, but also consider any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur outside of IRTP that would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs would be desirable or not.

The ICANN Staff will be working on this Issue Report and we expect to publish it before public comment before submitting it to the GNSO Council, and the timing of this will still need to be confirmed.

So how can you get involved if you're interested in transfer related issues? As I said the call for volunteers for the IRTP Part C Working Group is open and meetings are planned to kick off on the 8th of November, so you still have time to sign up.

And if you're interested to hear more about these issues, you know, please attend the IRTP update that's scheduled to take place at the ICANN meeting in Dakar on the Thursday, 27th of October from 10:00 to 11:30 Local Time.

And on the next slide you'll find some links to some of the reports I mentioned where you can read up on these issues. So the next item on my list is the

GNSO policy development process that has dealt with post-expiration domain name recovery.

This is an issue that was originally 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.

The Working Group that was created to address these questions delivered its Final Report to the GNSO Council in June of this year. And as a result the GNSO Council adopted the Final Report, and a subsequent public comment forum was opened to allow for community comments before the ICANN Board is to consider the recommendations, and the Board is expected to do so at this meeting in Dakar.

In general the recommendations that have been put forward are expected to provide additional guarantees to Registrants, improve Registrant education, but are also considered to be in line with existing practices.

So just to give you an idea of some of the recommendations that are to be considered by the ICANN Board, you'll find those listed here. These include providing a minimum of eight days following expiration during which the registration can be renewed by the original Registrant.

The redemption grace period or RGP should become a consensus policy for all unsponsored gTLDs and Registrars offering registrations in those unsponsored gTLDs.

The fees charged for renewal must be clearly posted and communicated at the time of registration. At least two notices need to be sent to the Registrant at set times to warn the Registrant about the upcoming registration expiration, and one note is - following expiration needs to be sent.

Some of the other recommendations include that the expired registration's Web site must explicitly say that the domain name registration has expired, and provide instructions on how to redeem the registration.

It's talking about encouraging the development of a - educational materials aimed at educating Registrants and explaining how to prevent unintentional loss of a domain name registration.

There are a number of best practices recommendations contained in the report that outline certain approaches that might prevent unintentional loss, for example by providing guidance on how Registrants can ensure that notices are received.

And it's recommended that regular updates on the effectiveness and status of implementation of the recommendations is provided following approval on implementation.

As said before the Board is expected to consider these recommendations for adoption at its meeting in Dakar, and if adopted as said the recommendations also call for the creation of an Implementation Review Team, which will be tasked to assist ICANN Staff in development of an implementation plan.

And then again on this slide you can find a link to the Final Report of the post-expiration domain name recovery Working Group in which you can find further details on the different recommendations and background.

And for those of you already tired of hearing me speak, you'll be glad to know that this is the last topic I'll be talking about to you, which is the discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to address the abuse of registration of domain names.

So this is a project that stems from one of the recommendations of the registration abuse policy's Working Group that delivered its Final Report to the GNSO Council in May of 2010.

One of the recommendations in that report stated that non-binding best practices to help Registrars and Registries address the illicit use of domain names should be developed.

In addition to that the Working Group provided a list of subjects that should be considered as part of such an effort, and the Council acted on this recommendation by requesting that ICANN Staff produce a discussion paper to explore this issue in further detail.

So in order to obtain community input on this topic, Staff organized a workshop at the ICANN meeting in Singapore. And based on the input we received there and Staff research and discussions, we finalized the discussion paper and submitted that to the GNSO Council last month.

So the GNSO Council is expected to consider the paper and next steps, which may include the opening of a public comment period at its meeting in Dakar. So this is to very briefly give you an idea of the issues that the discussion paper covers such as a scope, how does this fit with ICANN's mission and the role of the GNSO.

It also outlines issues that will need further consideration in the context of this effort, such as what makes a practice a best practice? Is there a need to create new ones or is it more a question of finding those practices that may qualify for best practices?

What is meant with non-binding? What should ICANN's role be in this process? What are the resources required and which processes should be followed?

How should you deal with the maintenance, review, promotion and dissemination of best practices, and how to consider costs, benefits, funding and incentives for the adoption of best practices?

So in short there are a lot of issues that will require further discussion if this - if or when this effort goes forward - further. So in addition to a paper it also includes an inventory of current practices which may be considered as best practices once the appropriate framework will have been established.

And the paper also proposes two next - main next steps first of all, which is the creation of a GNSO Working Group to develop a proposal for a framework for best practices, and secondly the creation of a cross community technical group, which would work on proposing candidate best practices to address the abuse of registration of domain names.

But as mentioned the GNSO Council is expected to discuss the paper and possible next steps at its meeting on Saturday. In addition a workshop has been planned for Wednesday, the 26th of October from 9:00 to 10:30 Local Time in Dakar, during which a paper will be presented in greater detail with an opportunity to ask questions or make comments. And again, here you'll find the link to several of the papers and background papers that provide further information on the issues. And with that I'll hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you very much Marika. Hello everyone. I'm Margie Milam. I'm a senior policy counselor with the ICANN policy team. And I'm going to be spending a few minutes to talk to you about the final issue report that was published on the current state of the UDRP, the uniform domain dispute resolution process.

With respect to the background, the GNSO council asks that an issue report be drafted on the current state of the UDRP. And as this process was initiated back in February of this year, the council suggested that we adopt the new

PDP approach, the approach that Marika was just talking about with respect to how the new policy development process should proceed.

And essentially the approach that we took with that was to publish a preliminary issue report prior to the Singapore meeting. We opened it up for public comment during May and July of this year and receive extensive comments on this topic.

This topic is clearly something that the community has a lot of interest in and with that, we took that information and included it in the final issue report that was published prior to the (car).

And at this time, the GNSO council will be deciding whether or not it intends to initiate a policy development process on the UDRP in the (car). So essentially staff was asked to describe the current state of the UDRP. As the UDRP has been in place for over ten years, it's widely recognized as a success.

It's one of those policies that came from ICANN's formative years and it's been widely recognized as a successful approach to dealing with the disputes related to trademark infringement of domain names.

And although it's recognized that it's not perfect, it certainly is seen as a viable alternative to costly litigation. If you think about what it was like to deal with trademark infringement and domain names before the UDRP was in effect, that typically involves litigation in ports throughout the world that was very, very expensive.

And what the UDRP did was allow for a short procedure, less expensive to be able to deal with some of these disputes. Over the last ten years, there's been a number of decisions published related to how to interpret the UDRP and this has been seen as a positive bringing a consistency and the liability to

both the registrants and the trademark holders that are trying to protect their brands.

And so the final issue report took a good look at the comments received in the public comment period to see what the community view was of the UDRP. And on this slide, I provide a summary of the highlights.

As I indicated before, the UDRP is viewed as cost effective as compared to traditional litigation. It's also viewed as flexible and fair primarily to respondents because it allows for a very inexpensive way of defending a claim related to trademark infringement.

And one of the emphasis was that even if a respondent didn't have representation by an attorney or didn't even submit papers that are oftentimes that UDRP cases would not be successful because the judges or the arbitrators would look at the paperwork to determine whether or not it actually had enough proof of infringement.

So that was viewed as flexible and fair to respondents. And although it's not perfect, it is viewed that there may be more harm than could be that could result from a PDP primarily because of the changes that might result from the PDP and the uncertainty of how they would be interpreted.

So there were a number of comments that focus on the fact that if the UDRP was to be reviewed, there was a suggestion that it should be focused on process improvements as opposed to policy changes.

There were also concerns that a PDP could undermine the effectiveness of the UDRP and the reason for that was that this in ten years of certainty and reliability that has been built up in the interpretation of the policy, might be uncertain as the new policy if it were to be adopted were to be implemented, a lot of people that rely on the case (level) would not know how to possibly rely on new changes.

And the suggestion also is that it might be better to wait if a healthy development process is to be initiated, it may be better to wait until we get some data on the new gTLD program uniform rapid suspension system, the URS because the URS was designed on the UDRP and some of the changes that are incorporated in the URS might be useful to look at to determine whether or not those changes should also be made to the UDRP.

So the community viewed the majority of the comments that were submitted supported the notion that there should not be a PDP at this time. There were certainly other views with respect to whether a policy development process should be initiated on the UDRP.

A minority of the commenters suggested that after ten years of implementation, that it's - that a review of the UDRP is overdue. There's also the notion that it is good practice to review all ICANN policies and that therefore the UDRP should be looked at.

Some points to the extent of third party literature that is out there that is critical of the UDRP as a reason for trying to take a look at the policy. And others question whether or not the changes, if there are any to be made, can be done outside of the formal PDP process.

Some also believe that the UDRP should be updated after ten years to include better perception for free speech and fair use. In the public comment forum and afterwards, there's been also advice submitted from the supporting organizations and advisory committees on this topic.

We did receive advice from the Government Advisory Committee, the GAAC, regarding the UDRP and in their view, the - initiating a PDP at this time, along with the launch of the new gTLD program has public policy implications.

The GAAC is concerned that there may be uncertainty out there because of the new untested rights protection mechanisms that have been adopted for the new gTLD program. This is the URS that I mentioned earlier.

That uncertainty might be compounded if the future of the UDRP is uncertain. And the GAAC also points to the fact that the availability of the longstanding and tested UDRP was an important factor to the new gTLD program and that uncertainty may be in question if the policy is changed at this time.

So in the GAAC's view, the advice to the GNSO council was that it is not the appropriate time right now to launch a PDP on the UDRP. The at-large advisory committee also submitted comments similar to the GAAC's comments.

They were concerned that if there is an expert panel adopted, there needs to be care as to how that expert panel is selected and to make sure that it's geographically diverse and consulate free.

The at-large community felt that in the past there hasn't been sufficient geographic diversity with respect to the collection of expert panels and they feel that with a topic as important as the UDRP that there should be care to make sure that that is taken care of.

They also note that those - a calls for a PDP right now do not appear to reflect the consensus in the community. And they do feel that more time should pass before a PDP should be commenced. So they agree with the GAAC as well that now is not the right time to launch a policy development process on the UDRP.

So in the final issue report, staff provides a recommendation and after looking at all of the public comments and all of the information that was submitted with respect to the UDRP, staff recommends against initiating a PDP at this time.

If a PDP is to be initiated, it's more appropriate in staff's view that it should be done in about 18 months after the URS has been in effect. That way you could have the information and the data from the effectiveness of the URS to determine whether that should also apply to the UDRP.

However, if the GNSO council believes that the UDRP should be reviewed right now, that does make some suggestions on how that can happen. Staff suggests, for example, that a team of experts be convened to look primarily at process recommendations.

And if we were to do that, we feel that you could make improvements that focus on process rather than the policy and that might be able to be done outside of the policy development process through an expert panel.

A PDP could also be initiated later if there continues to be a desire to take a look at the policy and they view the policy and certainly if the policy were to change in a way that would affect the contracted parties, the PDP would be the appropriate way of doing that.

So I provided on this slide, additional information for you. A copy of the link to the final report is there as well as information on a Webinar that was conducted by staff on the current state of the UDRP. A number of experts were invited to share their views on the UDRP and on the - it's all in the archive at the links there.

I also would like to invite you invite you to participate in the GNSO council working sessions on Saturday where the UDRP final issue report will be discussed. And so if you have any further questions, the information is right on the slide and this should be able to provide you with the information you seek regarding the final issue report.

And with that I'm going to hand it over to my colleague, Liz Gasster, who will talk to you about who-is.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone and thank you. This is just a brief update from me, Liz Gasster, on the who-is studies that are being commissioned by the GNSO council.

I'm going to just quickly review the status of four studies that the council has approved for - to be conducted and then also touch on a who-is service requirement upcoming survey on that report.

Just to let you know, on the studies, there will be no official update on who-is studies at the Dakar meeting. This is just to update you for those who are following this in general.

So first of all, I think you know that the goal of who-is studies is to help provide a factual foundation for further policymaking in the GNSO. The first study that the GNSO has asked staff to get done is in this (youth) study that will assess whether public who-is significantly increases harmful acts and also looks at the (in testing) of the anti-harvest view measures.

CMU, the Carnegie Mellon University in the United States in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania has begun to do that study and it'll take about a year to complete.

The second study that just for identification, that study has also just been launched. It is going to be done by (Nork) at the University of Chicago also in the United States and it's examining various domain name registrants, how they're identified and classified then into types of entities that register their names, looking particularly at legal persons, commercial activities and so that'll take about a year also to complete.

There is the who-is privacy and perhaps the abuse study. This study, the council did approve for us to have done. We are just still negotiating a contract with a vendor for this study and will be announcing the vendor and hopefully launching the study by the end of this year.

And then lastly, there is a who-is proxy and privacy relay and review study that is analyzing communications both the relay and identity review requests that are sent for privacy and proxy registered domains.

We're doing a pre-study survey and (Interall) Consulting is conducting this survey so there's a live survey online until the end of October and anyone who has experience with identity review or relay request is encouraged to fill out the survey which can be found under the announcements on the ICANN homepage.

And then lastly I'd like to just talk briefly about an inventory of who-is service requirements, a report that was completed in July of last year. It was a technical report to look at what technical requirements might be needed to support various policy initiatives that have been suggested in the past as well as existing requirements for who-is.

As I say, this report was finalized in July of last year but just recently - and this is a listing of the elements that are included in the report, the kinds of technical requirements that were identified and included in the report.

The GNSO council just decided recently to convene a drafting team to develop a survey to try to estimate the level of agreement among the GNSO and wider community with various requirements that have been identified in that report.

So there will be a working group session in Dakar of this group which is just formed to start to develop this survey and the hope is that survey results

might help determine whether there is, you know, benefit to considering a plan for the technical requirement recommendations in the report.

So there are some sites here or links here for more information on those two activities. And I'm going to now just quickly update you on the IRD working group report. I'm assuming that Steve Sheng has not yet been able to join us. Is that right?

Very good. So I'm just going to very quickly also update you on a new report that's just come out in Steve Sheng's absence today. This was an outsource of a joint working group between the GNSO and the SSAC that was charged by the board with studying the feasibility and feasibility of introducing sufficient and displaced specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data.

It's very important for the community to consider how best to support internationalized registration data since currently no standards exist for the submission and display of data in - of internationalized registration data in directory services.

Current who-is implementations do not consistently support internationalized registration data and could lead to a poor user experience and some interoperability issues.

So there is a draft report that this working group has just published for public comment. The group did look at four different potential models for display of internationalized registration data and there will be a public workshop scheduled on Thursday, the 27th of October, 10:00 am Dakar time to discuss this draft final report.

So I'd like to now turn this over to Bart Boswinkel to share with you ccNSO policy issues that are pending at this time. Thank you. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Liz and welcome to the ccNSO update. I've included the topics that may be more of interest to a broader community than just the ccNSO. So it's on the framework of implementation, the study group of use of country names, other name activities and one of the I think major joint working group is the SSA working group.

For those of you not familiar with the framework of implementation working group, I did an update on the previous Webinar as well. So what is the framework of interpretations and why is the term used?

It is to avoid confusion with guidelines. And it is, say, it is to develop interpretations of the current policies and guidelines which are documented in RSE5091 and the GAAC principles.

And the purpose is to make it at the invitation of these policy statements consistent and coherent. So why is it important? First of all - and this is not in this slide - the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs is almost of existential value or the ccTLDs and one of the major reasons why a lot of ccTLDs have joined ICANN in order to be able to influence the policies and rules regarding delegation and redelegation.

And it's not just important for the current ccTLDs but also for IDM ccTLDs. I'll come back to that later on in the presentation.

So the policies related - or that have been in a previous working group of the ccGNSO has - and issues have been identified with regard to the interpretation of the policy statement, of RSE5091 and GAAC principles and now the community is developing guides how to interpret these policy statements and guidelines in order to create an environment where consistent and predictable decisions by the ICANN board on delegations and redelegations of IDN ccTLDs.

And retirement of ccTLDs is not included. In time, the ccNSO will launch a policy development process on the retirement of ccTLDs. To date, there have only been a few retirements and so the major issues or the major priority is with delegations and redelegations.

And participation in the framework of interpretation is from - full participation is from the GAAC and the ccNSO, both ccLTD who are members and who are non-members of the ccNSO and are liaisons with - from the GNSO and at large.

This is - what you see now is a list of topics that have been identified by the previous working group and on which the framework of interpretation working group will provide interpretations or guidelines how to interpret these elements in RSE5091 and RSE- and the GAAC principles.

To date, the working group has concluded its activities on obtaining and documenting consensus on the current ccTLD manager or new ccTLD manager in case of delegation and redelegations.

And as published its results and recommendations for public comment. It also published a progress report which is more an overview of activities until now discussions on significant interested parties and their role in delegations and redelegations are almost concluded though in time so in the near future the working group will publish a public common document on this piece of work as well.

Next topic, which is probably of relevance to the broader community is the ccNSO initiates a study group in the user country (name). What is the purpose of this study group? It is to provide an overview of all the relevant policies and rules relating to the user country names as a TLD, develop a typology for user country names so you have to think of it in terms of how - what different categories of country names are there.

Histor- for instance, historical names, names - the official names of countries both in the short and long form, translations of these names, the two letter code as included in the ISO3166 standard, et cetera.

And based on, say, the typology and these - this categorization, it is - the study group will examine if there are any issues, if the policies are applied to this different type of country names.

Let me give you two examples. Under the (unintelligible) process, so that's for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs got a (unintelligible) as being as selected and delegated.

Now the question is, what will happen if dot Russia (insarela) would be applied. According to the fast track rules and in future, the overall policy for the selection, by the NCC TLDs, dot Russia would not qualify as an IDN ccTLD because there is only - the rule is only one meaningful representation of a county or a territory name in a script language.

So dot Russia would be open if all requirements are met, including government support, as a new GTLD as of the second round. And you can probably imagine the possible confusion this would create in the future.

So this is just an example of possible issues. Another one is if you take the example of, say, Belgium. Belgium and the official language of the country - and it has three official languages, could be (Belgiam), (Beljeek) or (Bellfere).

Now under the IDN overall policy, (Bellfere) in Dutch would qualify as an IDN ccTLD but the other two would not. So again, these are some of - this is an example of an issue that could arrive based on the survey around investigations.

So at the end there will be some recommendations. Now the current status is the working group is looking at the over- as an overview and summary of the

current and future policies and rules, and (Genesco) has been involved as an expert in the activities of the working group and there is a draft, strong and for its typology, circulated for discussion among the members of the study group.

In Dakar, we hope to finalize the overview of the policy and have a first in depth discussion on the typology and ask that Dakar look into the typology and to create specific examples and again, as I just described, look into the issues is you would apply these examples and simulate it through the different policies.

Other major activities of the ccNSO, especially in Dakar is the meetings over findings and strategic operational planning working group and the sessions on the findings and contribution to strategic planning during the CCNSO meeting itself.

And the IDN ccTLD related work, say the IDN PDP consists of two elements, one is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, this working group hopes to publish its recommendations and proposals for inclusion just prior to the Dakar meeting.

And we'll have a discussion with the ccTLD community on specifically on voting mechanisms in the ccNSO and with regard to the overall policy there will be a session on issues relating to confusing the similarity and the process under the fast track process.

And how it could change and be included in the overall policy. A final session for me is on the joint working groups in which the ccNSO participates, especially in a major one, that's the DSSA working group.

And those of you who are not familiar with it the purpose of it is to create a better understanding of the security and stability of the global DNS.

And one of the I think more interesting aspects of this working group, this is a really cross community working group. It has been initiated by ALAC ccNSO and the GNSO and has full participation of the NRO as well, acting in its capacity as ASO and members of ASAC participate as well as external experts.

It's activity since Singapore is to develop a list of vulnerabilities so this and definitions from external experts, especially there is a close relation with DNSO (arch) and it has made preliminary choices about threats and especially considered which threats would be considered in scope for further analysis.

So in scope of this working group which are outside but even that is interesting for those of you who are interested in security issues.

Scope in work is getting well along but it's not complete and the working group hopes to complete it just after the Dakar meeting.

The activities in Dakar of the DSSA is that each of the constituent members of the DSSA will provide an update to its community, it will create and wants to raise awareness of its activities and programs to date.

Again within each of the communities, and it solicits your input and if you want to provide input on say the work of the DSSA and its - please contact the DSSA member from your community and at the Dakar meeting itself it will continue scoping of threats and will start and initiate the analysis of the threat.

So this is more or less, this is the background material and those again those of you interested have a look at it, it's a very, very rich content wise what's on this wiki.

And I now want to hand it over to my dear friend and colleague Olof Nordling to give you an update on the ASF.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and hello everybody, well now you've heard a lot about names. So maybe you're longing later for numbers, like for example the number 14 of October which is tomorrow and a Friday.

But in ICANN circus numbers really boils down to IP address and autonomous system numbers and that's the realm of the ASO which actually opens up a universe of its own right consistent of numerous acronyms and let's start with looking a bit on those.

The RIRs for example and they are in (a row) and ASO itself. First of all the RIRs, well IP addresses if you look at the food chain are handed out in big chunks through ICANN through its IANA function to the RIRs who in turn hand them to in slightly smaller chunks to the internet service providers, also sometimes called LIRs.

Who in turn hand them to you, all of you to then connect to the internet, very useful. And the RIRs are as - well the acronym goes for regional internet registries and of which there are five, called AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North American, LACNIC for Latin American and Caribbean and RIPE for Europe.

They are operated regionally but they also have an international corporation across regional corporation mechanism called number resource organization or NRO.

So that's two of the acronyms and ASO then, well it's the address supporting organization. And it was set up through an MOU between ICANN and the NRO and actually the RIR's individually as well.

And that MOU stipulates that the NRO should take care of the ASO function, so in a sense ASO is - well could be seen as an AES for NRO. Very easy, isn't it.

And one of the main tasks of the ASO is to handle what's called global policy proposals and that sounds very important and it is. But it has particular meaning so let's look at that as well.

What is a global policy? Well the regional internet registers they all have their regional policy development processes and they've developed numerous regional policies through these bottom up mechanisms.

But a few of them would affect the IANA allocation of IP addresses and ASMs. And only those are called global policies, which imply that all the RIRs must agree on a particular allocation scheme for to be introduced in a policy.

So this is parallel policy development in the five RIRs, which eventually converge then into a final proposal that can be conveyed to the ASO or the NRO and finally to the ICANN board for ratifications.

There are global policies existing for ASNs, autonomous system numbers and for IPV6 and for IPV4, but as you may be aware we don't have very much IPV4 addresses in stock any more on the IANA level.

So that raises a question, how to handle potentially recovered IPV4 address space. And this is the global policy proposal that's in pipeline. Let's look a little closer at that one.

Recycling, that's what it's all about, post extortion, yes, the situation has come and we don't have a policy currently for handling and redistributing recovered IPV4 address space.

That's been taken care of by IANA. Should that occur one might add of course. So that's something that's needed. Well because the current valid policy says that IPV4 addresses can only be handed out from IANA in chunks of so called slash eights, which is well a considerable number.

And sixty million addresses, and it's very unlikely that that could really happen again. So the purpose of the global policy proposal is to enable IANA to receive recovered IPV4 address space and also to hand it out to the RIRs in smaller chunks, considerably smaller chunks one might add.

And this has been an iterative process, we're actually dealing with a third proposal on this theme which has been introduced in all RIRs and adopted already some time in AFNIC, for its final call in LACNIC, AfriNIC and RIPE and it is in discussion currently in ARIC.

And this one replaces two previous proposals that didn't reach global consensus, as I mentioned earlier it really calls for any such proposal to be identical from the five RIRs in order to - for that to be put forward through the NRO and the ASO address council, finally to the ICANN board for edification.

Now just a little advertisement as well on how can you be involved in those autonomous policy processes regardless of whether it's concerning global policy proposals or regional policy proposals.

Well I mentioned earlier that all the RIRs they have bottom up policy development process and you're free to participate in any of those regardless of where you happen to have your domicile.

They all conduct open meetings and policy proposals discussed on open mailing list so it's really very easy if you're at all interested in numbers.

And also if you want to - if you come to Dakar and want to get an overview of what's happening, not only on global policy proposals but also on regional policy proposals representatives from all five RIRs will be there.

And will conduct a workshop on Wednesday afternoon, 1:00 to 3:00 pm on Wednesday in Dakar. So please keep that in mind and pop in and explore this particular and very interesting universe.

With that on that note I would like to hand over to Filiz Yilmaz for more about how to participate in a wider sense. Filiz, please.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thank you Olof. My name is Filiz Yilmaz, senior director of parts special and engagement. And I will talk about recent development on public comment processes.

Public comments are the last piece of bottom up ICANN processes, as you have seen throughout this presentation within the ICANN stakeholder model various groups develop policies or documentation relating to their own specific area.

Before these are approved and put in effect, wider ICANN committee gets an opportunity to comment on these developments. This system is called the public comment process at ICANN.

Recently we have been working on enhancements on the system to make it more useful and easier to participate for the community. In the first phase of this project, we redesigned the public comment pages, making them easier to read and navigate and broad consistency on the way they are presented.

Then we moved on the second phase of the project as we developed different components to integrate to the intro system we first worked with a focus group appointed by ICANN community leaders.

Recently we compiled a report about these enhancements, edit the summary of the focus group input and put it up for wider community review and feedback by opening public comment period on the issue.

This public comment is called Phase II of public comment process enhancements what you see on the slide now.

Part of this report is about stratification and prioritization, these are about introducing categories assisting the subject matter to be understood quickly and so an informed participation decision can be made by the reader.

And about assisting community members in determining the importance or urgency of (SL) station for themselves.

The report contains a section on command supply command cycles too and this is a new concept about restructuring committee input process with an (in show) comment period followed by a separate reply period.

So that the previous comments can be addressed in that second period. As an initial test of this new concept we opened the public comment on the report on 31 of August.

The first comment cycle was closed on 30 September and on the same day with an announcement we opened the reply cycle that is still open until 15 of October.

The second period is only for responses to the previous comments. Note that the stratification and command reply cycle concepts are addressing the ATRT recommendations. The report contains background information about this too.

We also included ideas on introducing a wiki base forum interface so that threaded discussions can be supported. We believe threaded discussion and (wiremond) will maximize transparency and will assist the link in the thought process between comments and corresponding replies to them.

We received some feedback in the first comment period and we hope to hear your comments now to those during the second reply period. Not that there is only two - a couple of days left to provide responses to the previously submitted comments in this phase.

So please visit public comment box for the subject, the link is provided here and you can view the previously submitted comments there and respond to them.

About the wiki based threaded forum interface that is proposed within this report too if you receive enough support for this idea we plan to conduct a limited community testing on the platform that we have being developed so far.

And if you are interested, taking part in this test please let us know by sending a mail to [participate@icann.org](mailto:participate@icann.org) so we can reach you if and when the test is put in place.

Thank you and now I will leave the mic to Rob I believe.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks very much Filiz. I'm going to wrap things up and then we'll do some questions and answers. While this webinar has you know focused on many of the Dakar issues, our policy development activities are taking place in some form literally every day throughout the year.

So we really encourage you all to stay in touch with us in a variety of ways. In addition to the ICANN website resource, the policy team also produces a monthly policy update.

It's available for subscription free on the ICANN website where you can simply go to the link there on Slide 92 and set up an automatic delivery system to you for colleagues that you have who are not participating in this webinar or whom you might think are interested in ICANN policy issues, you'll

note that we have the policy update published in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

And we've been very encouraged to see the subscriber numbers in all those languages increase on a relatively steady basis over the last two and a half years.

So we definitely encourage you to utilize that as a resource. As Filiz noted as well we're also experimenting with other technologies including the confluence wiki so that any time you do have suggestions how we can improve the channels of communications out to you all please provide those suggestions to us.

There are two initiatives underway currently to improve two of the external tools that ICANN generally uses to communicate with various communities.

There's a redesign of the icann.org website that's getting a lot of attention internally and we're also still continuing to work on an improved site to be launched for the GNSO that continues to run into technology improvement issues where we add new things and have to figure out how the vision of that website can be incorporated into some of those new technologies.

So that work continues as well. Just in general as an overview for all of you and I'm just going to flip through these slides relatively quickly, you are only hearing from a relatively small percentage of our policy team that supports the various community efforts when you hear the voices on this webinar.

We have 17 full time members of the policy staff, we are in six countries, over eight different time zones. For those of you - particularly those of us in the US who sometimes consider California a separate country, we could be in seven countries if you include that as a definition.

Many of us have broader skills but a number of us are primarily working with particular supporting organizations and advisory committees, so you'll see on these slides here that folks have assignments to particular communities where we tend to primarily work.

But we're also flexible enough under David Olive's leadership to also shift our staffing to address increases in workload in other areas as well, wherever we can.

So that wraps things up generally in terms of what we expect to see in Dakar, some of the other issues that we're working on. What I'd like to do and I'll sort of look to you Hailey or you Gisella in terms of the process here, whether we're going to open up the lines for people to ask questions verbally.

I'd like to take a quick look back at the chat to make sure that everybody's had some of those questions resolved for those of you who were uncomfortable just speaking out on the phone call you can feel comfortable in typing your questions into the chat.

What we'll do is work hard to answer as many as we can in the next couple of minutes and those that we don't we'll reach out to you individually if we haven't answered your question.

So let me just quickly look back to see while we take the lines off mute. I think there's a question Bart that was for you from Steve Metalitz, I don't think has been resolved in the chat. Let me look for it quickly here.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I did Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay great.

Bart Boswinkel: Unless it's a different one.

Robert Hoggarth: And then Olof there were a couple for you, a couple from Avri and one from (Doogie), I don't know if you feel comfortable, you answered those all via chat.

Olof Nordling: I answered (Doogie) but I didn't answer to Avri and let's put it like that, when it comes to redistribution regionally of IPV4 addresses or across regions, it is not an ASO matter since this is not affecting the IANA location.

So I think the answer to Avri's question is quite simply no.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, and Bart there's a question for you that just came in, is there a risk that NTIA would extract statement of work for IANA contractor will set the FOI working group before fait de accompli?

Olof Nordling: Oh, I wonder if that's really for me to answer, it's rather for IANA and it is, support to the ASO is not directly done by IANA since that would be a slight - rather keeping an arm's distance of it, so I'm not representing the IANA and I don't think it's a question that I'm really competent to answer either.

I saw another question from Avri which I didn't notice before, whether the ASO will take any concrete actions in helping applicants for domain names from developing economies and meeting the IPV6 requirements imposed by ICANN.

This is also really beyond the remit of the ASO as it's conceived according to the MOU. That is not anything that can be easily tossed with and I haven't even heard a discussion about such activities being undertaken I must say.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart, let me answer (Yurio)'s question, so the question is, is there a risk that NTIA will extract statement of work for IANA contracts overall set FOI before a set fait de accompli?

If you look at the (sponsor) of the FOI working group anything that has to do with the IANA contract is considered out of scope.

And of course the IANA contract ICANN's role as the operator of the IANA function is relevant of what is happening. But this as I said in my overview the FOI working group is focusing primarily and only in fact on the interpretation of ROC5091 and the GAC principles.

So not so much on the practices and even these are out of scope of the IANA function. I hope this answers your question.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks Bart. I'm looking on the Adobe Connect room pods, I do not see any other hands raised, nor do I see anyone else typing. We all remain available as this final slide shows that [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org) so if you do have follow up questions or at any time during the year if you have something that you want to get a status report on or ask us something in addition to our own personal emails please feel free to utilize that address.

We're pretty much at the end of our time David, I'll throw it back to you for any final remarks and adjournment.

David Olive: Well I'd like to thank our participants for being involved with our policy webinar and also for engaging in questions and with that I'd like to close this session and thank everyone for their input and comments as we move forward to Dakar. Thank you so much.

Olof Nordling: Thank you.

END