

**Pre-Dakar ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
13 October 2011 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 13 October 2011 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-update-webinar-2-20111013-en.mp3>

on page:

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

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

David Olive: Thank you very much. I would like to welcome everyone to ICANN's Policy Update Webinar. This is a policy-themed regularly scheduled event prior to ICANN meetings. And it's my pleasure to begin this session. I am David Olive; Vice President for Policy Development Support.

And the policy team is here to provide an update to interested parties on policy development activities to help us prepare and focus our efforts at the ICANN meeting in Dakar.

Our policy team will be very active supporting the various groups and organizations, advisory groups and supporting groups in their activity in Dakar. And we'll also focus our attention on newcomers to the ICANN meeting to provide an introduction of how policy development takes place

and how one could get involved and participate in those working groups and in the process.

There is a lot of information contained in this presentation; the slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information at your own leisure and when you wish to.

A few housekeeping items if I may. Just below the slides you see the policy notes that helps you in the use of the Adobe Connect. To reduce interference we will mute the lines. But there will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the session which we'll unmute the lines for this purpose.

We also ask you to turn down the sound on your computers that'll help also reduce interference and have a better connection. And as you know we're working with Adobe Connect. And the link to this room is in the email that you received.

If indeed you want to ask questions during the presentation please use the chat box to the left there and we'll be able to either answer your questions or take them with the presenter after the presentation.

In terms of the ICANN Dakar meeting the goals of this session of course is to update you, as we talked about, review the issues in Dakar and then answer any questions that you might have.

Many of you will be participating in the Dakar meeting either in person or remotely. And for those who are participating remotely special attention has been paid to enhancing remote participation. And there are further details on the ICANN Website for the latest on remote participation.

The highlights for the Dakar meeting through it again a newcomers program, further discussions on the new gTLD sessions, a focus on security and

stability, DNS SEC, sessions relating to consumer choice and competition and trust, a review of domain name issues, dispute settlement mechanisms such as the UDRP, progress on the Whois enhancements and the latest rules for inter-registrar transfers.

And you'll hear from our presenters these various issues and there will be forums or working groups that will be addressing those in depth in Dakar.

When we talk about policy development at ICANN it's important to note that the focus of our presentation is on the groups that are responsible for that development. And at ICANN the Generic Name Supporting Organization, GNSO, develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domain.

The Country Code Supporting Organization, ccNSO, has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to the country code top level domain. And the Addressing Supporting Organization, the ASO, reviews and develops recommendations on Internet protocols and address policy.

In addition there are groups that advise the Board of Directors on policy and they are listed here; the At Large, the Security and Stability, the Root Server Group and the Government Advisory Committee.

Today we'll be covering a number of topics. We've just selected a few activities to show the work of the supporting organizations. And so here is a list of the topics covered by our policy experts. And with that I will turn that over to them so that you will hear more about the latest developments in the policy development process.

We now go to the GNSO. And I turn it over to my colleague, Rob Hoggarth. Rob, please.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you very much David. Greetings everyone. A number of the issues that you see up on the screen and generally the issues that we're planning on covering during this session you'll note are truly cross community issues in that they have an impact on a number of the supporting organizations and advisory committees within ICANN.

And so it's somewhat intentional on our part to give you all the broadest potential scope and to share with you the issues that are going to be discussed in Dakar with the broadest community impact.

From the GNSO perspective - and the reason that we're starting there is that the GNSO seems to really play a central role in policy development at ICANN. And it seems like most of the GNSO actions do have a direct or indirect impact on the other communities in some way. So that's why we're starting here.

I'm only going to be focusing on the first issue on this list, the geographic regions review. And then my colleagues will go into a number of the other issues you see on the screen.

As we've indicated there are over 20 projects currently under management of the GNSO Council so if there are any topics that we aren't covering during the session please ask a question in the chat or otherwise save your questions for the end of the presentation.

The reason why we have the geographic regions review item first is that it has broad implications for literally all ICANN communities and because it's something that's really coming to a head in terms of a working group's activities that the board formed some time ago.

In general, for those of you not familiar with this, the geographic regions is a fundamental component of the ICANN organization. It's essentially a recognition of the importance of truly community and industry-wide

participation in ICANN activities with a true emphasis on ensuring that participants come from all of the five geographic regions around the world. And you see those regions identified on the screen.

Why is this happening? Well as many of you know the spirit of ICANN is constant and never-ending review; always testing, always checking to see if things are operating the way that they should or if there are improvements or better ways to conduct ourselves.

The review of the geographic regions framework as anticipated in the bylaws. And back in 2007 the ccNSO Council stepped up and requested that the board begin that process. The board agreed and a community working group concept was developed in 2008.

And a group of community volunteers from a number of community SOs and ACs, supporting organizations and advisory committees, got together and got board approval of a charter in 2009.

Up until now the working group has produced two reports and initial report which was primarily research, due diligence, background, history, how the geographic regions are being applied currently; a second interim report in which the working group explored a number of the potential recommendations that it might make to the board.

And we're now in the third stage where the working group is very close to formally submitting a final report to the ICANN Board. In that final report there are a number of recommendations that the working group has drafted.

The three primary ones are, first, that ICANN maintain its own standard for geographic diversity rather than, you know, relying on other industry standards. Two, that the best starting point within the ICANN organization is to look at the organizational structure of the regional Internet registries and

use that as a foundation for how ICANN approaches its own geographic regions framework.

And finally, to look at a modified top-down framework to apply the geographic diversity; one that looks first at the board and sort of identifies very clearly what expectations there are from the board but one that looks at allowing individual communities the flexibility to create their own standards.

Particularly because one of the major findings of the working group was that cultural and language diversity is becoming more and more important and that it's critical for the ICANN organization to find ways to address that.

So the next steps are that right now there is a public comment forum open on the draft recommendations of the working group. That's going to continue through Dakar into mid-December.

In Dakar there's going to be a public workshop session during the Thursday of the meeting week where members of the community are going to have an opportunity to interact with working group members and discuss these recommendations.

There's also going to be a number of meetings that working group members are setting up with different supporting organizations and advisory committees where they will discuss the proposals.

And then the working group will go back after the comment period is over, closely review what comments have been submitted, determine whether they're going to make any changes or modifications to their recommendations. And they'll likely publish the formal final report in early 2012.

At that point according to the charter of the working group all the supporting organizations and advisory committees will have a formal opportunity to

submit comments directly to the board sharing their views and opinions. And then if you follow the normal course of action we'd then likely board review and action sometime in late 2012.

So this will potentially if the board accepts the recommendations of the working group have implications for all of your individual communities at the very least giving your communities an opportunity to look at how they address geographic diversity now and how they might do so in the future. So we encourage you a lot pay attention to this proceeding, provide input to your various SOs and ACs and continue to follow it.

I'm going to stop there on this issue and turn things over to my colleague, Marika Konings. Marika, I think you have a number of topics that you're going to go through right now. Thanks a lot.

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

So the first topic I have on my list of items is the new GNSO policy development process or also called PDP. This is the latest element of the GNSO improvements projects which started back in 2008 and as Rob just spoke about the never ending review that we seem to have at ICANN.

The objective of developing the new PDP was to ensure the incorporation of a working group model which is now the standard approach for developing policy in the GNSO compared to the taskforce model that was used before.

In addition the new PDP would need to be responsive to ICANN's policy development need meaning allowing 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, which describes the GNSO policy development process. And it also includes a proposed PDP manual.

Some of - some examples of the recommendations that are contained in this report are standardizing 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 comments followed by a final issue report which is then considered by the GNSO Council; this will hopefully allow community input on the information included in the preliminary report and allow for correcting and/or additions to ensure that all elements are covered in the report and allow the GNSO Council to make an informed on whether or not to initiate a PDP.

Ensure sufficient time to obtain community input by requiring a minimum of 30 days of public comments on the preliminary issue report and the working group initial report.

Ensure that there is review of the council report to the board prior to submission to the board of that report. And there's a recommendation to use implementation review teams to assist staff and the development of the

implementation plan once a policy has been adopted. And these are just a couple of examples of the recommendations contained in the report.

So the GNSO Council is expected to consider the updated final report and its recommendations for adoption at its meeting in Dakar. Once approved the public comment forum will be opened to allow for community input before the board will consider the recommendations.

So on this slide you can just find some links to - as well as the report that Rob spoke about before of the geographic regions working group. And as well links to the PDP final report and for those interested to learn more about the overall GNSO improvements project there is a link here to a page that is dedicated to that effort.

So the next issue on my list is the intra-registrar transfer policy or 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.

And as part of the implementation of that policy it was decided to carry out a review to determine whether it was working as intended or whether there were 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 complaint when it comes to issues that are raised with ICANN's compliance department.

So there's all of that review, a number of issues were identified which were then grouped together in five different policy development processes titled from A to E and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner. And in the next few slides I'll just give you a brief overview of the status of the different projects that relate to the IRTP.

So the IRTP Part B working group was tasked to address a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain name registration that has been inappropriately transferred as well as a number of questions relating to the use of registrar lock status.

The working group submitted its final report and the recommendations and these were adopted by the GNSO Council in June of this year and subsequently adopted as well by the board in August.

So two of the recommendations actually requested staff proposals one relating to a new provision to lock - or unlock domain names and a second one relating to clarifying Whois status messages in relation to registrar lock status.

So draft proposals are currently under discussion with the IRTP Part B working group. And we hope once we've received their input and finalize the proposals that we can publish these for public comment before submitting these to the GNSO Council for their consideration.

So the other recommendations that were adopted are in the process of being implemented. And this also includes, for example, a provision of a transfer emergency action contact. This requires registrars to respond to the request for another registrar in the case of an emergency such as a hijacking within four hours.

An update on the status of the implementation of these recommendations is also foreseen to take place at the ICANN meeting in Dakar. And I'll give you some further details about that shortly.

In addition the GNSO Council has now initiated a policy development process on IRTP Part C. And this PDP addresses three different issues. The first one relates to why there is a need to define the term change of control and how it is related to existing reasons for denial of a transfer.

The second relates to whether forms of authorization requesting a transfer should be time limited. And the third issues 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. And for more information you can go to the link that's on the page here and you can see how you can sign up for this working group should you be interested.

So one of the other IRTP recommendations that has now been adopted by the GNSO Council concerns the request for an issue report on the requirement of thick Whois for all incumbent gTLDs.

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 for a thick Whois for all incumbent gTLDs would be desirable or not.

And then ICANN staff will prepare this issue report which is expected to be published for public comment before submitting it to the GNSO Council. The timing of that still needs to be confirmed. As you'll see we have many issues that we're currently working on.

So how can you get involved? As mentioned before, you know, if you're interested in joining the IRTP Part C working group this group is currently being formed. All you need to do is send an email to the GNSO Secretariat. The first meetings of this working group are planned for the 8th of November.

And if you want to hear more about these issues you can attend the IRTP update at the ICANN meeting in Senegal which is scheduled for Thursday the 27 of October from 10:00 to 11:30 local time. And you'll find the link here to

that meeting. And here is some background information for those of you that are interested to read further about this.

So the next item on my list is the GNSO policy development process that has dealt with the expiration domain name recovery. So 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. 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 its meeting in Dakar so in two week's time.

So in general the recommendations that have been put forward are expected to provide additional guarantees to registrants, improve registrant education but at the same time are considered to be in line with existing practices.

So this is to give you just an idea of some of the recommendations that will be considered by the ICANN Board. You will find some of those listed here as 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 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 expiration and one notice following expiration. And here are a couple more. The expired registration's Website must

explicitly state that the domain name registration has expired and provide instructions on how to redeem the registration.

There are recommendations encouraging the development of educational materials aimed at registrants explaining how to prevent unintentional loss of a domain name registration.

There are a number of best practice recommendations 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 is also recommended that regular updates on the effectiveness and status of the implementation of the recommendation is provided following approval and implementation.

As I said before the board is expected to consider these recommendations for adoption at its meeting in Dakar. And if - or one is adopted the recommendations also call for the creation of an implementation review team which would be tasked to assist ICANN staff in the development of an implementation plan.

Here again you'll find the link to the final report of the post expiration domain name recovery working group in which you can find all the details and background on all of the recommendations.

So, you know, for those of you already tired of hearing me speak you'll be glad to hear that this is the last topic I'll be talking to you about which is the discussion paper on the creation of nonbinding 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 policies working group, also known as RAP, which delivered its final report to the GNSO Council in May of 2010.

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

So in order to obtain community input on this topic staff organized a workshop at the ICANN meeting in Singapore requesting input from the different parts of the community.

And based on the input received there and staff research and discussions the discussion paper was finalized and submitted to the GNSO Council last month. So the GNSO Council is expected to consider the paper next steps which may include the opening of a public comment forum at its meeting in Dakar.

So I wanted to just very briefly give you an idea of the issues that the discussion paper covers such as the scope, how does this fit with ICANN's mission and the role of the GNSO. It also outlines issues that will need further consideration such as what makes a practice a best practice, is there a need to create new ones or is it just a question of finding those practices that may qualify for best practices.

What is meant with nonbinding? What should ICANN's role be in this process? What are the resources required and which processes should be followed? And how to deal with maintenance, review, promotion and dissemination of best practices and how to factor in cost benefits, funding and incentives for the adoption of best practices so in short a lot of issues that will require further discussion should this effort go further.

In addition the paper also includes an inventory of current practices which may be considered as best practices once the appropriate framework has been established. And the paper also outlines two proposed next steps which are of course the creation of a GNSO working group to develop a proposal for the framework for best practices.

And also the creation of a cross community (tangential) group which would work on proposing candidate best practices to address the abuse of registration of domain names.

So as mentioned the GNSO Council is expected to discuss the paper and possible next steps at the weekend session - at the Saturday meeting. And 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 the paper will be presented in greater detail and an opportunity will be provided to ask questions or make comments.

And here you'll find a link to the discussion paper as well as the registration abuse policies final report where you'll find further background information on the issue itself.

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

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika and hello everyone. I'm going to talk to you about the final issue report that was published on the current state of the UDRP. That is the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Process or policy that ICANN has to deal with domain name infringement issues related to trademark infringement.

Essentially earlier in the year the GNSO Council was following up on a request made in the registration abuse policy report on looking at the current state of the UDRP. And they requested an issue report on the current state and provided guidance to staff on how to develop this issue report.

The UDRP is a policy that's been in place for over 10 years. It's from - it originates in 1999 and has not been reviewed by the GNSO Council since its inception.

And when we were tasked with writing the report we were faced with a tremendous amount of information and documents that were out there regarding the UDRP and its effectiveness.

And so in consultation with the Council we took an approach of trying to look at this under the new rules, the new PDP approach that Marika just outlined. And essentially what that meant was a publication of a preliminary issue report, which we did prior to the Singapore meeting.

And then there was a public comment forum that was opened on the preliminary issue report in May - starting in May until July where we received a tremendous number of comments on the UDRP and the preliminary issue report.

And then we took those comments and incorporated them into the final issue report that was published prior to Dakar. And at Dakar the GNSO Council is expected to vote on whether or not to initiate a policy development process on the UDRP at that time.

And so I'm going to go over some of the (themes) and recommendations that are set forth in the final issue report. The first thing that the final issue report does is talk about the current state of the UDRP.

And after doing this research and reading the comments and conducting a webinar on the current state of the UDRP we note that it's widely recognized that the UDRP is a success. It's recognized as a success from the very early years of ICANN.

And although it's certainly not perfect it's viewed as a viable alternative to costly litigation involving parties from different jurisdictions. In other words before the UDRP was adopted if you were to litigate a trademark infringement claim you would have to go to court in your local jurisdiction and it would be very costly and involve tremendous amounts of time and attorneys fees.

And so it's recognized that the UDRP has been successful in maintaining the cost - reducing the costs associated with trademark infringement involving domain names.

And over the last 10 years the UDRP providers have been successful in administering the UDRP. And there's approximately 10 years of decisions that have been published that both respondents and trademark holders can look at to determine whether or not they have a valid claim and whether they should proceed with filing for a UDRP claim.

So the report also talks about the community view of the UDRP. And this was essentially gathered through the public comment forum that I mentioned earlier. And as I mentioned it is viewed as cost effective. This is a general widespread view of the UDRP as compared to traditional litigation.

There is some information in the report about the experience of people who had filed litigation claims prior to the UDRP and how expensive and burdensome it was.

There's also a reflection of the notion that the UDRP is considered flexible and fair to respondents. In other words over the last 10 years case law has evolved to deal with many issues that have evolved over this 10 years such as domain tasting for example or adverse domain name hijacking.

And it's also viewed as fair to respondents in the sense that even if you're not represented by counsel or even if you don't file an answer to a UDRP claim the procedures are set up so that the providers or the decision makers will

look at the merits of the complaint to determine whether or not an adequate claim has been presented. And so a respondent can win a case even if they don't file a response. And so that's viewed as something that's fair to respondents.

There was also the notion in the report that although the UDRP is not perfect there is a sense that more harm than good can result from a PDP at this time. And there were a number of commentators from different stakeholder groups that were concerned about opening up the UDRP at this time for evaluation.

If the UDRP is to be reviewed at all there was a recommendation that perhaps the focus be limited to process improvements because that maybe that could be done in a manner that wouldn't open up the entire policy and affect the stability and reliability of the UDRP.

There was also a consistent theme in the comments that it would be better to wait from data in the new gTLD program before a PDP would be started on the UDRP. And the reason for that is that the uniform rapid suspension system that is incorporated in the new gTLD program was modeled off of the UDRP and has some perhaps improvements to the UDRP.

And it may be better to wait for that and get the data to see if that is actually the case if it is more effective and perhaps that data could feed into a PDP. And so as we looked at the public comments and the information we received from the community in Singapore we felt that the majority view is that there is no support for a PDP at this time.

But that is not a universal view. There are other views which I have labeled as a minority view. And certainly there were comments submitted to this effect mainly that it is good practice to review all ICANN policies. And after 10 years of implementation review of the UDRP is overdue; at least that's what some commentators believe.

There is also pointing to third party literature that is out there that has been published over the years that is critical of the UDRP and may point to a need for a review.

Some commentators also questioned whether changes can be done outside of a PDP. And that was one of the reasons for pushing for a PDP. And also there was the notion that the UDRP should be updated to include better protections for free speech and fair use.

And in adopting this new process of having a preliminary issue report and a final issue report we were able to gather information and the viewpoint of different SOs and ACs within ICANN. So for example the Government Advisor Committee, the GAC, submitted advice with respect to the UDRP.

And in the GAC view initiating a PDP along with the new gTLD launch at the same time has public policy implications. The GAC points out that there's uncertainty right now from the new untested rights protection mechanisms that are out there - this is the URS - and this might - uncertainty might be compounded if the future of the UDRP is also uncertain.

And so the GAC wanted the GNSO Council to be aware that continued availability of the long standing and the tested UDRP is important to the new gTLD program and perhaps now is not the right time to launch a PDP although the GAC was not opposed to a PDP at some time in the future.

We also received advice from the At Large community, the At Large Advisory Committee. And they had similar concerns. Primarily their concerns related to the recommendation that there might be an expert panel appointed to review the policy or the processes related to the UDRP.

And the At Large community felt that if such an expert panel was to be appointed that we need to have - take care into making sure that the participants are geographically diverse and conflict-free.

The At Large community pointed out that 10 years ago when the UDRP was first developed and the implementation of it was first developed that perhaps the experts were more US-centric and not - and there wasn't sufficient geographic diversity.

The At Large also points out that they feel that those that are calling for a PDP right now do not reflect the consensus in the community at this time. And also that in line with the advice from the GAC that a PDP should not be commenced at this time and that was the view of the At Large community.

So one part of the report includes a staff recommendation and after looking at all of this information and receiving all of this data staff recommends against initiating a PDP at this time.

We feel that if a PDP is to be launched it would be more appropriate to be - to take place after the URS - uniform suspension from the new gTLD program would be in effect for 18 months and that data could be used to support the information that's needed for the PDP.

But if the GNSO Council believes that the UDRP should be reviewed then staff suggests convening a team of experts - and certainly the experts should be geographically diverse and represent the different viewpoints - to focus on process recommendations.

We feel that there could be significant work done on the process recommendations through the expert panel. And if a PDP is still something that could be considered if there's a need to review the policy later on. So in other words once the expert panel does its work if it turns out that it's pointing to actual changes in the policy itself then at that point a PDP could be commenced.

And now on this slide I've provided additional information for you - information that includes where the UDRP is posted, information from the archive of the webinar that was conducted with experts on the current state of the UDRP. And there's also a link to the final issue report.

The GNSO Council is also having a working session on Saturday, October 22, if you'd like to participate and listen in on the discussions as the GNSO Council decides whether or not it will commence a PDP on the UDRP.

And with that I'll turn it over to Liz Gasster who will talk to you about Whois.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone and thank you so much, Margie. I'm Liz Gasster, also a Senior Policy Counselor in the GNSO. I'm going to be talking about Whois today. I'm going to be updating you on four studies that the GNSO Council has commissioned.

We don't plan to really delve into these studies at the Dakar meeting but I know there's interest in the community in just hearing where the studies stand so this is a update directed at that.

And then we have an upcoming survey on a Whois service requirements report that was published last year and I'll be talking just a little bit about a working group that's been set up to develop that survey.

So just quickly I think most of you are aware that the GNSO Council for some time has been concerned about addressing policy concerns related to Whois and has launched these studies in order to provide a factual basis for further policy development in the future.

There are four studies; the first is a misuse study. It is looking at whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and also at the impact of anti-harvesting measures. There's kind of two approach to the studies that are described there on the slide.

Carnegie-Melon University in the United States in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is conducting this study which will take about a year or so to conduct. And that is now underway.

There is, secondly, a registrant identification study which will look at how registrants are identified in Whois and classify the various types of entities that register domains with a particular emphasis on looking at legal persons and how commercial activities are - those who register domains for commercial activities are registered.

As it says here this study has been kind of re-casted as an exploratory study. (Morck) at the University of Chicago has been awarded the study to conduct and that's just being launched later this month.

The third study is a Whois privacy and proxy abuse study comparing a broad sample of privacy and proxy registered domain names associated with allegedly harmful acts to look at how often bad actors try to obscure their identity in Whois and how this rate of abuse compares to overall use of proxy and privacy services among other facets.

That too will take about a year to conduct. The Council did approve this study earlier this year. We're just in the process of finalizing a contract with a vendor and several sub vendors to conduct the study. And then it will be launched hopefully by the end of this year.

And then lastly there is a Whois privacy and proxy relay and reveal study that is analyzing communication relay and identity reveal requests that are sent for proxy and privacy registered domains to explore and document how those are processed.

This is a survey to assess the feasibility of actually conducting a full-blown study on this. It was launched last month and we hope to have results early next year.

And then again I wanted to briefly touch on, as I mentioned, a working group that's just been created by the GNSO to take a further look at a report that was completed last year, which we refer to as the Inventory of Whois Service Requirements Report.

This is a report that had been requested by the GNSO Council back in 2009 to inventory technical requirements that would be needed to both address known deficiencies in the current Whois service but also technical requirements that might be needed to support various policy initiatives that have been suggested or proposed in the past.

So it inventoried all of those policy initiatives and then looked at what technical requirements would be needed to support if any of those policy initiatives - if they had been requirements.

So that report was completed. These are some of the examples on the screen of what the report includes including thick versus thin Whois, which we discussed earlier. And looking at internationalized registration data, which is the next subject also coming up.

And so just recently in May the Council decided to convene a drafting team to develop a survey to estimate the level of agreement with various requirements that are identified in that report. So the hope is that survey results would help determine where - whether there's benefit to initiating a working group to actually, you know, consider specific technical requirement recommendations in the report.

That is a new working group. Here are some links to the reports and studies that I mentioned. Those of you who might be interested in working on this

working group should certainly contact the GNSO secretariat for more information about participating in that group.

Now I'd like to turn it over to Steve Sheng who's going to talk more about internationalized registration data and a new report that is in draft final form regarding that work. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you very much Liz and good evening - good greetings everyone. So IRD is the acronym for internationalized registration data as Liz just pointed out. It's the ability to represent the registration data in different languages and scripts.

So the IRD working group is a joint working group of the GNSO and SSAC, which is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. The Board tasked us to study really two questions. The feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data.

This is an important topic because supporting IRD is an important evolutionary step for the Whois service. So traditionally these data are all in U.S. ASCII. However, with the increasing adoptions of internationalized domain names, this situation is going to change.

However, as of today there are no standards exist for the submission and display of the IRD in the Whois services. And furthermore the current Whois implementations do not consistently support IRD. So for example, the Whois protocol as defined by RFC 3912 has not been internationalized. The protocol itself cannot consistently support. So, you know, ad hoc solutions could lead to very poor user experience and serious interoperability issues.

So the working group was convened in late 2009 and spent about almost two years now working on this. It issued an interim report, gathered community

comments and just recently it released its draft final report for public comment. There's a link here.

There's also going to be a public workshop scheduled on Thursday, October 27, 10:00 am local time that's going to discuss the draft final report. So we welcome you to participate in that session.

So next I'm going to hand over to my colleague (Bart) on ccNSO policy issue.

(Bart): Thank you very much Steve. I hope this will work. Yes. I want to take you through some of the topics currently under discussion in the ccNSO and some of the joint working groups the ccNSO is participating.

In this presentation I'll focus on those topics which may be of broader interest than just the ccTLD community. So the first one will be on the framework of interpretation. The second one will be on the - second topic will be the study group on the use of country names as TLDs. Some other main activities and one - said the last one will be on the joint working group, the DSSA, the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group.

Starting with the Framework Interpretation Working Group. First let me explain a bit why it's call the framework of interpretation and what is a framework of interpretation in this context.

The starting point is - for this working group is to develop interpretations of what are considered the policy and guidelines for the delegation and re-delegation of country code top level domain names. And these policy and guidelines are documented in RFC 5091 and the GAC principles from 2005.

Now this working group and the scope of this working group is not to change these policy statement but to provide color and depth to the interpretation of these policy statements. So hence, the word framework of interpretation.

And to avoid the use of the word guidelines because that has sometimes a specific meaning in the policy environment. Again, that was the second reason to use the word or to come up with the concept of framework of interpretation.

Now why is it important and especially important in the ccTLD environment? Again for those of you not familiar with the ccTLDs, the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs is changing the fact the organization who's running a country code top level domain or is designating the entity who runs and operates the country - top country codes of level domain.

So from that perspective it is existential almost for ccTLD managers. So the community is to develop what is - and that's the purpose of this Framework of Interpretation Working Group.

The community will develop guidance on the interpretation of the policy statements RFC 5921 and the GAC principles in order to create an environment that is consistent and predictable for both the ccTLD local Internet communities involved in these processes and also from - for the - provides a framework for the ICANN Board and assist IANA in analyzing some of the issues.

The Framework of Interpretation Working Group has full participation of the government - members of the Government Advisory Committee and the ccTLD community and liaisons with the GNSO and At Large. So again, in that sense it's a cross community working group.

The list of topics. The scope of the working group is again very limited to a few topics like - which have been listed here. These topics have been more or less distinguished and analyzed by a prior working group, which was the Delegation and Re-delegation Working Group, which submitted its final report at the San Francisco meeting. And this working group is taking - is providing the interpretation and further analysis on these topics.

The current status is that say on the first topic that was on a previous slide, the obtaining and documenting consent in the full delegations and re-delegations. The working group has concluded its initial work and has not published a report for public consultation. The announcement went out yesterday. And you can find the announcement on the ICANN Web site if you're interested.

The working group has also published a progress report, which is more or less a broad overview of its activity since Singapore leading up to Dakar. And the discussion on the second topic, the obtaining - yeah, input and documenting input from significantly interested parties has been - is almost concluded. And the public consultation on this second topic will be initiated post Dakar.

A second issue, which is probably of concern to a broader community than just the ccNSO and ccTLD community, is the study group on the use of country names as top-level domains. The purpose of this working group - sorry, excuse me, study group is to first of all provide an overview of the relevant policies and they are not just the ccTLD related policy but also the new gTLD related policies.

As most of you will know, under the current policies and especially on the new gTLD policies, geographical names could be applied for under special conditions and if you meet certain requirements and as of the - under the current applicant guidebook as of the second round of applications. This would include country names and territory names, which is more or less the area of ccTLDs.

So the overview of the relevant policies, not just limited to the delegation policies for (unintelligible) code, ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs but also includes the rules and polices for new gTLDs.

A second purpose of the working group is to try to develop a typology for use of country names. This is - this should provide a typology on different classes or categories of country names. As some examples, you may think of historical names for countries, full names - the official names in full or short form, maybe the country codes itself as listed in some of the - for instance the ISO 3166 standard and there are some other examples as well.

And then based on say the typology and looking at the overview and at the policies and analyzing the policies and based on this typology the study group intends to identify issues with some of the - with the policies. (Any fees) will come up with recommendations.

Current status is the overview and summary of the policies is - will be vetted by the study group at the Dakar meeting. (Unesco) is involved as an expert in developing the typology and a draft typology will be discussed in Dakar and this draft typology is based on the terminology developed by the United Nations Geographic Experts Group.

I think I've covered these topics. So I'll just go. Other major activities of the ccNSO which are (broader) is again the ccNSO will focus on the finances strategic and operational planning activities of ICANN and it has two working groups for that (affect), the Finance Working Group and the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, which will meet in Dakar and which - and who will also organize and lead some of the sessions of the ccNSO meeting in Dakar on Tuesday and Wednesday.

And a second major topic that will be discussed at the Dakar meeting issues related to the IDN ccTLD related work. One will be and is - one major topic will be on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. And the issue there is if especially the proposal on voting in the ccNSO and a second major topic will be the - regarding the overall policy that will be on the confusing the similarity process and the issues relating to it.

And there will be some proposals to improve that process. Mostly likely again these sessions will be open to non-ccTLDs as well as all the ccNSO meetings are open on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Finally, I want to just touch upon one of the major joint working groups in which the ccNSO is participating. And that's the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group. The purpose is - of this working group is to create a better understanding of the security and stability of the global DNS.

And one of the I think and that's from a personal view - one of the most interesting aspects of this working group it has participation of the At Large, the ccNSO, GNSO, the NRO and members of SSAC. So it's a very, very - it has very, very broad cross community participation. And that's probably one of the major differences with the Geographic Regions Working Group, which Rob touched upon.

This working group has been initiated by the community itself. So it's a fascinating process to watch how people from all these different backgrounds work together. And I'm honored to be part of that - of that group that support this working group together with Julie Hedlund and other colleague from the policy department and Patrick Jones.

Activities in Singapore for the - of the DSNO at or since at or since and which they'll report on in Dakar is a development of list of vulnerabilities and threats which is a very, very broad list and probably of interest for everybody who's interested in DNS security and stability.

And the working group solicits input and has solicited input from expert and interested parties to create that list and say since Singapore it's made some preliminary choices about the threats which are in scope for analysis so also within scope of the working group which are outside of scope.

The scoping work is getting well along and is not complete but nearly finished; that the working group hopes to conclude this part of its activities soon after the Dakar meeting.

And in Dakar it - the DSSA will provide updates to each of the participating supporting organizations and advisory committees. It will raise awareness of its activities and progress to date and will solicit your input to see whether they covered the - all the essentials regarding the threats for the DNS at a global level. And to provide input you can contact your - the DSSA members from your community.

And in Dakar it hopes to start the organize it's activities around the analysis of threats and continue its work on scoping. The DSSA background material you can find at the open Wiki space of this working group. And it also includes a very broad overview of the threats and risks identified to date. And they will share that information was well at the Dakar meeting.

I think that's all for me. And I want to hand it over now to my dear friend and colleague Olof Nordling who will talk about the ASO. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you so much (Bart). Good evening all from Brussels. You've heard a lot about a name side of ICANN but there is a number side as well. And with numbers we mean primarily IP addresses and autonomous system numbers. And that's the realm of the ASO which actually opens the universe in it's own right replete with acronyms. And let's have a look to start with on some of those.

First and I would say foremost the RIRs. They've managed them before. Stands for regional Internet registry. And in this vision chain of IP addresses well, it starts from the IANA function of ICANN, hands out, allocates big chunks of IP addresses to the regional Internet registries who in turn hand out slightly smaller checks of course to the ISPs and to service providers sometimes also called local internet registries in this particular universe and

those in turn provide you with Internet addresses which are so useful in order to connect to the Internet.

So regional Internet registry; well, there are five of those and the AfriNIC for the African region, APNIC for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North America, LACNIC for Latin America and the Caribbean and RIPE for Europe. They also cooperate globally in an organization called the NRO, the Number Resource Organization.

And now we can explain what ASO actually means because it is the memorandum of understanding between ICANN on one side and the NRO on the other side also involving of course the regional Internet registries, which identifies NRO as fulfilling the function of the address supporting organization. Simple isn't it.

Now when it comes to policy development well one major task of the ASO is to handle what's called global policy proposals and that's a grand name and it would deserve some explanation as well. Because a global policy it is just well the tip of the iceberg of what the RIRs are doing.

Policy development is actually conducted on a very bottom up policy manner by the RIRs and they develop plenty of regional addressing policies. But a few of those would affect the IANA and the IANA location of addresses in a sense and only those are called global policies.

And specific requirements for global policy to be actually arrive to the status of a global policy because it has to be adopted in all the five regions exactly in the same manner and with the same formulation in order to consequently be forwarded to the ICANN Board for ratification as a global policy.

And there are global policies, which have been adopted and are in use and practice for IPv4, for IPv6, for autonomous system numbers. And there is one

in pipeline right now. And that's about handling recovered IPv before address space, post exhaustion (assets) can be expressed.

And well it's all about recycling, let's be green and so let's recover the IPv4 address and use them as best we can. That's a bit of the rationale behind. And it is important in the sense that currently that still IANA may be out of IPv4 address space if (free pool) was depleted earlier this year.

But there's still a policy in place for handling - for allocating IPv4 addresses and it's based on the previous situation so it would only allow for allocation of so-called slash-8, which is a big chunk of 16 million addresses. And it's very, very unlikely to happen given the current situation.

So the proposal would enable IANA to both receive recovered IPv4 address space from the RIRs and to distribute them, allocate them in smaller blocks than was previously possible. And well, one could say there's been a bit of a bumpy road about this proposal. Perhaps not this proposal but a preceding proposal because this is the third one.

The two previous ones didn't achieve the global consensus necessary to be promoted to actually become a global policy. So they ended up with different formulations and different RIRs. But this one has evolved pretty well and it has been adopted in APNIC and passed the final call in LACNIC, AfriNic and RIPE and is currently in the final discussion stage in ARIN in North America.

So this may well in the not too distant future reach the global consensus necessary. And what happens then is that it is forwarded for review by the NRO Executive Committee Council and also then forward to the ASO Address Council for a final review to see that all the policy development steps been followed in all RIRs and subsequently forwarded to the ICANN Board for ratification within a 60 day period.

So that's where we are with the global policy proposals. And if this is at all interesting to you, well, you can easily participate in these activities because it's all happening in the RIRs. That's where the policies are developed for addressing policies.

And they're truly bottom up policy development processes. And you can - regardless of where you're based, you can participate in any of the RIRs. We also support these policy development processes with open meetings and regular intervals and there are open mailing lists for such matters. So you can very easily get in touch and come up with your proposals or at least get a close view on how it's working in (practice).

And to get a real overview of not only what's happening on a global policy and development level but also the regional policy development, you should be aware that in Dakar there will be a meeting or a workshop organized by the ASO Address Council with participants from all the RIRs who will run through what they're currently working on. And this is going to take place on Wednesday in Dakar 1:00 to 3:00 pm local time there.

And on the note of participation, I would like to hand over now to Filiz Yimaz in Amsterdam and to address participation in a wider context. Please Filiz.

Filiz Yimaz: Thank you Olof. My name is Filiz Yimaz, Senior Director of Participation Engagement. And I will talk about recent developments on public comment processes.

So public comments are the last piece of the bottom up ICANN processes. As you have seen throughout this presentation too 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 the opportunity to comment on these developments. This system is called the

public comment process at ICANN. Recently we have been working on enhancements on this 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 and as we developed different components to integrate to the improved system, we first worked with a focus group appointed by ICANN community leaders.

Recently we compiled the report about these enhancements, added the summary of the focus group input and put it up for wider community review and feedback by opening a public comment period on the issue. This public comment is called Phase 2 of public comment process enhancements, what you see on the slide now.

Part of this report is about certification 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 readers. And they're also about assisting community members in determining the importance or the urgency of a solicitation for themselves.

Report contains a section on comments, reply comments, cycles through. This is a new concept. It's about restructuring community input process with initial comment period followed by a separate reply period so that the - those previous comments can be addressed by participants as well.

As initial test of this new concept, we opened for public comment on the report on 31st of August and then the first comment cycle was closed on 30 September. And on the same day with an announcement we opened the reply cycle. That will last until 15th of October. The second period is only for responses to the previous comments.

Note that the certification and comment reply cycle concepts are actually addressing the ATRT recommendations and the report contains background information about that too.

We also introduced ideas on introducing a Wiki based forum interface so that thread discussion can be supported during the public comment periods. We believe a thread discussion and (unintelligible) will maximize transparency and will assist the link in the thought process between comments and corresponding replies to them.

So we'll see some feedback in this first comment period and we hope to hear your responses to those during the second reply period now. Note that there's only a couple of days left to do so - to provide responses to the previously submitted comments in the second period.

Please visit the public comment box for this subject and help us in improving this process. 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 proposed within the solicitation, if we receive enough support for this idea, we plan to conduct limited community testing on the platform that we have been developing so far.

And if you are interested taking part in this test, please let us know by sending a mail to participate at icann.org so we can reach you if and when the test is put in place depending on the community interest.

So thank you and now I will leave the mic to (Brian).

(Brian): Thank you very much Filiz. We just have a couple last things to wrap up and then we'll turn it over for some questions. Although this Webinar focuses issues for the Dakar meeting, there are of course many other ongoing issues

in work that the policy team is focusing on. And we encourage you to stay in touch with us throughout the year.

There are a couple ways to stay updated on what's going on. The first is that we the policy department publishes a monthly update on policy issues. It's published the mid month. It is available online at the address you see on the slide there.

You also can subscribe with the link that's provided. And it is available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. We have seen quite a bit increase in the number of subscribers which we're very pleased about and certainly encourage you to stay in touch with us and up to date on policy issues through this particular publication.

In addition we have a couple of external communication tools one being both undergoing improvements and redesign. You probably have noticed some of the beginning work done on the ICANN Web site itself. We're beginning to working on that on several months to make it more accessible and easier to use.

In addition we are continuing to work on improving the GNSO Web site including incorporating new technologies that hopefully again will also make it more accessible and more friendly in using.

We also encourage you to of course stay in touch with us and approach us at the international meetings including the upcoming at Dakar. And of course contact us in between. In addition to the policy staff members that you heard today on the Webinar, we have 17 full time staff members in six countries and eight time zones including the list here. We also have Kristina Nordstrom in Sweden who provides additional support for the secretariat and ccNSO.

And so we have a few minutes left for questions and I'd like to ask the staff here to go ahead and open up the lines if there are any questions. And

hopefully we can address those that are remaining in the time that we have left.

Coordinator: Thank you. All lines are now open if you'd like to ask a question. All lines are now open.

(Brian): Okay.

(Sala): Hello everyone. Since no one's asking a question, this is (Sala) from CG. And I'd just like to say thank you very much to all those who presented. This has been particularly useful for me in term - I've been navigating through Web site and reading all the documents but it brings a fresh insight and context that can't be gleaned ordinarily reading the policy documents. I thank you guys.

(Brian): Thank you very much (Sala). Appreciate it. Appreciate your comments both now and in the chat room as well.

Are there any other questions from the participants online?

Man: I think that just means you guys covered it all.

(Brian): Right. Well thank you very much. We appreciate everyone taking the time to, you know, learn about certain updates on the issues prior to the Dakar meeting. Of course we look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at Dakar. For those of you that might have some follow up questions, you'll see in the chat room first of all that the slides will be posted as well as the transcript, you know, soon after on a link provided in the chat room.

In addition, if you have any follow up questions, please feel free to contact us at the link that's provided here on the slide. And with that, I'd like to turn it back over to David Olive to - for closing remarks.

David Olive: Thank you very much (Brian) and members of the policy team and also more importantly those on the line who have been listening to our presentation. We again appreciate your comments and your inputs. And we'll be looking forward to talking with you or meeting with you in Dakar or online.

So thank you very much for your time and attention. I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning depending on where you are. Thank you again.

END