

**Pre Costa Rica Policy Webinar
01 March 2012 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Pre Costa Rica Policy Webinar on 01 March 2012 at 13:00 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

A participant list taken from the audio bridge and the Adobe Connect room can be found at the end of this transcription

Woman: Okay thank you.

Man: We can go ahead and start now. (Unintelligible) first though. Hello?

David Olive: Hello, my name is David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development Support. I would like to welcome all of you to our ICANN Policy Webinar.

I'm sorry for the disconnection when I tried to start but I think we are ready and I want to thank everyone for joining.

This is the regular policy update which we do prior to each ICANN meeting. We hope that it will help all of us prepare for the various discussions on policy and other matters that will take place in Costa Rica in a week time or so.

In addition to the policy members who are presenting I would like to point out two guest speakers on today's call; one is a familiar face I'm sure and voice, Olof Nordling, Director of Services from our Brussels office. He will be talking about the - addressing policy matters, the ASO activities, and Berry Cobb, a

policy consultant, will be talking to us about his work and the work of a group on the consumer metrics relating to the new gTLD program.

At this stage I'd like to point out to you in our policy notes just some housekeeping matters. We are going to be muting the lines because of the many people on the call.

And of course if you'd like to ask a question please go to the chat and type in the question and we'll make every effort to try to answer it then. Or we will have time afterwards to provide you with a chance to ask some other questions at the end of our presentation.

The goals of this session are here on our screen. We want to update you, the review the issues likely to be discussed at Costa Rica, inform you of the various other activities and of course to provide any answers to your questions.

The highlights of the meeting are these, in particular again we're having a newcomers track for those who are relatively new to ICANN meetings to allow them - provide them some special briefings and allow them - information sessions that will help them understand the activities at the conference.

There will be discussions on the RAA amendments, the Whois review - both review team and other discussions, consumer choice, competition and trust and a consensus-building session tool for best practices by Elad Levinson which should be of interest to all of us.

There's further information on our ICANN Website for Costa Rica. The citation is there and we ask you to look at that as well.

There are - will be a lot of information on today's call and we will let you know that this call will be recorded so that you can always go back and listen to it at

your leisure and that will be also I think helpful to all of us at the end of this call.

In terms of policy developed at ICANN of course the three supporting organizations...

Liz Gasster: Hi, all; can you hear me? It's Liz.

Woman: Yes we can hear you.

Liz Gasster: Why don't I pick up for David. He's having technical difficulties on this. And when David rejoins I'll turn it over to him again.

I'm Liz Gasster from the ICANN Policy staff. Good day everyone and sorry about our technical difficulties. David was just describing the organizations within ICANN that develop policy, the GNSO for generic names, the ccNSO for country code names and the ASO for addressing.

We also have advice provided by various advisory committees, the ALAC, the SSAC, the RSAC and the GAC. We are going to have a comprehensive set of topics covered today. I would like to introduce just the topics that are going to be covered by - related to the GNSO - the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

We'll have Marika talk about a number of topics including the new GNSO policy development process and the status various pending work. Margie Milam will be talking about the registrar accreditation agreement activities.

I'll be giving a Whois update. Berry Cobb will be talking about a recent report posted on consumer choice, competition and trust, Julie Hedlund on working group - on cross community working groups and Brian Peck discussing protection of IOC and other issues.

We also will have a presentation on country code topics and again on address supporting topics. So with that what I'd like to do is just jump right into the GNSO policy issues if we could. These are all of the current issues being discussed in the GNSO that you'll be hearing about today.

And I just want to note the last bullet in particular. There are quite a few other activities that we're not covering. Today we've tried to focus on the ones that - where there are either activities underway in Costa Rica or other details that you should know about. But we do have quite a few other activities as well going on.

So with that I would like to turn things over to Marika Konings for her briefing. Thank you, all.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Liz and hello everyone. Thank you for joining the Webinar. My name is Marika Konings; I'm a Senior Policy Director mainly supporting GNSO policy development activities based in ICANN's office in Brussels.

So first I want to briefly talk to you about the revised GNSO policy development process. Basically as part of the Board-mandated review of the GNSO the goal was set to revise the existing GNSO policy development process - or also known as a PDP - to make sure that it would incorporate the working group model which now has become the standard methodology for conducting policy development and also to ensure that the process is more effective and responsive to ICANN's policy development needs.

So actually following many months of hard work by a dedicated work team made up of volunteers from different parts of the ICANN community the revised policy development process, which is in the form of a new Annex A of the ICANN bylaws and a PDP manual, was adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

And as a result of that the right GNSO PDP has now been in effect since the 8th of December of last year and applied now to all new and ongoing policy development processes.

So on this slide you just see a very high level overview of the revised PDP outlining the main milestones of the process. And, you know, for those of you that are familiar with the GNSO - the old GNSO PDP this might look familiar as many of those milestones remain the same.

But however as usual the devil is in the details and there are a couple of important improvements and innovations that have been introduced in the revised PDP.

Unfortunately there is not enough time today on this call to discuss those in detail. But for those of you that are interested to learn about the new PDP I would just like to encourage you to review the revised Annex A as well as the PDP manual.

And you'll also have an opportunity to attend a session that will explain the revised PDP in further detail which is being held on Sunday the 11th of March from 9:00 to 9:30 at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica as part of the GNSO working session that takes place that day.

I just also wanted to highlight that there is currently a public comment forum open on some additional changes to the ICANN bylaws that are the result of the adoption of the revised GNSO PDP such as updating the section that provides an overview of the applicable voting thresholds as the revised PDP has introduced a couple of new ones.

So the deadline for comments is tomorrow, the 2nd of March, so if you still have something to contribute please do so. And on this slide you just find some links to the additional information in relation to this topic if you want to read up on it.

So next I'll be covering a couple of items that are related to the Inter-Registrar 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.

And as part of the implementation of that policy it was decided to also carry out a review to really make sure that it was working as intended or, you know, to determine whether there was any need for clarification of certain areas.

It might be worth mentioning that this is actually the number one area of complaint when it comes to issues that are raised with our ICANN compliance department.

As a result of that review a number of issues were identified which were then grouped together in five different PDPs which were labeled A-E and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

So first looking at the Part B PDP in this series this one is now nearly complete. Most of the recommendations were already adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board last year and are about to come into effect.

An update on the status of implementation of these recommendations is first seen on Saturday from 3:00 to 3:30 at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica again during the GNSO Council working session.

For two of the recommendations, one relating to how to lock and unlock domain names and one relating to a clarification of Whois status messages relating to registrar lock, the GNSO Council requested additional staff proposals.

These two proposals have now been approved by the GNSO Council and will hopefully be shortly considered by the ICANN Board. For one of those relating to the standardization and clarification of Whois status messages a public comment forum is currently open and comments for that one can be submitted until the 25th of March.

So in the meantime the IRTP Part C working group has already kicked off its activities as well. And this working group is looking at three charter questions, one relating to the issue whether there should be a change of control function for gTLD registrations as this currently does not exist, secondly whether the form of authorization, which is used to initiate a transfer should be time limited, and thirdly whether there should be a requirement for registrars to use IANA IDs for registrars instead of proprietary IDs.

So this working group has set itself a very ambitious schedule and hope to deliver initial report for community review and discussion by the ICANN meeting in Prague.

Currently the working group has started its deliberations on Charter Question A relating to change of control and is in the process of exploring processes used in the ccTLD community to see if there are any potential model processes that could also benefit the gTLD community.

So if you're interested in this topic and want to learn more there's still an opportunity to join the working group as they've only recently started. If you want to see them in action and have an opportunity to ask them questions or contribute to their discussions the working group is organizing an open working group meeting which will take place on the Wednesday the 14th of March of 8:30 to 10:00. And this working group will also provide a status update to the GNSO Council on Saturday from 2:30 to 3:00.

So moving onto the next topic which is the thick Whois; the IRTP Part B working group recommended that the GNSO Council requests an issue

report on this topic which is the first step in a policy development process. So the GNSO Council resolved to request such an issue report from staff. And this issue report should consider any positive as well as negative effects of a requirement of thick Whois for all gTLD registries.

And following the revised PDP a preliminary issue report was published for public comment in November of last year and we received nine comments as a result.

So following the review of those comments and updating the report accordingly the final issue report was submitted to the GNSO Council on the 2nd of February so earlier last month.

So the report itself provides an overview of the differences between thick and thin Whois, it describes the current situation of gTLD registries as well as the requirements that are in place for new gTLDs. And it also provides an initial list of issues that should be considered should a PDP move forward.

So these issues include specific benefits and/or downsides of thick Whois such as, you know, consistent response, enhanced stability, cost implications, privacy and data protection concerns. But it also highlights a couple of other issues such as scope of the PDP, relationship with other Whois activities and, you know, highlights the issue of are sufficient resources available.

So the staff recommendation in the issue report, which is a required element of each issue report, recommends that a PDP is initiated as the issue is considered within scope of the ICANN policy process and the GNSO.

So it is now up to the GNSO Council to decide whether or not to move forward with the PDP. And this issue is on the agenda for consideration during the open GNSO Council meeting in Costa Rica which is scheduled for Wednesday from 2:00-6:00.

So again here you'll find some links to the issues I've just spoken about where you can find more information.

So next up is a brief update on the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery PDP. 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 last year and subsequently the GNSO Council approved the report and its recommendations in July.

Then the Board adopted the recommendations at its meeting in Dakar. Overall there are 17 recommendations which aim to provide additional guarantees to registrants when it comes to expiration and renewal of domain name registrations. They intend to improve registrant education and comprehension and are largely considered to be in line with the existing registrar practices.

As part of these recommendations a PDNR implementation review team has now been formed which is consisting of community members. And that group is going to be tasked to assist ICANN staff in the development of the implementation plan for these recommendations.

Again an update on the status of implementation is scheduled to be provided during the GNSO Council working session on Saturday from 3:00 to 3:30 in Costa Rica. And again here you'll find a link to the final report which contains all the recommendations.

So next up is a PDP that is just getting started relating to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings, and we're actually still looking for a good acronym so if anyone has any suggestions feel free to suggest.

So this PDP actually follows from a recommendation of the IRTP Part B working group to address this issue as part of a possible review of the UDRP. And then it was also flagged in the issue report on the current state of the UDRP where it was also noted that this is a problem.

So the Council decided to initiate a PDP on this specific item only for the time being as currently there is according to the policy no requirement to lock a domain name in the period between the filing of a UDRP complaint and the commencement of proceedings. And in addition the UDRP itself doesn't define what status quo means in relation to the locking of a domain name.

So following the initiation of the PDP a drafting team was formed to develop a charter for this PDP which would set out the scope and the requirements for the working group that will be addressing this issue.

This drafting team is about to submit the proposed charter to the GNSO Council which will then be able to consider it for adoption at its meeting in Costa Rica. And once adopted a call for volunteers will be distributed and a working group will be formed.

So if you're interested in this issue please keep an eye on the GNSO Website where this call for volunteers will be posted. And if you're interested hopefully you'll sign up and join the working group in addressing these questions.

And then last but not least for me fake renewal notices so fake renewal notices are misleading notices that are sent to registrants from someone claiming to be or to represent the current registrar with the intention of getting the domain name transferred to this entity.

This was an issue that was discussed as part of the registration abuse policies working group which recommended that the GNSO Council should consider initiating a PDP on this topic.

But however following discussions - further discussions on this issue the Council decided it would be more appropriate to first obtain further information on this type of abuse to help inform its deliberations and decide, you know, whether or not to initiate a PDP whether that would be the right approach or not.

So as a result the Council requested a drafting team to develop a request for information from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and based on the feedback received report back to the Council accordingly.

So the drafting team got together and developed a survey outlining a number of questions relating to fake renewal notices to determine the size and the scope of the issue.

And based on the feedback received through the survey the drafting team is now in the process of finalizing its report to the Council which will provide an overview of the results of the survey but it will also contain a number of options the GNSO Council may want to consider when deciding on how to address this issue.

So the drafting team is on track to deliver the report in time for the GNSO Council to discuss it at its open meeting in Costa Rica before on Wednesday. So if you're interested in this issue you may want to drop by that meeting and hear further conversations about that topic.

And I think that's all for me and with that I'll hand it over to Margie Milam.

Margie Milam: Hello everyone. I'm Margie Milam; I'm a Senior Policy Counselor with the Policy Team at ICANN. And I'm going to provide you a brief update of the

status of the large project we've been working on related to the registrar accreditation agreement; we call it the RAA.

The RAA is the standard agreement that ICANN signs with all registrars to make them - to allow them to be an accredited registrar. And that is where a lot of obligations related to registrar activity are described.

And we are currently in the process of just trying to identify amendments to the RAA. This is a result from the Dakar Board resolution where the ICANN Board resolved and requested that negotiations commence immediately to identify amendments to be provided for consideration in Costa Rica.

Specifically those negotiations are meant to address a series of amendment topics, approximately two dozen of them, dealing with various recommendations that came from the law enforcement community over the last several years as well as members of a joint GNSO At Large drafting team that took a look at the RAA and made suggestions on amendment topics for further evaluation.

The Board also indicated that the negotiations should cover other topics that would advance the twin goals of registrant protection and DNS stability. So since Dakar we've been very busy following two tracks on this project.

One of them being the bilateral negotiations where there has been two negotiation teams; one representing the registrars and the other from ICANN staff to really work through these negotiation topics. These negotiations kicked off immediately after Dakar and the team has been working very diligently to try to deliver something by Costa Rica.

There has been over 12 plus meetings including a face to face meeting, several (unintelligible) ones, telephone calls as well as consultations with the law enforcement representatives that submitted some of these recommendations and discussions with GAC representatives.

There's a community wiki that's been launched to keep the community informed on these issues. And if you take a look at the wiki - I provide a link in my other slides - you can see the - each of the negotiation topics and get some information there.

And we're currently working on a status report that is going to be published prior to Costa Rica. At the moment, that is being finalized and should be ready to be published soon.

The status report will not have a specific amendment language but it will go through each law enforcement recommendation and drafting team recommendation and provide status - specific status on whether there's an agreement in principle and what the open issue are so that the community will be fully apprised as to where the negotiations currently stand. And that will also be addressed in specific detail in one of the sessions at the Costa Rica meeting.

The second project that I mentioned is the issue report request because the Board resolution essentially wanted to make sure that all of these amendment topics would be addressed quickly and receive adequate consideration. So the ICANN Board in its resolution requested that there be an issue report that would kick off the new policy development process that - following the procedures that Marika just described on what they called the remaining issues.

And essentially the Board resolution - I realize that there were these 24 plus amendment topics and wanted to make sure that if the amendment topics were not included in the negotiations that the GNSO Council would kick off a policy development process to evaluate them.

So with respect to this track of activity we've published a preliminary issue report on December 12. A public comment was opened and closed in

January of this year. And we are currently finalizing the issue report that will be delivered prior to Costa Rica for the GNSO Council to consider.

And then in Costa Rica - or after Costa Rica the GNSO Council would initiate the PDP on those specific topics that are essentially off the table - are no longer being discussed in the negotiations.

So briefly I'm just going to give you an idea of the types of issues that are being discussed. As you look through these 12 law enforcement requests these are really complicated issues and it describes - as the reason you can really understand it takes so long to - through these negotiation processes to really flesh out the issues and try to craft language that would specifically address these.

You can see that the law enforcement recommendations deal with things like abuse point of contact so that there's ways for reaching registrars in the event that there's some malicious conduct being involved. You can see that there is information - additional information requested related to registrar's contact information such as their business organizations or addresses, their officers.

There's requests related to disclosure of affiliates of registrars. And there's also several Whois-related topics, one being trying to identify obligations related to privacy and proxy services made in connection with registrations and escrow obligations related to privacy and proxy services.

If you look at the remainder of the list as I posted on this slide you can see that there's also issues related to resellers. And as you can imagine there are many, many issues associated with some of these Whois issues and reseller issues and that's what the negotiations have focused on is really trying to identify what would be a commercially practicable or reasonable way of dealing with some of these issues.

There's also a request for verification of data and that is something that there will be a specific session in Costa Rica that will focus on Whois verification and validation and what would be an appropriate model within the ICANN and DNS framework.

There's also a request to create an SLA - a Service Level Agreement - for the Whois for Port 42 servers. And so all of these issues are being explored in depth and will be covered in the status report that will be published prior to Costa Rica.

And so once that status report is published and the final issue report is published that I mentioned earlier because the Board has made this request under the ICANN bylaws the GNSO Council is required to commence a PDP on the remaining issues.

And the final issue report will identify which one of the amendment topics are no longer on the table and will be appropriate for the GNSO Council to initiate its policy development process.

And then because most of the topics are currently under discussion to the extent that those topics fall out of the negotiations and no longer are addressed the issue report will recommend that the GNSO Council initiate a PDP on those topics that might be identified later when the negotiations conclude.

And so as this work proceeds the GNSO Council will need to consider how to prioritize this work because assuming many issues come out of this negotiations that need to go to the policy development process there may be additional work and working groups that have to deal with these issues.

And the issue report will also identify where some of - where there may be overlap on some of the negotiation topics with other work that the GNSO Council is currently undertaking. So for example there's Whois studies

underway, there's the issues that Marika had talked about related to the UDRP.

And so some of these issues that are listed, the best practices work in connection with malicious conduct, all of this is current work that the GNSO Council is addressing that touches on some of these negotiation topics. And so it will be something that the Council will have to take a look at when final issue report is delivered.

And so for additional information and next steps I've provided a link to the preliminary issue report. And as I mentioned there will be a Costa Rica session on Monday afternoon from 1:00 to 3:00 that will provide a much more detailed analysis of - and an update of what's going on with the RAA amendment process.

In that session we will also focus specifically on Whois verification. And we really would like to invite the community who has interest in the Whois topics to attend that session and really share your views on what would be an appropriate validation model or verification on Whois.

And then as the GNSO Council starts doing work on those remaining items, the remaining issues that are no longer on the table, we invite the community to join the working group and work through some of those issues. And certainly take a look at the RAA negotiations wiki that will continue to provide information on the status of the negotiations.

And with that I'll pass it to Liz who will give you an update on Whois.

Liz Gasster: Hello again everyone. Liz Gasster here. I'll be updating you on four gTLD Whois studies that are underway, also a brief update on upcoming survey on the Whois service requirements report and brief mention of some other Whois activities that you've heard about, the thick Whois report, you've heard about

Whois in the context of RAA negotiations. There is quite a bit going on related to Whois and we'll just jump right in.

As you know the GNSO Council decided in 2007 that more factual data was needed to inform future policymaking related to Whois so they identified several areas that they felt really needed further study before policy was undertaken and suggested that studies be done to provide more information on them.

That's what led to the creation of these four studies and these studies are now approved and three of the four of them are underway. So I'm going to quickly update you on those.

The first is a Whois misuse study. This study which actually includes two parts of a study is assessing whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and the impact of various types of anti-harvesting measures so there are two mini-studies in this.

One is an experimental study that'll register test domains and measure harmful messages resulting from any misuse that may come from that public information. And the second is a descriptive study that looks at misuse incidents that are reported by registrants and others. This study is underway. Carnegie Mellon University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is conducting this study and results are expected early in 2013.

The second is a registrant identification study that is examining information about how registrants are identified and classifying them into different categories. We've done some re-casting of this study as an exploratory data gathering effort. And we're expecting initial results in late 2012. NORC at the University of Chicago in the United States is conducting this study as well.

The next study is a privacy and proxy abuse study which will compare a broad sample of registered domains with privacy and proxy services to look

at association with potential alleged harmful acts to assess how often bad actors try to obscure their identity in Whois, how this rate of abuse compares with overall use of proxy and privacy services and how this rate compares to alternatives like falsified Whois data and other means.

This study has not actually begun yet due to a number of factors that I'll be explaining in more detail. I'll give a longer briefing in Costa Rica. But I expect that this will start within the next month or so if things go well.

And then there is a Whois proxy and privacy relay and reveal pre-study survey. We had originally - the Council had asked for a study that would analyze communication relay and identity reveal requests for proxy and privacy registered domains. But potential bidders were unsure about the feasibility of this study, whether there was a sufficient data sample, etcetera, to conduct a real - a full study.

So we are conducting a pre-study to survey potential participants. I had hoped that this study would be completed in time for Costa Rica - this pre-study survey - but I think it'll be completed just after that and I'll be providing information as soon as the pre-study survey is complete.

Also I want to talk briefly about an upcoming survey by a new group that was formed by the GNSO Council last year - the Whois service requirements survey working group. Berry Cobb is primarily supporting this group but I'm going to quickly describe where we are with it.

This group is looking at a report that was crafted back in 2010 that is a complication of a comprehensive set of potential technical requirements for Whois that reflects not only known deficiencies in the current service but also policy - technical requirements that may have been needed to support various policy initiative that have been suggested in the past.

This report was - or inventory was released in 2010 and then subsequently the GNSO Council convened this working group to develop a survey to try to estimate the level of agreement in the community with various of these potential technical requirements.

So these are some examples of the types of elements or technical requirements that the survey will include things like a mechanism to find authoritative Whois servers, a standardized query structure, standardized error messages, etcetera, importantly internationalized registration data as well.

The survey is important, again, because it will help estimate the level of agreement with various requirements among the GNSO community. And it may be useful to the IETF and the broader community to have some of this information in terms of what the technical elements are that the community is in agreement about.

But again this is a technical inventory and is not defining or suggesting policies or operational rules that should apply, only the underlying technical requirements that should be included in enhancements to Whois.

So this survey draft is underway. We're at Version 7. It includes 13 requirements forming a total of 63 questions that'll get targeted to - broadly to the community but hopefully particularly to the technical community.

The working group is still going to edit and test the survey, submit the draft survey to the GNSO Council and then release the survey ultimately for 30 days and then analyze and publish the final report.

I do want to briefly mention two other pending Whois activities that you'll hear more about in Costa Rica as well. The first is the Whois Review Team draft report that includes recommendations on data accuracy, privacy and proxy services in internationalized registration data.

And the second is a draft roadmap to implement a SSAC advisory referred to as SAC051 which includes a proposal to evaluate and adopt a replacement registration data access protocol that supports the query and display of internationalized registration data.

Neither of these are specifically policy initiatives at all but they're both relevant - very relevant to Whois so I wanted to mention them in my presentation. And there are - both of these reports - draft reports - are also open for comments until 18-March.

So with that I'd like to turn things over to Steve Sheng to talk even more about Whois specifically related to the Internationalized Registration Data working group. Steve, thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Liz. My name is Steve Sheng. I'm a Technical Analyst for the Policy Group. I'm going to briefly talk about the Internationalized Registration Data working group or the IRD working group.

So the IRD working group is a joint working group of GNSO and SSAC. Its task is to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data.

So the - why is this important? So traditionally the registration data or Whois data is mostly in US ASCII. As the domain name system becoming more internationalized. So there's more demand to have this data represented in one's native language and scripts.

So supporting (IID) it's seen as an important (unintelligible) for the core service overall. So although that's important, however, today there's no standards that exist for both submission and display of that information.

Furthermore, the current (unintelligible) implementations do not consistently support the internationalized registration data. And could lead to poor user experience and inoperability issues. So the existing protocol as defined by (RSV3912) does not have the capability to support (IID).

So the working group was formed in 2010 and work for year and a half they issued a final report. So in the report here's the list of issues they considered. So the working group considered in the high - at a higher level whether it's suitable to internationalize the main registration data.

And the answer is yes, obviously. And the working group also discussed then what data elements are suitable to be internationalized. So they went through each of these elements in the (unintelligible) output and determined whether that's suitable to be internationalized and what are the standards - possible technical standards available for the display and submission.

The third question the working group considered is whether the current (unintelligible) system is capable of handling the query of domain and display of the (IID) data. And the answer to that is, no, not consistently, although there are some workarounds.

And finally the working group considered what other specifications that are feasible to do the (IID). So the working group has published its draft final report. It's been finalized.

We went through a public common process. And we finalized the report. So here's the link to the draft report. The next step for this report is it will be submitted to (GNSO) and (Unintelligible) for approval and action because of the joint working group.

So that's a quick update from. Thanks. Next I'm going to turn over to my colleague, (Barry), to talk about consumer metrics.

(Barry Cob): Hello. Thank you, Steve. My name is (Barry Cob). And I'm assisting the policy team on a few efforts. One of which is the consumer metrics working group.

I'd like to start off by saying in 2010 the ICANN board had requested advise from the (SO)s and (AC)s on establish definitions, measures, and three year targets for key phrases that are embedded into the affirmation of commitment. And those are competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

ICANN board requested this advice because 12 months post delegation of the first two (TLD) (unintelligible) to measure the effectiveness of the (GPLD) program.

Basically in September of 2011 the (GNSO) council formed the consumer trust choice and competition working group and approved their charter. And as of recently a public forum has been opened to solicit comments based on a draft advice letter that the working group had just completed.

Basically the contents of the advice letter contained definitions on our key phrases and also a set of metrics per each of the definitions. For the purposes of this call today I won't read through the definition. However, there are a couple of key takeaways that are derived from this slide.

The first is that there's a specific order to these terms and definitions primarily because they required a little bit grouping. To define consumer trust and consumer choice it was important for the working group to accurately define consumer. And so within the advice letter you'll see a strong connection between those three definitions.

Secondly, competition is only viewing competition within the contracted parties that provide (GPLD) and domain registration services. And so it was separated out from a difference from the consumer all definitions.

Secondly on this slide there's basically a high level summary of the types of measures per definition. I invite the working - I invite the community to take a look at the advice letter. Within there it's segmented out by definition. And you'll see the specific proposed measures for each one of those definitions.

Each measure not only includes a definition, but it includes a most likely probable source for that data. And also will provide the reader a probable three year target as defined by the working group for that.

Basically the next step as I mentioned the public forum comment period just opened up on the 23rd of February. We have submitted translations for the other UN five languages.

The comment period will be open for a total of 40 days from the last translated document. And then we'll also conduct a 21 day reply period after that.

There will be a public session in Costa Rica. And it's scheduled for Wednesday at 11:00 am local time. So we invite the community to come in for a more detailed presentation of the content of the advice letter.

And lastly the working group is targeting May of 2012 to submit the final advice letter. However, that may be pushed into June given the duration of the public comment period with the translations as well.

And lastly, for further information here's a link to the public comment period as well as the (unintelligible) used for the consumer metrics team where you can see (unintelligible) drafts of this advice letter and some of the details of the metrics.

So with that I'll pass that over to (Julie). And she'll talk to you about across community working groups. Thank you.

(Julie): And they have been used in several cases. And I'll mention on the next slide a few that are currently in operation. But there have been some concerns about their operations and in particular coordination among their participating (SO)s and (AC)s.

And the council now, the (GNSO) council is seeking principles to help bring clarity and predictability for the participants in cross community working groups.

Recent cross community working groups include the (SOAC) new detailed applicant support working group, the geographic regions review working group, the internationalized registration data working group that Steve Sheng just spoke about, and the (DMS) security and stability analysis working group that Bart Boswinkle will be talking about a little later in this Webinar.

Recent developments - in October the (GSNO) council approved a charter and the formation of a drafting team to define a way forward for the effective chartering functioning and utilization of cross community working groups.

And this drafting team just in January provided to the council for consideration some draft principles for cross community working groups. These draft principles address the following area, the scope of these groups, including possible purposes and their relationship to the policy development processes. And also the operations, how are they formed, what do they execute and how. And what are their outcomes?

The next steps are that the (GNSO) council will consider these draft principles at its meeting in Costa Rica on March 14. And in fact I should add that the council will be discussing also the cross community working groups and related issues at their working session on Saturday March 10. And that is at 4:00 to 4:30 that day.

The council then plans to circulate and discuss these draft principles with the (SO)s and (AC)s to get their guidance input. And then once they're approved these principles may be incorporated in the (GNSO) council's guidelines for establishing working groups and in the formation of new cross community working groups.

And so for further information here's a link where you can go and look at the draft principles. Thank you very much everyone. And now I shall turn everything over to (Brian Peck) who will talk about Red Cross and (ISO) names drafting team.

(Brian Peck): Thank you very much, (Julie). I'm going to provide a brief update with regards to the (GNSO) drafting team's work on looking at the protection of Red Cross and international (unintelligible).

In Singapore the board did authorize protection for specific risks of requested names from both the Red Cross and organization (NAOC) by basically placing a temporary moratorium on those names for the top level only during the initial application period, which is currently ongoing for new (DLD)s.

And that moratorium is in place for that first round until the (GNSO) and (GAC) develop policy advise based on overall public interest. Since that (unintelligible) resolution and adoption in Singapore the (GAC) did submit a proposal in September of last year to the (GNSO) to protect those names as reserved names at both the top level and the second level.

The (GNSO) drafting team was formed after the (car) meeting and has been working on a proposal on how to protect the (IOC) and Red Cross names under the new (GTLD) program and is currently working on such proposals.

It has been reading on a regular basis. And they appear to be coming together on a proposal that would protect basically the (IOC) and Red Cross names as reserved names with some modifications to other reserved names

in the new detailed process to allow certain exceptions for certain numerous things such as, for example, Olympus cameras or Olympic Airlines, which they hope would be considered by the (GNSO) council in Costa Rica.

Obviously this still needs a lot of work to be done to reach consensus both in the (GNSO) and with the (GAC) within a short time frame before the Costa Rica meeting.

However, if no consensus is reached the bottom line is that these names are protected in the first round by the board resolution back in Singapore. So stay tuned I'm sure there might be some developments in the Costa Rica meeting, of course, which either if you're attending or, you know, can follow through the various methods that are setup by ICANN for the Costa Rica meeting.

So with that I'd like to turn it over to our colleague Bart Boswinkle to talk about (unintelligible) policy issues.

Bart Boswinkle: Good day everybody. I want to address a couple of topics with you today. The first one is a little bit on the structure of the (CCSNO) and how it's organized.

I've noted that on these Webinars a lot of people are not very familiar with the mechanics of the (CCNSO)s. So I thought it might be a good opportunity to enlighten you a bit about it.

The second part of the presentation will be on an overview of the main activities. And the third part will be on activities of the joint working groups, which the (CCSNO) is participating.

It should work here. Sorry. This one is - I need to go back one. The (CCSNO) is constituted in mainly of two parts. One is the (CCSNO) membership. And the second is the (CCSNO) council, which I will address in the next slide.

The (CCSNO) membership the membership consists of (CCTLD) managers currently. To date (IDN) (CCTLD) managers are not eligible yet. But this is part of one of this part of the policy development process, which I will talk about a little bit later.

And the (CCSNO) membership should be distinguished from the (CCTLD) community. The (CCTLD) community in the terms of the (CCSNO) is that members and nonmembers of the (CCSNO) but all are (CCTLD) managers.

This is important to make a distinction between the (CCSNO) members who have voting rights in the (CCSNO) and by policies developed by the (CCSNO). And the (CCTLD) community at large can all participate in (CCSNO) working groups.

So to date the (CCSNO) consists of 125 members. The latest member was just approved last week, (Unintelligible). So the (CCTLD) manager for (dot PF) (France Polynesia). And we have one application pending.

You see it includes an overview of the (CCTLD) managers per ICANN geographic region. And I want to note that the membership is a bit distorted. Some organizations run two or more - are manager of two or more (CCTLD).

An example is, for instance, (Unintelligible) from Norway. They are a (CCTLD) manager for (dot NO), (dot BV), and (dot SJ). But they just member for (dot NO). So the membership doesn't really cover the 250 or - a little less managers organizations than the 250 plus (CCTLD)s.

The (CCSNO) council itself consists of 18 counselors, three from every ICANN region and three non-appointees. There are four observers. Through the council they participate in the discussions but are not able to vote. As well as two liaisons, one from Iraq and one from the (GNSO).

The role of the council is (unintelligible) according to the bylaws and rules of the (CCSNO). It is that to ensure the continuity of the (CCSNO) activities. And for that reason one of its main tasks is to maintain a work plan.

And during the Costa Rica meeting the (CCSNO) council in corporation with the working group chairs will update and review the current work plan. And as an additional feature will start to include and reflect the capacity of the volunteers from the (CCSNO) in combination with the anticipated workload and the anticipated increase in workload. So that's going to be an interesting exercise.

The next topic I want to address are the main activities of the (CCSNO) focusing on the Costa Rica meeting. And I've distinguished between activities which are policy related and activities focusing on the (CCTLD) matters or on ICANN processes as such, for instant, the strategic and operational planning processes.

One of major activity currently undertaken by the (CCSNO) is what is called the framework of (unintelligible) working group. It has joined members from the (GAC) and the (CCSNO) and liaisons from (ALAC) and the (GNSO).

In Costa Rica the (CCSNO) and (GNSO) will discuss the final recommendations in obtaining and documenting consent, which a report has just been published.

And the working groups seeks endorsement from the (GAC) and the (CCSNO) on its recommendations which will then be submitted to the ICANN board.

A second topic that will be discussed are the draft recommendations on obtaining and documenting support from significantly interested parties also formally known as the local Internet community or (LIC).

And the working group itself will address the issues and recommendations for unconsented re-delegations, which is one of the other working items of the framework of interpretation working group.

The objective of the framework of interpretation working group is to provide consistent. And during interpretation of the current policy for the delegation and re-delegation of (CCTLD)s and its activity it interprets the current policy, which is documented in (RSE 1591) and the (GAC2005) principles.

The next set of the policy related activities are the (IBMCCPDP). The (IBMCCPDP) address in fact two topics or main issues. One is the overall policy for the selection of (IBMCCCTLD)s. And the second one is on the inclusion of (IBMCCCTLD)s in the (CCSNO).

As I just explained the (IBMCCCTLD)s are currently not eligible to the (CCSNO). And the bylaws need to be changed in order to accommodate (IBMCCCTLD)s in the (CCSNO).

So this is part of the (IBM) policy development process. The overall policy is currently focusing on issues pertaining to confusingly similarity. And it will update and take into account the experience of the fast track process as part of the policy. The working group will meet in Costa Rica. And there will be a presentation there as well.

A second part relating to existing policies is the study group under use of country and territory names (STLD)s. The purpose of this working group is to identify issues and recommend further actions to the (CCSNO) pertaining to the use of country names and enter those names as top level domains.

The membership is from the (GNSO) and the (CCSNO) with observers from the (GAC) and at large. To date it has documented the current and future policies. And it is currently developing (unintelligible) of country names to

understand the scope and impact of the policies identified. And to users to understand potential issues and identify the issues.

In Costa Rica the working groups hopes to finalize the (unintelligible) of which will then be used for a survey by (Unesco).

A third set of main activities or a second set, as I said, pertains to (CCTLD) community or ICANN processes. The finance working group is a working group which is focusing mainly on the (CCTLD)s. And it's trying to develop a new financial model for financial contribution for the (CCTLD)s to ICANN.

Note the financial contributions of (CCTLD)s is outside the policy (unintelligible) of the (CCSNO). So the advice of this working group goes through the (CCTLD) - it's for the (CCTLD) managed community and is a nonbinding guideline, which will replace the current guidelines.

What will happen in Costa Rica is that the finance working group will present the results from a survey among the (CCTLD) community on (CCTLD) contributions to ICANN in general. So support provided to ICANN not just financially, but also resources, for instance, on assisting and organizing ICANN meetings locally.

For example, the (.CR) registry manager is assisting ICANN in preparation of the Costa Rica meeting. And that's part of that survey as well. The finance working group to make it very clear is not representing the (CCSNO) or individual (CCTLD)s as such.

A second working group, which is focusing more on ICANN activities is the strategic and operational planning working group. It focuses on ICANN strategic and operational planning processes.

As part of - this working group has submitted its comments on ICANN's fiscal year 2013 framework operational plan and budget, which you can see at the (CCSNO) working group.

And it will further engage with ICANN and the (CCTLD) community to monitor and evaluate ICANN's fiscal year 2013 operational plan and budget. And will engage with other (SO)s and (AC)s on this matter.

Finally, a little bit on joined working groups in which the (CCSNO) is participating. The first one is the joint (DNS) security and stability. And that is working group - (DDSA) working group.

Please note this working group is in principle very, very broad in ICANN terms. It has participation from the - at large from (ALAC), from the (CCSNO), (GNSO) and (NRO), and with participation of individual members of (ASAC). So it is truly a real cross community working group.

The focus is to identify analysis (unintelligible) vulnerability of the (DNS) and understand gaps if any to mitigate these threats and vulnerabilities and recommend if possible any - make recommendations to the participating (SO)s and (AC)s for further steps.

To date it has been focusing on analyzing threats and vulnerabilities using the (unintelligible) 830 series where you can find it. And the co-chairs will provide updates to the participating (SO)s and (AC)s during their Costa Rica meeting itself. And there will be more far more detail than I can provide you right now.

Finally the joint (CCSNO), (GNSO) (IBM) working group the (unintelligible). It has published its public interim report or universal acceptance of (IBMTLD)s. The public comment period has been extended until the 23rd of March.

During the ICANN meeting on Monday the working group will further discuss universal acceptance and will probably participate at the round table on this topic on Wednesday afternoon.

The secretariats from the (CCNSO) and the (GNSO) sent out a call shortly to the (GNSO) and (CCNSO) seeking more participants not just only to address the to identify and address the policy aspects of universal acceptance, but also for future work on their (IBM) variant issues.

And just recently both - there was a joint letter from this working group - from the (CCSNO) and (GNSO) council to the board on the first topic the working group addressed that was single character (IBMTLD)s.

In this letter that both the (CCSNO) and (GNSO) council reaffirmed their support for introduction and have raised some questions relating to the ICANN board resolution from all of those 2011.

Finally the (CCSNO) agenda for the Costa Rica meeting I want to draw your attention in particular to two sections from the (CCSNO) meeting day that's on Tuesday and Wednesday.

The first meeting is on regulatory and (unintelligible) developments in some countries that may impact the global (DNS) and Internet. This is an introduction for the (Unintelligible) and broader community on (Unintelligible) and (Unintelligible), Internet government control in Mexico, China law enforcement, and (DNS) filtering, and Internet governance issues in Korea.

This meeting is open for all who are interested in it. And it will be on Tuesday afternoon from 2:00 to 3:30 pm. On Wednesday there is another session, which is a panel discussion. And the topic of that session is marketing (CCTLD)s with the event of new (GTLD)s, strategies and reactions to the changing environment.

Again, this is a panel. As I said, this is a panel discussion with public participation. And this is open again to all interested in this topic.

I now want to hand it over to my dear friend and colleague Olof Nordling to talk to you about the (ASO).

Olof Nordling: Thanks ever so much, (Bart). And hello everybody. Time for the (ASO), which takes care of the numbers in the ICANN world. And with that I mean IP addresses and (unintelligible) system numbers.

So I'll get to a lot of policy development as well. But first of all we need to perhaps make ourselves familiar with the (ASO) structure. Widely unknown as it would seem to be the case.

First of all, the (RIR)s, the regional Internet registers, those are the entities which receive huge locks of IP addresses from the (Unintelligible) of ICANN and then hand over big blocks but not as huge to the individual ISPs in their respective regions, which in turn hand over the IP addresses to the final users so you can access the Internet. Good thing.

And there are five of those. I won't repeat the names. You can read for yourself. They are covering the globe in a very unique fashion. And they cooperate on a global scale through the (NRO), the number resource organization.

And now we can come to the explanation of what the (ASO) stands for. It's the address supporting organization, which is actually established through an (MOU) between ICANN and the (NRO) and the (RIR)s actually, which identifies the (NRO) as taking on the role of the (ASO). Crystal clear isn't it? So it's more of an alias for the (NRO) one could say.

Now to the policy development. One major task of the (ASO) is to develop and handle global policy proposals. And that's a grand name. What's behind that term?

The global policy - well, the (RIR) develop lots of regional addressing policies for their own use, within their own regions, through (unintelligible). But a few of those, and actually very few of the policies, do effect the (IANA) and their distribution. And only those are called the global policies.

A few are far between indeed. Well we do have them for (IPB6). We have had them for (IPB4) for a long time. We have them for (AS) numbers. And one that is a pipeline right now is recovered - policy proposal for recovered (IPB4) address space post extortion as it's called.

And a little more about that, okay, it's all about recycling. As you're well aware, the (IANA) (Unintelligible) of (IPB4) addresses they've run out last year. And it may happen that the addresses could be returned to the (IANA). And then they need some kind of policy to in turn allocate them to the (RIR)s again.

It's (unintelligible) than the current policy (unintelligible), which is a (slash 8), which is 16 million others. So this has been going on for roundabout two years. And we're actually now on the third proposal after the two previous proposals ended up being a little bit of a gridlock due to disagreement on the actual wording, because (RIR)s need to agree on exactly the same wording of the policy in order for it to be advanced and actually be acceptable as a global policy.

So this one has now reached the final agreement and adoption by all the five (RIR)s. And then it's now dealt with the (NRO) executive committee and the (ASO) address council, which (unintelligible) everything else proceeded as it should in the processes. And will thereafter hand it over to the ICANN board

for ramification, which may happen - delivery of that may happen within a month or two, possibly three.

And then ICANN board will have 60 days to rectify or pose additional questions to the (ASO). So that's where we stand on that particular policy proposal.

And it is very, very easy to get involved in the (ASO)'s work. And it really consists of getting in touch with the regional Internet registry. And you can contact any (RIR) to do that. They all have open meetings where they discuss open policy proposals. And there are mailing lists for such matters as well.

And you may choose freely between them. You can actually live in Europe and participate in the (unintelligible) in North America if you like and so on.

And last but not least on Wednesday in Costa Rica there will be a workshop organized by the (ASO) address council where you can get an excellent overview of what's (unintelligible) and what's not in the (RIR)s in the (ASO) right now. It's on Wednesday afternoon.

And with that I would like to hand over not to (unintelligible) is on vacation if I understood it. Right? So I think it's (Brian) that takes on this part. Thank you.

(Brian): Thank you, Olof. And, yes, this is - as Olof mentioned, (Unintelligible) is on travel currently. So and he also mentioned it's time to leave some time for questions for the community that's online.

Just to quickly highlight, which at point the slides are summarized, two key developments in terms of the public comment process. And that is that the implementation and the new public comment process has been in effect since the January 1 of this year, which basically implements the (ATRT) recommendations.

There are basically now two cycles for comment itself and then for replying. But this system is in place, as I said, since the first of this year. The other is the staff and a group of dedicated community leaders are working together on a (Wiki) based sort of discussion environment for public comments.

That has been in place in terms of the work in review. Some of the features and functions which the volunteers have been testing on. Some of our volunteers are currently on the call. We would like to thank them for their time and efforts on this initiative.

It now is up to the exec team and the (PVC) to decide whether to go forward with this (Wiki) based system. And just to note that there will be several public comment and engagement events and activities taking place in Costa Rica. And, you know, certainly encourage you to take advantage of them at that time.

In addition, (Felice) will be in Costa Rica to answer questions that you might have. And so with that I'd like to turn it back over to (David Aller).

(David Aller): Thank you, (Brian). And I just wanted to update people on how to stay current with the policy issues. In particular, our monthly policy update report is a particularly notable vehicle for this.

This is published every mid month. And here are the ways to subscribe via the Web site at ICANN. We are happy to say that they are available in the various languages listed here. And we encourage you to subscribe and to use it.

With that, of course, I'd like to point out that the ICANN policy staff has been busy working on this Webinar for the community. And we appreciate their efforts and the cooperation you give them in the various (SO) and (AC) activities.

With that I would like to open it to questions. You can raise your hand on the (Doby) Connect and we'll be happy to answer your questions or type it into the chat room.

Man: Cheryl Langdon-Orr has a question.

(David Aller): And thank you, Cheryl for your participation.

Man: Yes, there are no questions.

(David Aller): We will be concluding our session. With that I would like to thank (Brian Peck) in particular who helped to organize this event. And again our guest speaker Olof Nordling and (Barry Pop). So with that thank you for your participation. And I wish people a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning depending on where you are. Thank you all.

END

Participant list – audio bridge and Adobe Connect room:

Oksana Prykhodk	Brian Beckham	Lemmerich
Syed Iftikhar Shah	Angie Graves	Martin Sutton
Siranush Vardanyan	Christine Brouillard	Maureen
Carton Samuels	Benny	Philip Sheppard
Cintra Sooknanan	Celia Lehman	Raquel Gatto,
Titi Akinsanmi	Cheryl Langdon Orr	Ron Sherwood
Anabeth Lange	Chris Chaplow	Sarah Gatward
Amy Mushahaar	Chrstin Hesselman	Sergio Salinas
Osvaldo Novoa	Dev Anad Teelucksingh	Sieger Springer
Philip Corwin	Gabriela Gijon	Stefan Legnar
Kelly Salter	Gina Lee	Tobias Mahler
Michael Shohat	Judy Harris	Vera Schweinbjornsdottir
Bill Drake	Kelly	Yrjo Lansipuro
Doug Wood	Kevin Murphy	