

TRANSCRIPT
Pre-Toronto Policy Update Webinar
Thursday 04 October 2012 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Pre-Toronto Policy Update Webinar call on the Thursday 04 October 2012 at 1900 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-1900-20121004-en.mp3>

on page

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

and

<http://www.icann.org/en/resources/policy/presentations>

Coordinator: Thanks for standing by. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

David Olive: Thank you very much, my name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support at ICANN and it's a pleasure for me to welcome you to our Policy Webinar.

As you know this regular update Webinar we do prior to each of the ICANN meetings in order to provide interested parties with the latest on policy development activities. We think it helps all of us to prepare for our activities and efforts in Toronto.

There is a lot of information contained in the presentation, the slides and recordings and transcripts we made available following this session so that you can refer back to them when you wish. A translation in French and Spanish of the transcripts will also be provided soon thereafter.

A few housekeeping items -- to reduce interference we ask you to put your phones on mute. There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the session and at that point we will unmute those lines.

During the session you can submit a question in the chat room of the adobe connect.

Woman: Thank you.

David Olive: And we hope that you do that and we'll do our best efforts to answer it during that time or after the presenter is finished with his remarks - or her remarks.

The goals for this session are to let you know the current policy work we are engaged in and the various supporting organizations and advisory committees and their activities.

I'll highlight the issues to be raised in Toronto at this stage, inform you of other upcoming activities and opportunities you might be aware of and want to participate in and also to answer any questions that you may have on the substance and subjects that we'll be discussing today.

Like any ICANN meeting the Toronto meeting will be a very busy one. Some of the highlights -- and there are many other issues because of the supporting organizations and advisory committees will be meeting there -- the working groups will be meeting there.

But in addition to those important meetings we have some highlights -- the newcomers track for those that are recent attendees of the ICANN meetings - - these are always informative sessions -- an update on the Registrant Accreditation Agreement, ongoing implementation of the new gTLD Program and some anniversaries for our regional organizations of at large which we'll be hearing a little more about.

As you can see, you can go to toronto45.icann.org for the full program and the scheduling.

In terms of policy developed at ICANN, policy recommendations are formed and refined by the ICANN community through its supporting organizations and inputs by the advisory committees -- all composed of volunteers -- many of them on this call.

A sample of those stakeholders include companies that offer domain names to the public, entities that operate top-level domain registries, internet service providers, intellectual property interests, business users, non-commercial users, individual internet users and governments are all part of that process through the supporting organizations or advise given to the Board by the Advisory Committees listed on this slide.

Topics covered in this session to focus on those activities or policy issues for Toronto will be within the generic name supporting organization -- the status of completed or current and pending policy developments -- Marika Konings will do that for us, our Registrar Accreditation Agreement update from Margie Milam, Barbara Roseman, Berry Cobb and Steve Sheng will provide some information on the Whois update.

Berry will also tell us about activities on the consumer choice competition and trust area. And Brian Peck will talk about the protection of IOS Red Cross and IGO Names.

Bart Boswinkel our counselor for the ccNSO or the County Code Supporting Organization will talk about the main activities within the ccNSO group. Heidi Ulrich will talk about the at large Advisory Committee activities and Barbara Roseman will give us some more information about the Address Supporting Organization including some of their sessions to be held in Toronto.

With that I'll like to turn it over to Margie Milam our Senior Counselor dealing with the at large matters. Margie why don't you take us through the policy issues with the GNSO.

Margie Milam: Thank you David. I wanted to provide you all an update on some of the activities going on within the GNSO. On this slide you can see that the GNSO's very active. There are over 20 projects underway covering various issues -- some of which we will not talk about on this Webinar.

If you have an interest in these though, we encourage you to reach out to the policy staff to see how you can participate in some of these efforts as many of them are just starting to get underway.

For example the Faith Renewal Notices or the (unintelligible) -- all of those are issues that are kicking off and we on the policy staff are very eager to have as many new volunteers and fresh faces to come work on some of these issues with the others in the GNSO.

One of the interesting things going on in Toronto as you come to the meeting you'll see that there's a change of leadership happening in the GNSO Council. There will be a new Chair elected -- Stephanie Van Gelder will be stepping down -- and all of this will be happening in the Wednesday meeting in Toronto.

There's also weekend sections both on Saturday and Sunday where the GNSO will be exploring -- the GNSO Council will be exploring some of the active issues that it is managing and those sessions are open to the public. If you're interested in participating please visit the Toronto meeting information spot and you'll see all the various topics to be covered there.

And with that I will pass it over to Marika Konings and she will talk to you about the Inter-Registrar Cancer Policy.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Margie. Hi everyone, my name is Marika Konings, I'm a Senior Policy Director - supporting when they need the GNSO in its policy development activity.

And the first topic I'll be talking to you about is the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy or also known as the IRTP. This is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted back in 2004 with the objectives to provide registrants for the transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation of the policy it was decided to carry out a review in order 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 consumer complaints when it comes to issues raised with ICANN compliance tasks.

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

For the third in the series at IRGP Part C Working Group is looking at three different issues. First of all they're looking at whether there should be a change of control or a change of registrant function for GTL's new registration -- as this currently does not exist.

Secondly they're looking at whether the form of authorization which is used to initiate a transfer should be time limits.

And thirdly they're looking at whether there should be a requirement for registries to use IN IDs for registrars instead of using proprietary IDs.

So the Working Group published its initial report prior to the last ICANN meeting in Prague in conjunction with the opening of a public common forum as well as a workshop they held there -- in order to obtain community input on the report and the preliminary recommendations that are contained in that report.

So between Prague and now the Working Group has focused on reviewing those recommendations - or those common service (unintelligible) -- as well as continuing its deliberations on some of the open items that were identified.

So the Working Group is now very close to finalizing its report and hopes to do so next week in time for GNSO Council consideration in Toronto -- so just wanted to give you a short preview of the recommendations as they currently stand as they are expected to be made in relation to the three charter questions.

So first of all the Working Group is expected to recommend the creation of a new policy which would govern a change of registrant. The idea would be to create an overarching transfer policy under which you would have one branch that relates to a change of registrar while the other branch would prescribe the rules for a change of registrant.

Some of the basic rules include that both parties -- the previous and the new registrant -- would need to agree to the changes and that a change of registrar and change of registrant cannot be conducted at the same time to avoid complications.

More details on the exact nature of the proposed process can be found in the report itself.

A second recommendation relates to a time limiting forms of authorization. The Working Group is recommending that an FOA should not be valid for more than 60 days. And following that it would expire and a new FOA would be needed on order to initiate a transfer.

A third recommendation proposed is to require all GTLD operators to publish their registrars -- the registrar of records IN ID in the TLD's Whois. At the same time noting that of course it should be prevent a registry to use proprietary IDs in the context of other operation as long as the IN ID is also published.

So as said today, IRTP Working Group hopes to finalize its report next Tuesday and submit it to the GNSO Council for its consideration. In addition they have planned a meeting in Toronto to brief the community on the final report and its recommendations which is scheduled for Wednesday for 8:30 to 10:00 local time.

And so if this is a topic that interests you please come and stay and meet us at the workshop. Following that it will be from the GNSO Council to consider recommendations and as they move forward for adoption and they'll move to the Board for adoption and from there they go to implementation.

And then at the same time we will probably move into the next IRTP Part D. So if you're interested in this topic keep your eyes open and please volunteer for when that effort takes off.

And here's some links to the background information -- to the initial report as well as the currently - the current transfer policy.

So next up is a PDP that relates to the looking of a domain name subject to UDR pre-proceedings or the UDRP domain name Lock Working Group as is also being referred to.

So following the issue report on the current state of the UDRP, the GNSO Council decided to initiate a PDP on the specific item - on the specific item only as a more extensive review of the UDRP is scheduled for a later point in time.

Currently there is no requirement to lock a domain name in the period between the filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of the proceeding. The UDRP itself only refers to maintaining status quo but does not define what this means or at what point in time the status quo should be maintained.

This as a result has led to different interpretations and practices by registrars which in this turn have results in confusion and lack of clarity for registrars -- really IP providers -- but also complainants and registrants.

So as part of its charter the Working Group has been asking to consider a number of questions -- such as whether there should be an outline of the process for the locking of the domain name which should be followed by a registrar.

Whether there should be a definition of what lock means and, you know, link to that which changes can and cannot be made once a domain name is locked. And whether there should be any additional safeguards to protect registrants.

So one of the first tasks of the Working Group per its charter was to obtain further input in order to have a clear understanding of the exact nature and scope of issues encountered with the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

And to this end the Working Group conducted two surveys -- one for registrars and one for UDRP providers in which a range of questions were asked to get further insight into the current practices into relation to the

locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings. But also get their input on the issues they encounter with the current practices and policy.

So in addition to that the Working Group also opened a public common forum and they reached out to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as the different ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees to get their input on this topic.

So now that all the information has been received the Working Group has started to review all the comments and they hope to start developing responses to each of the started questions soon.

The Working Group is targeting to publish its initial report for public comment towards the end of this year. And I will provide another opportunity there to provide input on the draft recommendations that the Working Group will come up with.

So if you're interested to hear more about this topic the Working Group is organizing an open Working Group meeting in Toronto which will take place on Thursday the 18th of October from 9:00 to 10:30 local time. The Working Group is planning to make this a really interactive session so you're encouraged to come and share your views with the Working Group.

The next topic concerns another policy development process that has recently kicked off in the GNSO which relates to a (SIC) Whois.

So Whois a requirement are specified in the registry and registrar agreement that ICANN has and they're currently two models that are being used by GTLS registries to meet this requirements.

One is known as the Thin Whois model which the registry only collects the information associated with a name such as the data sufficient identified as

sponsoring registrar, the status of the registration and creation and expiration dates for each registration and name server data.

The last time the record was updating the registry database and URL for the registrars Whois servers. And this model of registrars are the ones that maintained a data associated with the registrant of the domain and they provided via their own Whois services. Currently the jobs, .com and .net operate under the same model.

The other model is known as the (SIC) Whois model and in this model (SIC) registries - the registry collects both sets of data so it's domain - the data associated with the domain name but as well as the data associated with the registrant. They collect that from the registrar and in turn publish that data via their own Whois.

So from discussions in other Working Groups such as your IRTP Working Group -- it became obvious that, you know, from a transfer perspective a (SIC) Whois would have a lot of advantages as the identity of the registrant would be known by both the registry as well as the registrar which would address some complications that currently exist.

But at the same time there was also a realization that there may be other factors that would need to be considered in order to determine whether a (SIC) Whois would be - should be required for all gTLDs.

So in order to explore this issue in further the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on this topic earlier this year. And the - a drafting team is currently working on putting the final touches on the charter for the PDP Working Group which is hopes to submit to the GNSO Council for consideration in Toronto.

And once a charter has been adopted a Working Group will be formed and is expected to make recommendations to the GNSO Council on this issue.

So if this is an issue that interests you and you would like to participate in this effort, you know, please keep your - keep an eye on the GNSO Council Website. We're culpable in two years will get published once the Working Group starts forming. And is, of course, this call for volunteers will also get sent out through the different mailing lists and publications that we manage.

And here's just some further information if you want to read more about this particular issue.

So last but not least for me at least is the uniformity of contracts to address registration abuse. This issue dates back to the registration abuse policies Working Group which was tasked by the GNSO Council to identify which issues relating to registration abuse would be suitable for policy development.

And as part of this task the Working Group discussed a lot of issues and amongst others they've identified a number of types of registration abuse and they also looked at the current policies and provisions that registries and registrars have to deal with the abuse.

So in order to examine in further detail whether some kind of uniform provision would assist registries and registrars to address registration abuse - - the Working Group recommends to the GNSO Council that it would evaluate whether a minimum baseline should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements and if created evaluated how such language should be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse.

So as the next step in the process the GNSO Council requested an issue report on this topic. And following the preliminary issue report which was published for public comment -- ICANN staff has not published the final issue report for GNSO Council consideration.

The issues that reported self looks at the history of the issues, reviews existing abuse provision in registry and registrar agreements, it makes a

determination that the issue is considered in scope -- and meaning within ICANN's remit and the GNSO Council to deal with.

And as a result of all that research it recommends that the GNSO Council initiates a PDP on this topic. The initial report does identify that there's a need for additional research to determine how effective current approaches and policies are that are in place by the different registries and registrars and what effect uniformity or uniform provisions may have, you know, both positive as well as negative -- which would help inform the Working Group's deliberation should the GNSO Council decide to proceed with this PDP.

It might be worth pointing out as well that in response to the public problem forum an alternative way of dealing with this issue was put forward which suggested that ICANN staff should take a lead in this effort and draft proposed provisions to address registration abuse for community review.

So this report is now in the hands of the GNSO Council to look at and review the recommendations and decide whether or not to initiate a PDP on this topic. So this is an issue that is on the agenda for Toronto and they may decide to take a decision there or it might get deferred to the next meeting, so.

If you're interested in that topic, you know, please keep an eye on the GNSO Council agenda and the related discussions that will follow from there.

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

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika. I was going to give you an overview of what's going on with the RAA negotiations -- essentially the RAA is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and that is the document that ICANN signed with all accredited registrars to allow them to register domain names.

And as many of you may recall in (Drakur) there was a board resolution that basically kicked off two projects running on parallel tracks. The first one was to initiate the bi-lateral negotiations with the Registrar Stakeholder Group to try to update the RAA to address some of the topics that were raised by the Joint GNSO ALAC Drafting Team that had looked at this issue -- and also recommendations that were presented by the Law Enforcement Community and they had made specific recommendations to areas that could help them deal with a D&S related abuse and Cyber Crime.

So since that time as the negotiations have been actively underway there's a lot of information that's available if you go to the community Wiki where the latest updates are there -- on that Wiki page there are meeting reports for several meetings so you can really get an in-depth view of what's going on in the negotiations.

Since Prague there's been an active effort to really try to bridge the differences between the law enforcement related requests and the position of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and ICANN staff -- to really try to identify how to deal with the big issues that were addressed in Prague -- specifically the Whois verification issue and the data retention issue.

The other thing that's happened since Prague is there's been a focus on trying to work on developing a privacy and proxy accreditation program. This stemmed from statements made in Prague that this effort should proceed immediately as opposed to waiting until the negotiations were concluded -- as so there will be a session in Toronto that will focus on that specific issues and we're very interested in keeping community input on these issues.

The other aspect of the project is the Issue Report request which essentially - the Board requested an Issue Report from the GNSO in order to allow a TDP to commence once the negotiations conclude to address any topics that may have not been included in the negotiated RAA.

So prior to Toronto a series of documents have been published -- there's an RAA negotiation summary that will go into much more detail on the topics that have been discussed since Prague -- including a summary chart of law enforcement and acute recommendations that came from the Registrar Stakeholder group and ICANN as well.

We did not post a new RAA or new specifications because we really tried to focus in on the main issues to try to get closure on the Whois verification and data retention issues.

And if you go to - if you'd like to see what the draft RAA looks like in Prague those documents are still published on the Wiki page. And you can certainly see a draft RAA that shows the status of the - as proposed by ICANN prior to Prague as well as Registrar generated documents in response to some of those postings.

So as I mentioned earlier we focus really on two issues, the data verification and the - the data retention and the Whois verification. And if you read the documents posted prior to Toronto you'll see that the issue really has come down to what are the number of data points that are to be verified?

And the difference being that the law enforcement and the ICANN position has been to request email and phone number verification versus the Registrar Stakeholder group of having verification of email or phone. So those are the issues that we'd like to explore in the session in Toronto. Other issues related to verification include -- the timing of the verification -- whether they are to occur before or after resolution of the domain name. And also there's been discussion about when would there be an event that would trigger an obligation to re-verify that information.

With respect to data retention -- there is essentially an agreement in principle on a two-tiered retention schedule for additional data retention obligation -- one being a six month with more sensitive information versus a two year

period for some of the data that may not be as sensitive. And there's been an agreement on the pipes of data to be maintained and that information is posted in the documents that were published prior to Toronto.

One issue that we really tried to focus in on after the Prague meeting was to try to find a way to deal with the issue of what happens when the obligations that may be negotiated in the contract - what happens in the event that they might violate local law.

And the discussion was a GAC representative and the law enforcement representative was to try to identify what process should be applied in the event that a registrar seeks an exemption to these obligations that may be included in the new RAA.

And the recommendations coming out of these discussions was that there is a current policy called the Whois Conflict of Law Policy that is currently in place. And the proposal is to amend that policy to also address some of the issues related to data retention -- and that will be some of the ongoing work that takes place in Toronto and after Toronto.

And then on this slide and the next slide I just highlighted some of the areas where there's been progress in the negotiations. This information is mostly reflected in the documents that were published prior to Prague.

I'm not going to go into it in any detail but you can see that the negotiations really reflect a very comprehensive review of the RAA and address many aspects of registrar business.

There's also continued discussion related to topics that we expect to take place with the registrars after Toronto dealing with, for example, Whois an SLA on availability, dealing with provisions related to IBMs and also as well as dealing with proposals that came from both ICANN staff the Registrar Negotiating Team.

And with that I've provided you links to all of this information. There is the link to the staff announcement that has all of these summary documents that I mentioned earlier -- as well as the negotiations Wiki with the meeting reports and the latest information.

And then I've also highlighted two sessions if you're interested in further information on this topic -- one being the general update on the RAA which is to occur on Monday -- as well as a session that is currently scheduled for Thursday -- although we are trying to move it to Wednesday -- to explore with the community how a privacy proxy accreditation program might be developed.

And so we invite you to participate in those sessions to hear more about this topic and to provide your input on these important issues.

And with that I'll pass it to Barbara Roseman who will talk to you about the Whois studies.

Barbara Roseman: Hi, excuse me, this is Barbara. I'm going to cover the Whois studies update and then we'll move on to other people for the other activities.

As you know for the Whois studies there's currently four studies underway -- the Misuse of Public Data, Registrant Against (Suction), Proxy and Privacy Abuse and Proxy and Privacy Relay and Review with Study 4 -- and that one has been changed somewhat and so I'll get to that in a moment.

The goals of the TLD - gTLD Whois studies were to actually develop some data on how Whois operates in certain areas. The Council decided that we needed some more objectives and factual basis for moving forward with a Whois policy structure.

They identified several Whois study areas that reflect key policy concerns and show staff initiated these studies through an RFP process.

The most relevant updates for this meeting are the Study 3 -- the Whois Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse Study being conducted by NPL -- examines the extent to which gTLD domain names used to conduct - are used to conduct alleged illegal or harmful internet activities are registered via privacy or proxy services.

They should have results shortly and we're hoping to have them available for discussion in Toronto but if not it will be shortly after Toronto.

Study 4 -- the Who is Privacy and Proxy Relay and Reveal Study has completed but it completed in a different form than it was originally envisioned. Originally it was supposed to try to track relay and reveal requests from beginning to end -- and that turned out to be not feasible.

And so the study migrated to a determination of whether doing a full study was even possible. And the study has been completed. It is posted and the Webinar was held back in August.

That's online for anyone who would like to go back and review it. The results of that were that a full study would be worthwhile with certain limitations, so there was certain data that would not be able to be found doing the study as it was originally envisioned.

But with some changes there were - there was good data that could be derived. The next steps on this are to take it to the Council for a discussion about how to proceed, either to go forward with a new study or move in a different direction. And with that I will pass you off to Steve Sheng to talk about the SSAC.

Steve Sheng: Thank you (Barbara) and hello everyone. I'm going to give you a quick briefing of the SSAC comments on the WHOIS Review Team Final Report. So the ICANN Board asked each Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees to submit comments on the WHOIS Review Team Final Report.

There are 16 recommendations in the Final Report, and in response SSAC published SAC 055 as its comments. So the SSAC reviewed every one of the 16 WHOIS recommendations and supported all of them.

The SSAC also provided comments on some of the implementation options. In addition I want to bring your attention that SSAC highlights one problem for the community to consider.

So the problem SSAC asserts is a cornerstone problem facing all the WHOIS discussions is understanding the purpose of domain name registration data. This includes, you know, why are the data collected, what the purpose will the databases serve, who collects the data, where is the data stored, where is the data escrowed, who needs access to the data and why and who needs access to locks of the data?

So, you know, the SSAC asserts that that's a foundational problem the community may want to consider first. So with that the SSAC recommendation is for the Board to clearly state that the development of registration data policy for assessing the purpose of the WHOIS data is a critical priority, and direct the CEO to form a committee to address this issue.

So if you want to know more about the SSAC comments there's a link here for you to go and take a look. And that will be all. With that I'll pass on my - to colleague Berry Cobb to talk about WHOIS Surveys Requirement report surveys.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Steve. Basically the WHOIS Survey Requirements Working Group is actually a derivative of some prior work from Steve. What - basically

what happened in 2009 - the GNSO Council asked ICANN Staff to compile a comprehensive set of technical requirements for WHOIS that was not only based on deficiencies of the current service, but also some technical requirements that may need to be supported for various policy initiatives that had been suggested in the past.

That report was published mid-2010 and in 2011 the GNSO Council convened the Working Group to develop a survey to help measure some of those requirements.

So why is the survey important? The biggest aspect of it is to gauge a level of agreement across the community among the various technical requirements that are loaded within the survey.

It will provide a voice for the community and input on some of these technical features. And probably one of the most important results out of the analysis and the eventual report will be possibly useable for what is currently going on within the IETF to develop a new WHOIS protocol.

The survey is purely a technical survey. It has zero implication on any other activities going on that are more policy related or operational rules in nature. Some of the recent developments that occurred - the Working Group has been established for about the past year.

And essentially the Working Group had published a draft of the survey around July I believe. And once that survey was released for public comments, we received some really good feedback from the community and have since incorporated some of those comments and changes that you would see in the final version today.

Once the Working Group agreed on the final version, the survey was migrated to a ICANN hosted Web environment and then the survey was released on the 13th of September of 2012.

Essentially the survey is quite long. There are 15 sections designed around 11 technical requirements that were defined in the original requirements report.

As - given the size and complexity of the survey itself, there was some important requirements that were necessary for the survey. Basically we needed a resume later functionality.

So when participants are going to take the survey, if they're not - unable to complete it within that single session, there is this resume later functionality that will save your answers, allow you to input an ID and return later.

Another key aspect to participants that take this survey is because it is so technically in nature, it was - it may be possible for organizations - for multiple persons within the same organization to complete that single survey.

So this resume later functionality will allow the opportunity for participants to maybe share the completion of the survey if certain participants may not have the technical skills necessary to complete the survey.

This slide is a little bit busy but basically this is a list of the 11 requirements that were established earlier. And I won't go through the details of this but the takeaway for this slide is when participants review the announcement of the survey itself, it does incorporate a PDF version of the survey that will allow users to review the survey in its entirety, possibly answer - pre-answer some of the questions and hopefully that will help facilitate taking the survey in a quicker fashion.

Basically the next steps for the Working Group - right now the survey is available to the community until the end of October. And once the survey is closed the Working Group will reconvene and we're going to analyze the results of the survey and understand what are some of the important

takeaways, formulate some recommendations that may be useful for the community and the Working Group is targeting to publish its Final Report December of this year.

And for more information the first bullet here is the link to the actual announcement itself. I encourage the community to check out this announcement.

There's more detailed information about the survey, some tips and hints on taking the survey and of course the location where the survey can be used, as well as there's also the Working Group activity page on the GNSO Web site that can provide a - kind of the chronological history of the survey.

So that'll wrap up the last of the WHOIS topics for today's presentation. We're going to shift gears now and go over to another Working Group that the community worked on, and which is consumer metrics.

So consumer metrics and why these are important - late December of 2010 the ICANN Board had requested advice from the SOs and ACs on establishing definitions, measures and three-year targets for those measures for terms that are used frequently within the Affirmation of Commitment.

These terms are defining competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, and not only in the context of the domain name system but more importantly in the context of how they're used in the Affirmation of Commitment.

And why this is important is the AOC requests that one year post the first delegation of the new gTLDs, that a review be conducted to ascertain or measure the success of the new gTLD program.

Some of the recent developments - first and foremost the Working Group had - has been in session for about the past year or so. And after a public

comment period for the draft advice letter, the Working Group compiled all of the public comments.

We received quite a bit from the community and formulated its final version of the advice letter. Once the Working Group agreed that that was the final version, we submitted it to the GNSO Council on the 17th of August.

Since then there was a GNSO Council session held on the 13th of September, and that was just to initially brief the GNSO Council about the availability of the advice letter and they also submitted a draft resolution for them to consider.

This slide is a listing of the finalized definitions. You actually see four here and the first takeaway is that for defining consumer trust and consumer choice, it was imperative to first define what consumer was.

And I won't review through all of these in detail, but basically these are very critical for the future efforts that will occur through the new gTLD program. And the secondary takeaway here is that when reviewing these definitions, it's always important to use them when referencing measures.

But it's also important to understand the distinction between consumer choice and competition. First and foremost they're both linked very closely together, but the differentiation for competition is the fact that it's only measuring the quantity and diversity of the Contracted Parties that are supplying the services for the new gTLDs.

This slide is basically a very high level summary of the proposed metrics for each of the measures. I think what's very important here is that the community reviewed the actual advice letter that's been submitted.

And what you'll understand is that there's a total of 48 metrics across the three measures. Within the detail of the advice letter what you'll find is not

only the metric itself but possible difficulties in implementing the metric, as well as the three-year targets or possible three-year targets that are applied to each one of those metrics.

So what are the next steps? First I, you know, I think that members of the Working Group are going to brief the GNSO Council on the GNSO weekend session so that the Council can deliberate some of the details within the advice letter itself, and then further that - to set up for the Wednesday session, the public GNSO Council session, so that the Council can deliberate/review the final resolution in terms of trying to pass the - try to pass the advice letter over to the ICANN Board.

And for further information you can review the GNSO Consumer Metrics Project page, which is located on the GNSO Web site. As with many of the other pages it provides a chronological history of how the Working Group came to where it's at today, as well as I also recommend reviewing the wiki and participants or the community can review previous revisions of that advice letter up to the final that we've produced.

And so with that I'm going to turn it over to Brian Peck to brief you on the protection of Red Cross and IOC names. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much Berry and hello everyone. I'd like to provide you a brief update on the various work projects that are taking place in regards to addressing the issue of protecting the names of Red Cross, IOC and IGO names.

The work that has been taking place is actually going forward in two fora. One is with the ICANN Board and specifically with the new - the ICANN Board's new gTLD Committee.

Over the course of the last few months the committee has determined that the Board should leave these issues in terms of determining whether - what

types of protection if any are appropriate for Red Cross, IOC and IGO names in the hands of ICANN's policy making bodies.

Last month the new gTLD Committee did resolve that the GNSO should advise the ICANN Board prior to 31 January next year about any global public interest or security and stability concerns with regard to second level protections for the IOC and Red Cross names.

It further resolved that in the absence of any such advice the Board would be prepared to adopt the GAC recommendations for second level protection, which was provided September 2011.

The GAC has specifically recommended that the names of both the IOC and the Red Cross be permanently protected at both the top and second levels of new gTLDs.

In terms of the other fora that work is taking place it's within the GNSO, and there are two tracks. One is first the Issue Report. Earlier this year the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report with regards to special protections for all international organizations, including of course the Red Cross and IOC, but all IGOs as well.

The final Issue Report was published this past Monday and it's going to be taken up in the - by the GNSO Council in its meeting at Toronto in a couple of weeks.

The other track deals specifically with the Red Cross and IOC names and is being conducted by the IOC/Red Cross Drafting Team. It has been working over the past several months looking at the issue of second level protection for both the Red Cross and the IOC with their names.

They have come up with a proposal and they just recently opened a public comment forum on the proposal to protect the Red Cross and IOC names at the second level in new gTLDs for the first round.

The reply period for this particular public comment forum closes on the 9th of November. We certainly encourage you and members of the community to participate in the public comment forum to express your opinions/comments related to this issue.

The specific recommendations of the proposal from the Drafting Team are that - to, you know, to call for an expedited PDP as the necessary process to determine the appropriate protections for the IOC and Red Cross names.

And it also recommends that in the interim of any PDP outcome or an ICANN Board resolution, that a temporary reservation of these names for these two organizations at the second level domain level should be put in place.

As I mentioned the final Issue Report has been published. It includes Staff recommendations particularly calling for the GNSO Council to initiate and expedite a PDP.

Again this is on a broader issue of not just the Red Cross and IOC names, but all IGO names as well. It also recommends that representatives of the IGOs, Red Cross and IOC organizations should be formally invited to participate in the PDP Working Group process, and to suggest that the GNSO Council should also consider in initiating a PDP if it decides to do so of expanding the PDP to cover any new gTLD protections to existing gTLDs as well.

As mentioned the GNSO Council is expected to vote on whether to initiate a PDP on this issue at its Toronto meeting. And here for further information are the links for both the final Issue Report and the public comment forum.

And again we would certainly encourage the members of the community to participate in the public comment forum on the issue of protecting these names.

And with that I'd like to turn it over to my colleague Bart who will talk about - for an update on the ccNSO and its activities. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Brian. Good day everybody. Included are some slides with a brief overview of the structure of the ccNSO and the membership and the Council.

I will not go into detail about it so you can read it at your leisure, but experience has shown that most people who attend the Webinars are not really familiar with the structure and the workings of the ccNSO.

Just one point I want to touch upon say because - that's relevant in the next part of the presentation is the ccNSO is more than just a - or - than just a policy development organization.

It's currently running one PDP, the IDN PDP, which I will touch on. But it also does some policy related work, which I will elaborate a bit on. But - excuse me.

But it's also - and that's very important for the ccTLD community itself, the platform for exchange of information and networking. Moving forward currently the ccNSO membership, so this is one part of the structure.

It has 133 members. That means 133 different ccTLDs - member of the ccNSO. This is the slide about the geographic spread of the membership, the growth over years and then a little slide on the role and responsibilities of the ccNSO Council itself.

Currently there are elections going on. One is an extraordinary election because one of the Councilors stepped down from the European region, so

there needs to be a - an election to fill the seat until the end of the term and the ordinary Council elections.

But now going into the substance of the presentation on the ccNSO policy related abilities, I would touch upon the IDN PDP, the joint - the study group on the use of country names, sTLD and the framework of interpretation Working Group.

And again just as a reminder the PDP is clearly - one of the PD - is the PDP - the study group will just look into issues and may come up with some recommendations.

And the framework of interpretation is again another way for the ccTLD community and the ccNSO to structure their activities, which I'll touch briefly upon as well.

The PDP - PDP has two parts. One is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO and the other one, which is the substantive part, is on the overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

This in time should replace the Fast Track process and Fast Track methodology. The draft - the Working Group or the group that has been working on the overall policy has just published its draft Final Report, including the recommendations on the criteria and the process.

The proposed policy builds on the Fast Track methodology, and it takes into account the three years of experience with the Fast Track process, so since November 2009 when the Fast Track process was launched and the results of two years - of two reviews of the process itself.

The major changes are - have - are regarding the - confusing the similarity issues and how to address it. The - there is a placeholder in - for IDN current management.

The placeholder is put in because the Working Group did not want to preempt the outcomes of the variant issue program. And so in time - in due time this part of the policy will be revisited.

It includes an update and clarification of the current processes. One thing that needs to be say - or kept in mind is this policy is on the selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

It's not about the delegation and redelegation process and policy. The current policy for the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs also applies for a delegation and redelegation of IDN ccTLDs, so it will not replace parts of that policy.

Next steps after the public comment period has been closed - finalization. Then there will be an interim report, which will combine the overall policy and the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs, the recommendations, a Final Report submitted to the Council hopefully by the Beijing meeting.

And then again a characteristic of the ccPDP is that the ccNSO members will have a final vote. After the Council have voted on - for adoption, the ccNSO members will vote before it will be submitted.

The recommendations will be submitted to the Board. Next item - excuse me again. The Country Name Study Group - again I've touched upon this topic at previous Webinars.

Purpose and scope of its activities have been addressed and again discussed and you can have a look at it. Currently the Working Group is - has - is winding up its identification of issues and is awaiting the outcome of a survey by UNESCO.

The UNESCO survey is done under the MOU between - under the umbrella of the MOU between ICANN and UNESCO. And the survey has been sent out to 39 countries selected by UNESCO, and it's based on the typology of country names developed by the study group.

The responses are getting in slowly. It - the survey was launched in August and for most countries that is yes holiday season and so for civil servants as well, so it's been sent to the member states of UNESCO.

We - the working - or the study group hopes to have a preliminary discussion on the results at its Toronto meeting. And after that so after the survey has been finalized and concluded, the study group will prepare its report and it may or may not contain some recommendations for the ccNSO Council and for the broader community.

Finally on the policy related work I want to briefly touch upon the framework of interpretation Working Group. Again the purpose and scope of this Working Group is that it's not about new policy, but it's an interpretation of existing policy.

The basic policy document is RFC 1591 from 1994, and it builds on the work of a previous Working Group that has identified some topics that in the view of the ccNSO need to be addressed.

So again this is not a policy development process, but a Working Group that will come up with recommendations for the ccNSO Council and for the GAC.

So it has a ccNSO Working Group structure, and as I just mentioned the recommendations will be submitted both to the ccNSO and the GAC and need their support in order to be submitted to the ICANN Board.

The topics - again I will not touch upon them. The progress in this - of the Working Group since Prague is it's currently still focusing on issues around revocation and unconsented redelegations of ccTLDs.

This has - is one of the most contentious issues in the ccTLD community, and they've been working it now for quite some time. And they will - are making steady progress but it became clear that the Working Group couldn't conclude its work on this particular topic, so there will not be an interim report.

A second point the Working Group is working on is a response on a input from the GAC on its previous document, the support from the significantly interested parties in the ccTLDs also known as the local Internet community.

The Working Group is preparing its respond and hopefully they will conclude it at the Toronto meeting. So just after the Toronto meeting it will be sent to the GAC and once that's completed it will finalize its recommendations on the SIP.

At the Prague meeting there was a change in the way the FoI wants to present its recommendations or final recommendations to both the GAC and the ccNSO.

Before Prague meeting - before the Prague meeting the understanding was to do it on a chapter-by-chapter basis. But that has been replaced in order to avoid confusion by a process that it will submit its full set of recommendations, so on all five topics to both the GAC and the ccNSO to seek their support.

The next slides are again on the broader range of activities of the ccNSO. I'll just briefly touch upon them. The ccNSO Working Groups are - one of the issues that is currently discussed is the review of the financial contributions of the ccTLDs.

At the Prague meeting again the - as a result of when it became clear that the - one of the tools the finance Working Group was using, the expense area grouping presentation in ICANN's operational plan and budget, could not be used for the purpose the finance Working Group wanted to use for, they needed to explore alternative approaches.

At the Toronto meeting they will further discuss one of these approaches, which is a very - which is a value-based approach for financial contributions. So - and that will be presented at the Toronto meeting to the ccTLD community itself as well.

At the same time they're working on a - and develop a model for fair and equitable contributions. So that's more the distribution of the total amount to the - to ICANN across the ccTLD community itself.

The second working group that will - yeah, will come - will meet in the - at the Toronto meeting and that's been very active over the last couple of years is the strategic and operational planning working group of the ccNSO. At this time they're preparing their input on ICANN's strategic plan 2013 until 2016 -- it shouldn't be 2015 -- of which the public con closes in 15 November.

The working group will have a meeting in Toronto and to start prepare its input which then is submitted. But the ccTLD community is invited to use that input as well for their own purposes.

Finally the ccNSO council has - itself has lost what is called a capacity study group. And it's looking into methods to balance both - to balance the workload of the ccNSO and the capacity of the volunteers.

It - say at the Costa Rica meeting it became very clear that say the capacity of the volunteers has reached its limit. So this working group has already looked or the study group has already looked in methods to increase the

capacity of the volunteers and now is looking into methods to - yeah, to deal with the current and future workload of the ccNSO.

Finally on working groups just a brief update on the - one of the joint and cross-community working groups in which the ccNSO is participating. That's the DSSA working group.

Probably most of you will know this is probably - is one of the broadest working groups in the ICANN environment. It has membership from the At-Large, the ccNSO, the GNSO, the NRO and members from SSAC. And they've been working on the topic of DNS security and stability analysis for the last two years.

They just published their Phase 1 report and public comment is open until the 21st of October. And they - the working group is looking for input and feedback from the community in order to understand whether they've chosen the right approach which is described in this Phase 1 report. So you can be requested if you have an interest in the topic of DNS security and stability to look at the report and submit your comments.

The second - the current or - the DSSA's currently focusing on mapping overlapping gaps in the, say, in the mandate and activities of all the organizations that are involved in DNS security -- so that's the broader field of DNS security -- and to describe their roles and responsibilities. And they hope to produce that, say, post-Toronto.

And finally they're interacting with the ICANN board, DNS risk framework working group to see - to understand if and how the DSSA could provide input into the work of - on the DNS risk framework itself.

Just some highlights from the ccNSO meetings in Toronto, there will be a two-day tech working group together with DNSO. That's on a Sunday and a Monday.

At the ccNSO meeting itself -- so that's on Tuesday and Wednesday -- one of the sessions will be a follow-up on the (wicket) discussion which, say, at the Prague meeting the ccNSO conducted a panel discussion on (wicket). This will be a follow-up of activities in the different regions regarding (wicket) which in the meeting or the session is scheduled for Wednesday from 9:00 to 10:20.

A second session is DNS marketing strategies. The - this one is on Tuesday. And this will - the outcome of this session will be submitted to - on the - to the DNS (SAC) sessions on Wednesday as well.

And the final, I think, interesting session will be the panel discussion on principles that guide ccTLD's operator's decisions to participate - or to - on DNS (SAC), whether or not to change their policies, how they change their policies, etcetera.

And again this - all these sessions are open for anyone who's interested in one of these topics, just some background information where you can see these sessions.

And that concludes my presentation. I'd like to hand it over to my colleague, Heidi Ulrich. Thank you.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, (Bart). Hello, everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the director for At-Large.

I'm going to be providing a very brief update on the ALAC's policy and process activities as well as outreach and capacity-building sessions taking place in Toronto today. These highlights have been identified by the ALAC executive committee for the purpose of this webinar.

So the first one on the policy issues, just to point out that the ALAC produced 37 statements in response to open public comments between January and

mid-September this year. And this means that they will very easily surpass the record 40 policy advice statements that they submitted in 2011.

In terms of policy areas there are four key policy issues that the ALAC would like to highlight and that will be discussed in Toronto. The first is Whois.

The ALAC has produced - has stated that it supports the recommendations of the Whois policy review team and has urged the board to take effective action on these recommendations. And in a recent follow-up to a board resolution encouraging input from the ACSOs on the Whois final report the ALAC reiterated that it would like to see the entire set of recommendations be implemented expeditiously. The At-Large Whois working group's going to be meeting on Monday the 15th of October between 11:00 and 12:30 during the Toronto meeting.

On IDN VIP or Variant Issues Projects, members of At-Large are participating in the IDN VIP. The views of At-Large regarding IDN standard prioritization include to instruct the VIP team to prioritize work on IDN variant issues relevant to the received IDN gTLD application and to consider the applications on a case-by-case basis. The At-Large IDN working group will be developing a long-term IDN strategy during their meeting in Toronto which is scheduled for Wednesday the 17th of October between 16:30 and 18:00.

The third policy issue the ALAC would like to highlight is that of compliance-related issues. Members of the ALAC welcome the new - the position that compliance has been given within ICANN and are looking forward to their meeting with the compliance team in Toronto which will take place Sunday afternoon.

The At-Large registrant rights and responsibilities working group has been working on drafting new language on the RAA, Section 2.7.8 on - with accuracies and will be keeping a watch and briefed. And that group will be meeting on Tuesday afternoon.

Finally the R3 whitepaper which is entitled Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected, the At-Large future challenges working group has been working on this whitepaper since late 2011. And this paper identifies four challenges ICANN is facing and makes recommendations for how to overcome those challenges.

Recently the ALAC unanimously ratified this paper. And in Toronto the future challenges working group will be focusing on the next steps to take with its recommendation. And that group will be meeting Monday the 15th between 15:30 and 16:45.

And as you can see on the slide more information on all of the ALAC statements are available on the At-Large correspondence webpage.

Moving on to ALAC process issue I'd like to highlight two process-related activities. The first are - is the current effort to revise ALAC rules of procedure. Revisions of ALAC rules of procedure were mandated by the ALAC At-Large improvements project which was completed during the Prague meeting.

Over the last several months four drafting teams have been working on separate sections of ALAC rules of procedure to revise the 27 rules or the current 27 rules on participation and accreditation, presentation of the ALAC conduct of business and adoption amendment of the rules and procedure. An aim is to complete the revisions of the ALAC ROPs and have them ratified by the ALAC either in Toronto or shortly thereafter.

The second process-related area that the ALAC is working on that they would like to highlight is the ICANN - in ICANN's new gTLD program the ALAC is given the responsibility to consider and possibly file objections to new gTLD applications.

A 15-member new gTLD review group which was selected by the ALAC and the five RALOs has been meeting regularly to review comments received. And to date two comments have been received, one of which the review group judged to be outside of the areas At-Large is able to comment on, including existing limited public interest objection and community grounds. And they will continue to review the second comment in Toronto.

And this activity is the At-Large community's first operational role. That group is going to be meeting on Wednesday afternoon I believe.

Moving on to capacity building and outreach events, during the Toronto meeting the North American Regional At-Large Organization or NARALO will be holding a series of meetings with our At-Large structure representatives. These meetings which are intended to (unintelligible) the ability of NARALO ALSs to participate effectively in the At-Large community include the (unintelligible) of NARALO's capacity-building sessions including sessions - joint sessions with ICANN fellows, a NARALO general assembly, the first since 2009, which issues being discussed during that general assembly include inreach and outreach and how NARALO will fit into the post-new-gTLD environment in ICANN.

And NARALO outreach activities, the NARALO organized community, has brought together volunteers from NARALO to be at the ICANN information booth during coffee breaks and lunch breaks to reach out to potential new members of the At-Large community so if you are - or answer questions. So if you would like to speak with them they will be there during those times.

And finally NARALO is organizing a five-year anniversary of the five regional At-Large organizations. They will (unintelligible) as you can see in the diagram the RALOs play a crucial role as a interface between the globally diverse At-Large structure certainly -- 146 of those exist -- and the 15 members of the ALAC.

The guest - main guest speaker will be Fadi Chehadé, the CEO of ICANN. There'll be other - several other guest speakers as well. And you're all very warmly invited to participate in this event.

And that concludes ALAC update. And I would like to now pass the floor over to (Barbara) for ASO policy issues. Thank you.

Barbara Roseman: Hi. Thank you, Heidi.

The ASO does not hold their general meetings at the ICANN meetings. They usually hold their meetings at their - they do most of their work at their regional meetings of the RIRs.

The ASO is actually comprised of the RIRs plus the NRO umbrella organization. And the membership in the ASO AC is elected through the different regional internet registries so they comprise the ASO council.

There are five registries. They each hold meetings, some once a year. Well actually I think everyone's at twice a year right now. And most of the work that is conducted in the ASO or that is relevant to the ASO takes place at the RIR regional meetings.

The work of the ASO is to forward to ICANN global policies. These are policies that affect the relationship between RIRs and IANA and that apply to all of the RIRs.

There are really very few of these different global policies because the bulk of the work done at the RIRs pertains to the local regional internet registry, not to all of the RIRs together.

The latest policy proposal that they've approved and that ICANN has ratified is the recovered IPv4 address space post-exhaustion policy. And what this refers to is that IANA has already distributed the last of the IPv4 net blocks to

the RIRs. And so any recovered IPv4 space that comes back to IANA from this point on needed a mechanism to be redistributed back to the RIRs. And so that's what this policy addressed.

As I said earlier most of the work for the ASO takes place within the RIRs. And so the best avenue for getting involved is to actually go to a regional internet registry meeting. They conduct open meetings where their policy proposals are discussed.

And all of the RIRs maintain mailing lists for policy discussion as well. And anyone is welcome to join those mailing lists.

If you would like to get an overview of the work of the ASO AC they're going to be giving a brief update on Monday the 15th of October at 5:00 pm local time. And then they're conducting an IPv4 addressing workshop which deals with the legacy addresses on Wednesday at 3:00 pm. And so I think those would both be good times to become familiar with the ASO and get to know how their particular supporting organization works within the ICANN framework.

So Filiz off to you.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thank you, (Barbara). Filiz Yilmaz Senior Director of Parts Station Engagement. And I will quickly touch on the Parts Station Engagements activities overall events in Toronto.

The - in Toronto the new meeting structure started with the last meeting will continue. You can find the full ICANN 45 schedule on the URL noted on the slide. And the meeting will close by Thursday evening officially after the closing reception.

Some of the - some very specific Monday sessions are scheduled to increase interactive discussions on specific topics. There are also similar sessions,

common interest sessions on Wednesday and Thursday. And we keep receiving more and more requests for more sessions which is often parallel tracks and you will notice that in the schedule if you go in and have a deeper look.

The newcomers' activities are taking place in Toronto again. As you know this program is to increase the efficiency in getting the new ICANN meeting participants onboard in a more efficient and more quicker way and have them oriented as soon as possible so they may start making benefit of their first week at an ICANN environment.

One pillar of the program is the newcomers' lounge. And it will serve in Toronto again from Saturday to Wednesday following the opening hours of the registration desk.

And it will be staffed with an - by an ICANN staff and a community member. We will also have fellowship alumni there supporting this effort.

This is a very good example of ICANN working together with the community and for the new members of the community. And it is turning into an ICANN information hub for everyone, not only for the newcomers. So we try to have all sorts of facts sheets produced internally as well as those from the community groups.

If you are a new participant or you know new participants that will attend Toronto please help us disseminating this information which they may find useful.

The other pillar of the newcomers' program is the newcomers' Sunday tracks. These are mainly training sessions to give basic information to the newcomers of the meeting so they can follow the meeting efficiently.

These are also getting very popular. And we get now not only the first-timers but also the old-timers who sometimes would like to get a refresher.

Newcomers' Sunday tracks will start at 10:30 am on Sunday with a welcome session including an introduction to ICANN, the ICANN community and the mock stakeholder model. Then they will continue with the sessions on policy development processes, role of the ombudsman, what's going to happen during the week ahead, main conversations and sessions, ICANN engagement tools, introduction to registries and registrars and the recent developments in the GNS as well as the contractual compliance.

Again if you know new participants to ICANN you may want to advise them to attend these sessions and also drop by the newcomers' lounge.

As you know ICANN's board's public participation committee meets with the community through regular consultation sessions at ICANN meetings. And in Toronto this session is scheduled for Thursday morning at 9:15 am. The main topic this time will be the future ICANN meetings and the consolidated meets strategy which is also out for public comments at the moment.

As you know, meetings, ICANN meetings, is very - as a whole, ICANN community is we all interact with each other is our main tool. And the purpose of the - of this strategy, the latest statement and the proposal, is to ensure that the conference venues that offer the best facilities can be used while the ICANN's commitment for having meetings globally is also met. So you may want to make note of this interesting session with the PPC.

As usual we will have a public forum in Toronto too on Thursday. This is where the community meet - come together with the ICANN board and raise questions both to the board and to the rest of the community as well as making comments.

Following the new meeting structure there will be a board report section at the beginning of this session which will then be followed by an agenda with more specific topics. During open mic there will be time for feedback on the board's reporting as well as the usual specific agenda topics.

And these topics are again across that and outlined with input from community leaders. We want to make sure that it - the agenda of the public forum contains subjects that the community wants to talk about.

So now I'm currently working on such a detailed agenda after having received feedback from the community leaders. And we will publish it in a couple of days and again in advance for popular review before the session takes place on 18th of October.

Finally if you cannot be in Toronto in person you can still follow the meeting through remote participation. We will again have - we will be again broadcasting all the public sessions of the meeting, allowing full remote participation to the sessions where applicable.

With this - I mean if the chair of the session is taking questions and comments in the room, in the physical room, same will also apply to remote participants. You do this by basically staffing the chat room so this designated staff can read your questions or comments out loud, real-time, on behalf of you in the venue rooms.

And there will be a post-survey meeting - sorry, post-survey about these services. So if you use them please let us know of your feedback and experience through the survey.

Thank you. And I will leave now to (David), I believe.

(David): Thank you, (Phyllis), and all the presenters. We have the next few slides of how to stay updated. In particular I would urge you to subscribe to our policy

monthly, a report that keeps you current on the various activities in the SOs and the ACs. This comes out in and will be out -- I'm sorry -- just before the Toronto meeting for our Toronto edition and is available in the languages indicated here. We of course can refer you to the policy staff, a list that is here on the - on our slides.

And now we'd like to open it to any questions if indeed you would like to raise your hand or type something in the chat. And I thank you for adding the questions while we were talking in the chat. We'll be try - we'll be happy to answer them or you can contact us at policy-staff@icann.org. So now I'd like to open it up to any questions you may have at this stage.

(Christina) notes that hers were all answered in the chat. We hope others were all answered in the chat as well. That is an efficient way to do that.

I will give a last call for any other questions. The question there is: the - can we have a link to the presentation of slides? That will be made available, yes indeed.

And I see that there is someone's hand up. I'm trying to see. Yes, (August), would you care to have a question please?

August Malonga

Yes. Hello. I had a question actually in connection with the point on the protection of international intergovernmental organizations and wanted to know if Brian Peck could be able to answer.

Brian Peck:

Sure. What's the question? I'll try.

(Agustin):

Yeah. Okay. So I'm (Agustin) (unintelligible) at the IMF, International Monetary Fund. And the question is about a clarification on the process.

You actually pointed out a few developments regarding the protection of the Red Cross organization and the international (unintelligible) committee. At the same time I saw the report, the issue report that was published on the 1st of October which also enlarged the issue to the protection of all international organization whether governmental, intergovernmental organization or a nongovernmental organization.

I just wanted to mention that the IMF welcomes the issue report on the protection as it gives a real opportunity for internal IGOs to express their view and better explain to the ICANN constituencies that need to protect their names and acronyms.

And as we're not fully familiar with the ICANN procedures we wanted to know a little bit too. I have a few points of clarification on how the working group membership is decided.

The second point is how do - how does this process that you are actually initiating through the GNSO will articulate with discussions with our country and the way within the GAC. And at the end we'd like to understand how the decision will be taken at the ICANN board level with regard to this question of protection of international organizations. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Sure. As - there is an established process that's available online but I'd be happy to try to brief you some rights for it and if you have additional questions could, you know, take a dot - you could submit the question and we could respond through the email address that (David) mentioned.

But briefly, you know, the next step is for the GNSO council to consider the final report, the recommendations of the staff. And if they decide to vote to initiate a PDP that starts - a working group is established.

The membership is designed to represent all constituencies of the community. And as we recommended we also would hope that the organization representatives could participate as well.

The working group comes up - is tasked with coming up with recommendations, policy development recommendations, which once formulated then are submitted to the GNSO council for approval or non-approval.

If approved then it goes to the board for the board consideration. And whether the board would adopt it or not would be up to their process.

AugustMalonga

Okay. And the GAC and the discussion within the GAC?

Brian Peck:

Sure. The GAC is an advisory committee. And so the GAC is - responsibility is to provide advice to the board.

They have provided advice. Actually they provided advice or at least their views on both, you know, on the various organizations that are at issue in this particular matter.

But their role is - I mean the GNSO is independent of the GAC. The GAC is independent of the GNSO. And again the GNSO, its role is to provide advice to the board.

(Agustin):

Okay. Thank you.

Brian Peck:

Okay. Did that answer your questions basically to the extent that you needed or...

(Agustin):

Yes. But basically what you are saying is that there's going to be two tracks. The GAC being independent from the GNSO, this issue is also discussed

within the GAC and it will continue. And probably once you issue a final report then the GAC will probably position itself vis-à-vis the paper issued by the GNSO. Is that something which will make sense in the process?

Brian Peck: It's possible. I mean the GAC directly provides advice to the board...

August Malonga
Yes.

Brian Peck: Not necessarily to the GNSO. And so it's - again being independent they can certainly, you know, weigh in with their advice.

At what step of the process, again it's up to them. You know, their effort's for them to get engaged earlier in the process so that their views can be taken into account. But again, you know, as you pointed out it is - they are independent and in an advisory role rather than actually participating for example in the, you know, for example on the working group and so forth.

August Malonga
Okay. Thank you.

David Olive: Thank you, August. If you need to have any further clarification please be in touch with Brian and we'll make sure that that happens.

August Malonga
Okay. Thank you.

(David): We are soon - we have now reached our limit. So I want to thank everyone for their participation and active questions.

And so with that I would like to conclude our session, wishing everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be. And thank you for participating in our policy webinar update in preparation for Toronto.

Coordinator: This concludes today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

END