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Introduction

David Olive
Policy Development at ICANN

ICANN Supporting Organizations
• GNSO - Generic Names Supporting Organization
• ccNSO - Country-code Names Supporting Organization
• ASO - Address Supporting Organization

Advice provided by Advisory Committee
• ALAC - At-Large Advisory Committee
• SSAC - Security & Stability Advisory Committee
• RSSAC - Root Server System Advisory Committee
• GAC - Governmental Advisory Committee
ICANN Ecosystem

ONE WORLD. ONE INTERNET.

WHAT DOES ICANN DO?
ICANN is responsible for the coordination of the global Internet’s systems of unique identifiers and ensures the systems’ stable and secure operation. It also develops policies and standards appropriate to its mission through a community- and consensus-driven, multi-stakeholder model with a broad representation of the global Internet community.

WHO’S INVOLVED?
Board of Directors
Supporting Organizations: ASO, ccNSO, GNSO, etc.
Advisory Committees: ALAC, GAC, etc.
Liaison Group: TLG
Task Force: IETF

HOW DO I PARTICIPATE?
- Online forums on ICANN’s website
- Supporting Organizations’ and Advisory Committees’ mailing lists for participants
- Public meetings throughout the year
- Public input at the Public Comment Forum

WHICH FUNCTIONS DOES ICANN COORDINATE?
- Domain Name System (DNS) management
- Internet Protocol (IP) address allocation
- Protocol parameter registry operator
- Generic Top-Level Domain name (gTLD) system management
- Country code Top-Level Domain name (ccTLD) system maintenance
- Root server operator
- Time zone database management

Multistakeholder Model

Security & Stability
ICANN protects and prevents misuse of Internet unique identifiers, and ensures that the system operates as expected.

Interoperability
ICANN ensures continued and stable domain name system interoperability with the global Internet.
Goals for this session

• Update you on current policy work and encourage you to participate
• Review issues to be discussed at the ICANN Meeting in Durban
• Inform you of upcoming initiatives and opportunities to provide input
• Answer any questions you might have after each SO/AC update
Topics covered in this session

• Thick Whois PDP
• Locking of a Domain Name subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP
• IGO-INGO Name Protection PDP
• Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information
• WHOIS Survey Working Group
• Metrics and Reporting Working Group
• Other topics:
  • Policy and Implementation
  • IRTP Part D PDP
  • Purpose of gTLD Registration Data PDP
Topics covered in this session

Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO)
- ccTLD Financial Contributions
- IDN ccPDP
- ccNSO 10th Anniversary
- Results Study Group Country Names

At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
- ALAC Policy Statements since Beijing
- ALAC and RALO activities since Beijing
- At-Large events in Durban

Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)
- Restructure overview
- Joint DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group
Current issues being discussed in the GNSO

- Protection of IOC, Red Cross, IGO names for new gTLDs
- Locking of Domain Names Subject to UDRP Proceedings
- WHOIS - Studies, Purpose of gTLD registration data, Whois Service Requirements study, ‘thick’ Whois, translation and transliteration of registration data
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy
- Metrics & Reporting
- Policy & Implementation
- Others - currently there are over 15 projects underway
‘Thick’ Whois Policy Development Process

Marika Konings
Why is it important?

- ICANN specifies Whois requirements through the registry and registrar agreements
- Registries use different services to satisfy their obligations:
  - ‘thin’ Whois: A thin registry only stores and manages the information associated with the domain name
  - ‘thick’ Whois: Thick registries maintain and provide both sets of data (domain name and registrant) via Whois.
- ‘Thick’ Whois has certain advantages e.g. transfers, but there may be negative consequences that should be explored in order to determine whether ‘thick’ Whois should be required for all
Recent Developments

- Initial Report has been published for public comment
- Based on review of all issues, WG recommends that:

  The provision of thick Whois services should become a requirement for all gTLD registries, both existing and future.
Initial Report

- Considers in detail all issues outlined in its charter, incl. data protection & privacy; stability; data escrow; accessibility, cost implications etc.
- Recognizes that a transition of the current thin gTLD registries would affect over 120 million domain name registrations - should be carefully prepared and implemented
- Community input requested on all aspects of the report
Next Steps

- Comments may be submitted until 14 July followed by a reply period
- Workshop in Durban to obtain community input (Wednesday 17 July from 12.30 - 14.00) - see http://durban47.icann.org/node/39777
- WG will review input received and update report accordingly for submission to the GNSO Council
Further Information

- DT Workspace - [https://community.icann.org/display/PDP/Home](https://community.icann.org/display/PDP/Home)
Locking of a Domain Name
Subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP

Marika Konings
Why is it important?

• PDP limited to the subject of locking of a domain name subject to UDRP Proceedings
• Currently no requirement to lock names in period between filing and commencement of proceedings
• No definition of ‘status quo’ which has resulted in different interpretations
Recent Developments

- Initial Report published for community input prior to Beijing
- 5 submissions received - mostly in support, but some important issues raised (loss of informal response time, how to address suspension / settlement)
- WG working to address comments received and finalize report in time for submission to GNSO Council in Durban
Final Report (draft)

• Recommendations intended to clarify and standardize the process for locking of a domain name subject to UDRP Proceedings, including:
  – Definition of ‘locking’
  – Requiring registrar to apply lock within 2 business days following request for verification
  – Removing obligation for complainant to notify the respondent at the time of filing, but add automatic extension of 4 days to response time upon request
  – Step by step clarification of requirements of parties
  – Development of educational and informational materials to assist in informing affected parties of new requirements and recommended best practices
Next Steps

- Final Report expected to be submitted to GNSO Council prior to Durban
- GNSO Council consideration / approval
Further Information

• Initial Report -

• Public comment forum -

• WG workspace -
  https://community.icann.org/x/xq3bAQ
Protection of Red Cross, IOC, IGO and INGO Names

Brian Peck
Protection of RCRC, IOC, IGO & INGO Names: Current status in new gTLDs

- Red Cross/Red Crescent and IOC names on “Reserved Names” List prohibiting the registration at the second level in the new gTLDs

- ICANN Board to discuss with GAC which IGO identifiers would qualify to be placed on the Reserved Names List and receive same protections
Protection of RCRC, IOC, IGO & INGO Names - Status of GNSO PDP WG

• PDP WG tasked to evaluate the need for, and develop policy recommendations for additional permanent special protections at the top and 2nd level in all gTLDs for IGO and INGO identifiers, including the RCRC & IOC

• Initial Report published for public comment on 14 June
  – Presents proposed policy recommendation options for special protections at top and 2\textsuperscript{nd} level currently under consideration by WG for community feedback
  – Public comment period closes on 17 July; Reply period closes on 7 August
Next Steps

- WG session at the ICANN meeting in Durban on Monday 15 July from 15.00 - 17.00 (local time)
  [http://durban47.icann.org/node/39655](http://durban47.icann.org/node/39655)

- Panel Discussion on special protections for IGO and INGO names in Durban on Wednesday, 17 July from 11.00 - 12.30 (local time)
  [http://durban47.icann.org/node/39775](http://durban47.icann.org/node/39775)

- WG to review input received in view of reaching consensus on a set of policy recommendations

- Publication of draft Final Report for public comment
Further Information

- Initial Report

- Public Comment Box

- Additional Information
Policy Development Process: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

Julie Hedlund and Steve Sheng
What is Transliteration and Translation?

- **Translation** = translation of text into another language
- **Transliteration** = writing letters using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet

Examples: The capital of Russia is spelled Москва in Russia’s Cyrillic Script

- The **translation** of Москва into English is Moscow; in Spanish it’s Moscú, etc.
- The **transliteration** of Москва into Latin script is Mockva

Image credit: http://www.8thingstodo.com/
The two issues of the transliteration and translation PDP

1. Should local contact information be translated into one language (such as English) or should it be transliterated into one script (such as Latin)?

2. Who should decide who should bear the burden to either translate or transliterate contact information?
Recent Developments

Call for Volunteers for a Drafting Team to develop a Charter for the PDP Working Group was issued on 19 June 2013.

Those interested should send an email to the GNSO Secretariat (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org) by 01 July 2013.
Related Issues

- Staff will commission a commercial feasibility study on translation and transliteration of contact information to help inform Working Group.

- Another, forthcoming Working Group will determine the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements, including relevant outcomes of this PDP.

Image credit: www.dkit.ie
Next Steps

• Formation of Drafting Team that will produce a Working Group Charter.

• The GNSO Council considers and approves the Charter.

• Staff issues Call for Volunteers and PDP Working Group is formed.

• Working Group considers relevant issues, consults with community and produces an Initial Report.

Image credit: http://3.bp.blogspot.com/
Further Information

GNSO Council Motion: [https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+13+June+2013](https://community.icann.org/display/gnso/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+13+June+2013).


Whois Survey Working Group

Berry Cobb
Why is the survey important?

- Allows the community a voice to the technical features of a future WHOIS system
- Analysis & Report may be useful for IETF protocol efforts & Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services on gTLD Directory Services
- The survey was a technical inventory and does not intend to define or suggest the policies or operational rules that should apply
Recent Developments

- Survey Closed 31 Oct 2013
- Staff Completed Draft Version of Final Report (57 pages)
- Proposed recommendations
  - Deliver results to IETF and EWG
  - Create machine parsable list of WHOIS services by Ry & Rr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total responses:</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full responses:</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete responses:</td>
<td>180 (20 Saved, not submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interview time:</td>
<td>38 min. 55 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median:</td>
<td>25 min. 30 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Working Group to review and approve Final Report
• Submit report to the GNSO Council
Further Information

- **WSWG Page:**
  [http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/whois-requirements](http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/whois-requirements)

- **WSWG Wiki:**
GNSO Metrics & Reporting
Working Group

Berry Cobb
Why is it important?

• This effort allows a review how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and other service providers in the sharing of complaint and abuse data that may also further educate Registrants and Internet users in submission of complaints to the appropriate party.

• It could also investigate more formal processes for requests of data, metrics and other reporting needs from the GNSO that may aid in GNSO policy development efforts.
Recent Developments

• On 9 May 2013, the GNSO Council approved the Final Issue report’s recommendations to await any further action regarding Contractual Compliance metrics and reporting until the conclusion of their three-year plan towards the end of 2013.

• The GNSO Council also adopted the recommendation to form a non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities of reporting and metrics recommendations that might better inform policy development via fact-based decision making, where applicable.

• Call for Volunteers - Drafting Team for GNSO Metrics & Reporting WG Charter
Next Steps

- Form Drafting Team to create the GNSO Metrics & Reporting WG Charter

- Form the Working Group upon approval by the GNSO Council of the proposed Charter
Further Information

Other GNSO Projects
IRTP Part D PDP

What is it about?
• This is the final episode in a series of Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) related PDPs and it has been chartered to provide recommendation on six specific Charter question - see also [https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIIPDGW/3.%2B%2FWG%2BCharter](https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIIPDGW/3.%2B%2FWG%2BCharter).

Status
• Finished reviewing input from GNSO SG/Cs & SOs/ACs
• WG discussions have focused on reviewing the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP), requirements for dispute reporting, and the possibility to develop dispute options for registrants.

Next steps
• Further review of Charter questions and development of Initial Report

ICANN Durban F2F breakfast meeting on Wednesday 17 July, 7.30-9.00am

More info: [https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg](https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg)
Policy & Implementation

What is it about?
GNSO has created a DT to develop a charter for a Working Group to address issues that have been raised in the context of the recent discussions on policy & implementation that affect the GNSO

Status
• DT has been formed and started its discussions on 10 June
• Working on charter, identifying issues to be addressed

Next steps
• Submission of proposed charter to GNSO Council by Durban (target)

More info: https://community.icann.org/x/wiJ-Ag
Purpose of gTLD Registration Data PDP

What is it about?
Board requested an Issue Report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data, and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data and created an Expert Working Group (EWG).

Status
• Preliminary Issue Report was published for public comment. One comment from the ALAC was received.

Next steps
• Following finalization of the recommendations of EWG, the report will be updated and finalized following which the PDP will commence.

More info:
Questions
ccNSO Policy Issues

Bart Boswinkel
Topics

• ccTLD Financial contributions discussion
• Results study group country names
• Current status IDN ccPDP
• 10th Anniversary ccNSO
• Other events and WGs
Financial contributions

- ccNSO Finance WG mandate
  - Model and mechanism for Allocation of ccTLD’s related Expenses
  - Distribution model
- Goal: voluntary, agreed, predictable and sustainable model for contribution
- From Expense Area Grouping (EAG) to Value Based Approach
Conceptual Value Categories

Specific
- Easily Identifiable
- Direct support of the ccTLD’s
- Benefit exclusively the ccTLD’s

Shared
- Shared resources for shared benefit
- Not directly accountable to ccTLD’s
- Tangible matters

Global
- Support of the Internet eco-System
- Support of the global infrastructure
- Subjective matters
No clear cut boundaries

- Global
- Shared
- Specific

- IANA Function
- Local presence
- Travel funding
Financial contributions

• Distribution model
• Current status
  – Finalization of exchange model and monetization
  – Refinement of distribution model
  – Preparation of guideline to replace the 2007 guideline
Results Study Group Country names as TLDs

• Mandate study group
  – Overview of all relevant current and future policies
  – Typology of country and territory names
  – Identify issues, if any
  – Recommendation to ccNSO Council
• Participants from ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC and observer from government, and assistance from UNESCO
Main Observations

• Complex area, especially in light of the multitude of languages and scripts
• No Authoritative list that captures all nuances
• No consistent treatment of country and territory names across ccNSO and GNSO policies
Recommendations to the ccNSO

• Set-up ccWG to review current definitions, and propose consistent framework across the different policies

• Until such time, request the Board to extend current rule to exclude
Current status IDN ccPDP

- ccNSO Council adopted Final Report in Beijing
- Members report published
- Members vote on IDN ccPDP, 22 May - 11 June
- Quorum rule (50% of members) and adoption by supermajority (66% of votes cast)
- No quorum, vote will NOT be employed

Next steps:
- Discussion on voting at ccNSO meeting
- Second and final round of voting
10th Anniversary of the ccNSO

- In June 2003 adoption of Article IX
  - ccNSO became effective in March 2004 (membership threshold)
- Main events during Durban meeting
  - Panel discussion on achievement and added value of ccTLD SO to ICANN and other stakeholders
  - ccNSO cocktail for ccTLD community and invited guests
Other events and WG

• Joint ccNSO - GNSO IDN WG: draft Final report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLD’s
• Tech Day: Monday 15 July
• ccNSO meeting 16 and 17 July
  – Panel discussion on cross regional capacity building
  – Security session
  – ccTLD news session
• Election of new chair ccNSO
Background material

• ccNSO meetings agenda
  – http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/durban

• Members Report IDN ccPDP

• Finance WG information
  – http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/finance-wg.htm

• Draft Final Report Study Group on use of country names
• Draft report JIG Universal Acceptance
Questions
ASO Policy Issues

Barbara Roseman
Current Activities

- ASO recently reappointed Kuo Wei Wu to seat 10 of the ICANN Board
- Working on identifying IPv4 transfers between RIR regions
- Redefining operating procedures for ASO Address Council
- Five ASO members will be onsite in Durban
RSSAC Policy Issues

Barbara Roseman
Current Policy Activities

• RSSAC Executive Committee formed
  – 12 Root Server Operators (all of the named roots), Root Zone Managers (Verisign, NTIA, ICANN-IANA)
    • Working on Operating Procedures
    • Forming Caucus - large community of DNS experts to assist with working groups and other RSSAC work
• Holding next face-to-face meeting at IETF-Berlin
• Following this year, at least twice a year meet at ICANN meeting
Questions
ALAC and At-Large Policy Issues between Beijing and Durban

Heidi Ullrich
Policy Activities

The ALAC submitted 11 Policy Statements between Beijing and late June, including:

- FY14 Draft Operating Plan and Budget
- New gTLD Board Committee Consideration of GAC Safeguard Advice
- ALAC Statement on the Proposed Final 2013 RAA
- ALAC Statement to the Board Regarding Security and Stability Implications of New gTLDs
- ALAC Statement on the Trademark Clearinghouse and IDN Variants
ALAC and RALO Activities since Beijing

• New Beginner’s Guide on ALAC Policy
• ALAC, Regional Officer and NomCom Delegate Selections
• Series of AFRALO Capacity Building Webinars
• EURALO General Assembly
At-Large Activities in Durban

• At-Large will hold 21 Meetings in Durban
• Will be Meeting with the Board, GAC, ASO and the ATRT2
• At-Large Multi-Stakeholder Policy Roundtable
• And...
Invitation to Participate in the AFRALO Showcase and Reception
18:00 - 19:30
Meeting Room: Hall 2AB

Will include local Internet End-Users

At-Large Organizational Diagram
Questions
How to Stay Updated

Monthly Policy Update

• Published mid-month

• Read online at: http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/

• Subscribe at: http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy/

• Available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish
Policy Development Support Team

**David A. Olive**  
Vice President, Policy Development (Turkey)

**Matt Ashtiani**  
At-Large Coordinator and Policy Specialist (USA)

**Bart Boswinkel**  
Senior Director, ccNSO Policy Development Support (Netherlands)

**Glen de Saint Géry**  
Secretariat Services and Operations Manager, GNSO (France)

**Jeannie Ellers**  
GAC Coordination (USA)

**Gisella Gruber-White**  
Secretariat Operations Coordinator, At-large, GNSO (UK)

**Julie Hedlund**  
Policy Director and SSAC Support (USA)

**Lars Hoffmann**  
Policy Analyst (Belgium)

**Rob Hoggarth**  
Senior Policy Director (USA)

**Susie Johnson**  
Executive Assistant (USA)

**Marika Konings**  
Senior Policy Director, GNSO (Belgium)

**Kristina Nordstrom**  
Secretariat Operations Coordinator, ccNSO (Sweden)

**Olof Nordling**  
Senior Director, GAC Relations (Belgium)

**Brian Peck**  
Policy Director (USA)

**Nathalie Peregrine**  
Secretariat Support, GNSO/At-Large (France)

**Carlos Reyes**  
Policy Analyst (USA)

**Barbara Roseman**  
Policy Director and Technical Analyst (USA)

**Gabriella Schittekk**  
Secretariat Services and Operations Manager, ccNSO (Poland)

**Steve Sheng**  
Senior Technical Analyst (USA)

**Heidi Ullrich**  
Director, At-Large (USA)

**Silvia Vivanco**  
Manager, At-Large Regional Affairs (USA)

**Mary Wong**  
Senior Policy Director (USA)
Final Questions
Thank You

Subscribe to the Monthly Policy Update:
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/policy

Contact us at: policy-staff@icann.org