

**Pre-Buenos Aires Policy Update Webinar  
07 November 2013  
First session: 12:00 UTC**

David Olive: Operator, could you start the recording please. Thank you very much.

I'd like to welcome everyone to our Policy Update Webinar. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support and I'm here with members of the Policy Team to provide you with an update and information about policy development activities to be taking place in our ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires.

We're very pleased that you are able to join us for this Webinar. We'll have another one repeated later in the time zones to allow others.

Please note the policy notes there on the Webinar. We would ask you to place questions in the chat and we'll attempt to answer them while we are giving our presentation, and of course there will be time afterwards for questions as well. We'll unmute the lines for that purpose.

In addition, the Webinar will be recorded and transcribed so that you can refer back to it at your leisure as you prepare for our Buenos Aires meeting next week.

With that, I would like to proceed with our update. Here of course I want to draw your attention to some of the highlights of the Buenos Aires meeting.

There'll be orientation sessions for some incoming SO and AC members.  
There'll be a DNS forum for the Latin American region.

The meeting highlights will be the SO/AC led high interest topic on Monday, strategic panels, Internet Governance discussions, Community Day where the stakeholders and constituencies meet will be on Tuesday. The Public Forum and Board Meeting on Thursday and other sessions relating to new gTLD will be running in parallel as well.

This is an important year and meeting as ICANN celebrates its 15th Anniversary, and there'll be a special reception during the Buenos Aires conference to note and celebrate this event. Also there will be a focus on IPV6 workshops, a strategy update for Latin America, and of course, as always, the LACRALO showcase on Monday.

Just to go through our basic functions at ICANN, policy development at ICANN is done through the supporting organizations, the Generic Names Supporting Organization or GNSO, the Country Code Names Supporting Organization, ccNSO, and the Address Supporting Organization, ASO.

And I might add today we have a special guest speaker, the Chairman of the ASO Council will be joining us to talk about activities in his supporting organization.

Obviously there are advice and advisory groups that do provide their inputs to the Board of Directors and to other community organizations. We have the At-Large Advisory Committee, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Root Server Systems Advisory Committee, and of course our Government Advisory Committee. All these form a policy development process and advice into those processes for decisions made by the Board.

I like to always show this info graphic which talks about our activities at ICANN including the policy development activities, but also coordination of

(Tech Development) DNS operations and compliance as part of our multi-stakeholder model.

The goals for this session would be to give you an update on policy work that will be taking place in Buenos Aires. I encourage you to participate in those sessions.

Also to inform you about upcoming activities including our supporting organization and advisory committee engagement opportunities, and of course answer any questions you might have on these updates.

Here are the topics covered within the Generic Name Supporting Organization and you'll see them, they'll go through them; I won't read them all. Obviously we'll also have a report from the Country Code supporting Organization that Chair Louis Lee will present an update on the Address Supporting Organization, and we'll also have some information on the Root Server System Advisory Group.

Also, in today's presentation we'll talk about the Security and Stability Advisory Committee activities, an overview on our Government Advisory Committee, and activities planned in Buenos Aires from the At-Large Advisory Group.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Marika Konings who will lead the discussion on the GNSO update. Marika, the floor is yours.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much David. Hello everyone and my name is Marika Konings; I'm the Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO based in the ICANN Office in Brussels. And I'm kicking off the part that is focused on the activities that are currently being discussed in the Generic Names Supporting Organization or also referred to as the GNSO.

As we only have limited time during this Webinar, we've decided to focus our contribution on those items where there either is a decision imminent, an opportunity to provide input, or call for volunteers open noting that all GNSO working groups are open for anyone introduced to participate.

And at the end of our overview, we'll also provide a brief update on those activities where those imminent milestones for which you can expect one in the near future or those activities that also have activities ongoing in Buenos Aires at the ICANN meeting there.

And you'll see here that the topics we'll be talking about, and just a note that this is just a limited list as we currently have over 15 projects that are active in the GNSO.

So first I'll be talking to you about the Thick WHOIS policy development process. WHOIS requirements are specified in the Registry and Registrar Agreements that ICANN has with its contracted parties. There are currently two models that are being used by gTLD registries to meet these requirements. One is known as a Thin Voice model, and that model the Registry only collects the information associated with domain name such as a sponsoring registrar, the status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, and name server data, the last time the record was updated in the Registry Database, and the URL for the registrar who is service.

In the Thin model, the registrars maintain the data that's associated with the registrant of the domain, and they provide by their own WHOIS services. Currently, Dot Job, Dot Com and Dot Net are gTLDs that operate on the Thin model.

The other model is known as the Thick WHOIS model. And this model the registry collects both sets of data, so the one that's associated with the

domain name as well as associated with the registrants from the registrar, and in turn publishes that data by the WHOIS.

From some other discussions that were held in the GNSO, it became obvious that, for example, from a transfer perspective, Thick WHOIS would have a lot of advantages as the identity of the registrants would be known by both the registry as well as the registrar. But it was also realization at the same time that there may be other factors that will need to be considered in order to determine whether Thick WHOIS should be required for all gTLD registries. And as a result of that, the GNSO Council initiated a policy development process or PDP on this topic in March 2012.

So the working group published its initial report for public comment earlier this year and has recently completed its review of the public comments received. And in turn, submitted its final report to the GNSO Council two weeks ago.

The report and its recommendations obtained the full consensus of the working group. And following its review of all the factors that were outlined in its charter, as I said, the stability, accessibility, data escrow, data protection and privacy, the working group has concluded that unbalance they believe that the provision of Thick WHOIS services, with a consistent labeling and display as per the model outlined in Investigation 3 of the 2013 RRA, should become a requirement for all gTLD registries both existing and future.

In addition to that recommendation, the working group also provided a couple of recommendations in relation to the implementation of this recommendation. First of all, it recommended that following the adoption by the GNSO Council of the recommendations, the subsequent public comment form as well as a notification of the GAC, should specifically ask for input on any issues in relation to the transition from Thin to Thick so that these can be factored in as part of the implementation process.

In addition, it was also recommended that a legal review should be undertaken to identify whether there are any issues that have not been recognized yet by the working group related to the transition of that if would occur when moving from Thin to a Thick model as well as giving due consideration to any privacy issues that may be the result of such a transition.

To support the implementation (unintelligible), it was also recommended that an implementation review team would be created following the Board's adoption of these recommendations.

So actually, at this recent meeting, a meeting that took place last week, the GNSO Council unanimously adopted the recommendations of the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group. And as required by the ICANN by-laws as one of the required steps in the PDP process, a public comment forum was opened yesterday to ask for community input on the recommendations prior to Board consideration.

Comments may be submitted until the 7th of December and I'll post a link to the comment forum shortly in the Chat Box. And following the closing of the public comment forum, its staff will summarize the comments received and submit those together with recommendations to the ICANN Board for their consideration.

On this slide you can find some further information to the efforts, the final report, as well as the working group work space.

And with that, I'll hand it over to my colleague Julie Hedlund.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Marika. And I am Julie Hedlund, and also with me is my colleague Lars Hoffman, and together we are supporting the policy development process on translation and transliteration of contact information.

And so to the next slide; just a little bit of background. There was an initial report published on the 21st of March in 2013. And following that report, the GNSO initiated the PDP on 13th of June 2013.

Following that initiation of the PDP, there was a drafting team that was developed to produce a charter, and that chartered drafting team sent its Draft Charter to the GNSO Council on the 30th of September.

The Council is considering the revised Draft Charter and it will consider a motion to approve the charter at its meeting in Buenos Aires. And following approval of the charter, the working group volunteers will be established. The staff will put out a call for volunteers, for people to join the PDP working group.

And why is this important? There are two key issues in this PDP; transliteration and translation of contact information. The working group charter is proposing two substantive questions for the working group to consider.

The first is should local contact information be translated into one language such as English, or should it be transliterated into one script such as Latin? And the second issue is who should decide, who should bear the burden to either translate or transliterate contact information?

Related issues are that staff has commissions, a commercial feasibility study, on transliteration on translation of contact information. This study is going to help inform the work of the PDP Working Group. And there is another working group that will determine the appropriate internationalized domain name registration date of requirements including the relevant outcomes of the PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information.

The next steps then are that the Charter must be adopted. Then we will form a working group on the PDP and we will do outreach to the supporting

organizations and advisory committees to solicit community input to the charter questions. And the working group will then draft an initial report.

Thank you very much. And now I'd like to turn everything over to my colleague Berry Cobb. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Julie. Welcome everyone. Today I'll be talking with you about the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs. For those that don't know, IGOs are Inter-Governmental Organizations and INGOs are International Non-Governmental Organizations. And so basically we'll provide a little summary of what the group has been up to.

First and foremost, the working group was tasked to evaluate the need for protection recommendations at the top and second level for all gTLDs. And this includes IGO and INGOs as well as the Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee, both of which are INGOs, but based on previous efforts, were considered separately from regular INGOs.

Essentially, we're talking about the protection of these organization identifiers. And identifier is more a summary term used to signal that we're discussing the organization's full name or perhaps their acronym as well. So for instance, you could have Red Cross/Red Crescent, or in fact, they might refer to their acronym RCRC. And of course, there's several organizations that use both full name and acronyms.

As I mentioned, this is both top and second level reservations. External to the efforts of this working group, there has been dialogue in the community between the GAC and the ICANN Board with respect to this issue. And the interim, the ICANN Board has implemented protections with the deployment with the new gTLD program up until any policy development is determined and approved by, not only the GNSO, but the ICANN Board itself. And as I mentioned, this will influence not only the new gTLD program but any



consensus policies that are adopted and approved will impact existing gTLDs.

So some of the recent developments, we've been in operation for about a year for the actual working group although this issue has been deliberated within the community for over two years. Actually it's been around since 2007, but with the launch of the new gTLD program and based on GAC Advice, this was started about two and-a-half years ago through various efforts.

Essentially we just completed drafting our final report. We submitted public comments that closed on the 31st of October, and the working group is currently reviewing all those public comments and determining whether it changes any of the proposed recommendation or any other aspect that the working group hadn't considered.

Essentially the working group is finalizing the recommendations and we're preparing delivery of the report to the GNSO Council.

So I'm going to give you a very, very high level of summary of the working group recommendations, and I'd like to make a disclaimer. Anything I'm about to state here is in a very general sense and for much more detail I'd recommend that everybody go out and review at least the draft final report that's posted out on the Web page. And we'll be posting the final final report that we delivered to the GNSO Council in the next couple of days.

In essence, there are about just shy of 40 total recommendations. About 28 of those recommendations have received consensus level, although none of them or only one or two of them have actually achieved full consensus. But there are various packages of these recommendations that are categorized by the four types of organizations that I've mentioned; Red Cross, International Olympics, IGOs and INGOs.

There's also a fifth grouping of some general recommendations which include a possible PDP to review curative of rights protections such as UDRP and URS. And that would basically be access for these organizations to the curative RPs.

In essence, the working group has come to consensus that there should be top-level reservation protections for organizations' full names and that some sort of exception procedure should be developed in case these protected organizations wish to register their said name as well as there's also second level reservation protection of the full names and also an exception procedure, each of which have varying implementation considerations for the protection itself. But in essence, these are reserved and ineligible for delegation and/or registration.

Further, with respect to acronyms of these organizations, there does not appear to be enough support to make any recommendations regarding the protection of acronyms. I need to be clear here that this is the reservation of acronyms. So for example, ISO, an international sugar organization that is a designated INGO, that three letter acronym would not be reserved.

However, there is support in the working group that acronyms themselves could potential be allowed to be bulk added into the Trademark Clearinghouse. And there is some support for possible sunrise access for these identifiers, but that still needs to be finalized.

But there definitely is support for what is considered a claims notification service that in the case of - pardon me - in case of registration, if one of the names was to be registered, the possible registrant and the protected organization would be notified of that registration, and as I mentioned, the possible PDP for URS and UDRP access.

So our next steps, like I said, the working group is preparing the final report to the GNSO Council. At the meeting in Buenos Aires, the working group chair

will be briefing the GNSO and describing the recommendations in detail. We also have a face-to-face meeting scheduled for Monday the 18th. At this point, it's not clear whether it will actually be needed or not, but based on outcomes for the weekend, if the working group feels they need to meet we have the option.

Secondly, the GNSO Council will deliberate this issue at their Council Meeting on Wednesday and then of course, the adopted recommendations will be considered by the GAC and there will also be an additional public comment period when the ICANN Board is considering this issue.

As with the other projects, there are links to access the information. I'll definitely point out the IGO/INGO Web page out on GNSO.ICANN.org and that will point you to the entire history of this effort as well as the most recent deliverables.

And with that, I will turn it over to Mary Wong and she'll discuss projects under her control. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you Berry. Hello everybody, my name is Mary Wong; I'm a new member of the Policy Team and it's my privilege to speak to you on the Cross Community Working Group effort that started within the GNSO and what is currently going on in that project.

This is a fairly important project because, and for many of you, this will be an issue that is quite familiar. Over the past few years, I think across the ICANN community, there has been a recognized need for there to be a framework of at least basic operating principles that can be developed so that when the various ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees come to work on policies affecting issues of common interest, it can work effectively, it can function efficiently, and obviously lead to good consensus based outcomes.

One issue obviously among several is that each SO and AC has its own operating rules, has its own mandate and remits, and these can differ quite significantly across a number of SO and ACs.

Like I said, this is not a new issue. It's also not a new phenomenon because as many of you know, there have already been a number of CWGs that have been working very well. And one example that we have here in the slide, the DFSA involved a fairly large number of participants across a number of SO and ACs.

So within the GNSO, recognizing that there was this need, a drafting team was created in late 2011 to at least create initial framework that could be discussed and further refined in collaboration and upon feedback with the various other SOs and ACs.

What happened was that the draft principles that were developed within the GNSO was then circulated for feedback. There was some really constructive feedback that the GNSO received including some excellent comments and suggestions most recently from the ccNSO in June. And very recently in discussing the feedback and (accepts) the Council passed a motion to create a new drafting team based on the work of the initial drafting team.

The idea is that this would be truly collaborative across the different SOs and ACs. And the GNSO Council Chair recently invited the ccNSO Chair to send a representative to co-chair this meeting with a representative from the GNSO.

The idea is that this new drafting team will be set up shortly after the ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires. The hope is that this will have representation from across the various SOs and ACs so that the framework that I spoke about earlier can be developed in a reasonable period of time.

So please watch this space and hopefully you or your colleagues will be interested in joining the new drafting team. For further information, here are some links that you can look at for the initial principles as well as the ccNSO feedback and the GNSO Council resolution.

It is also my privilege to speak to you on the PDP that was recently started on the RAA privacy and proxy services accreditation issues. As many of you know, I think as everybody knows, the RAA here stands for the Registrar Accreditation Agreement which in its newest form was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2013.

Again, as many of you know, this is the product of negotiations that have been ongoing for well over a year and those negotiations have been formed by previous community work, not just from the GNSO, but from joint groups formed with, for example, the ALAC, as well as a number of recommendations from law enforcement agencies and comments from the GAC.

As a result, the staff were asked to essentially spot the remaining issues that were not dealt with in these negotiations that stemmed from prior community work that could be suited for a PDP. And to cut a long story short, there is a staff paper that summarizes the development, the processes and the number of issues that were considered.

Ultimately, it was identified that it was the use and regulation of privacy and proxy services for domain name registrations that was probably the one substantive remaining issue that had previously been identified as a fairly high priority topic.

We should note that it's not that the new RAA does not do a privacy and proxy at all. There is a specification as many of you know. However, that runs only either to the earlier of January 1st, 2017 or until ICANN develops and implements an accreditation program for privacy and proxy service providers.

So this PDP is being launched with that background and those timelines in mind.

This PDP is somewhat different from some of the others that we're talking about today in that it was initiated by the ICANN Board who in initiating the RAA negotiations had also requested the first issue report. The GNSO Council has been discussing this for awhile, and most recently is meeting on 31st of October. The charter for the working group that will be working on the PDP was approved.

And just so you know, and again, we hope that there will be many interested volunteers from the ICANN community to join the working group. This will be quite a large effort and we look for your support as well as your participation on this.

For information, as my colleague Berry did, I'll point you to the GNSO Web pages. You should also review the new form of the 2013 RAA as well as some further background information that may be of interest to you. So with that - and I will post the call for participation for this particular working group in the Adobe Connect Chat.

I will now hand over back to my colleague Marika to talk to you about other GNSO projects; all yours Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Mary. And as sort of like the beginning, we'll now briefly capture some of those GNSO projects that are also in the works but that don't either have an immediate milestone or call for volunteers or call for input open at the moment, but that we will wanted to highlight as they may have in the near future. And then of course, we'll look forward to everyone's participation and input.

So the first one of those is the purpose of gTLD registration data (P&P) which was a board initiated PDP on exploring the replacements for Whois which is

currently from the GNSO perspective and a holding dock awaiting at a completion of the work of this expert working group which was created at the same time to look at this issue. So the idea is that once they complete their work, those recommendations will feed into this policy development process for further review and completion.

So basically, we completed the first step in that process by publishing the preliminary issue report for public comment, and the next step would be once the EWG completes its work that that would feed into the final issue report which would then kick off the next steps in this policy development process.

If you're interested in this topic though, the EWG will be providing an update its activities and the status thereof in Buenos Aires on Wednesday, the 20th of November from 8:30 to 10:00 local time.

The next topic which work is also ongoing is related to Whois studies. The GNSO Council commissioned several Whois related studies back in 2010. Two of those have already been completed and two of them are currently actively being worked on.

But the first one, the Whois Privacy and Proxy Abuse Study was recently published for public comment, and the reply period is still open until the 13th of November. So if you're interested in that topic, please have a look and see the comments that have been submitted.

And then there's also the Whois Issues Study which is in the process of being finalized and which we hope to publish for public comment shortly.

It's our expectation that several of these studies will help inform various of the current and future ICANN efforts that are ongoing in relation to Whois such as, for example, the privacy/proxy service at accreditation issues PDP that Mary just spoke of, as well as some of the either EWG efforts as well as the PDP I just mentioned on the (unintelligible) gTLD registration data.

The next topic I wanted to mention is that (intervention) counts for policy Part D policy development process. This is hopefully the last, I think, as some say in a series of (unintelligible) that are looking at improvements and clarifications to the existing inter-registrar transfer policy also known as IRTP.

And several of those questions relate to the transfer dispute resolution policy, and the working group is currently actively reviewing the charter questions. And their hope is to finalize their recommendations and publish their initial report by the end of November 2013.

Again, if this is a topic that you're interested in, the working group is having a public session at the meeting in Buenos Aires on Wednesday the 20th of November from 10:30 to 12:00 local time.

And other efforts (unintelligible) just kicked off actually, is the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Drafting Team. This Drafting Team is working on a charter that aims to address how the community can collaborate with contacted parties and other service providers into sharing of complaints and abuse data. The hope is that by having better access to information and data, that this will help in better data availability as well as metrics to support policy development efforts.

So this drafting team is currently working on the charter which as I understand they hope to finalize towards the end of this year. Again, if you're interested in knowing more about his topic, this drafting team is also planning to have a public session in Buenos Aires, a face-to-face meeting on Thursday the 21st of November from eight to nine local time in the morning.

And then the Policy and Implementation Working Group, the GNSO formed a working group a little while back to look at issues that have been raised in the context of recent discussions on policy and implementation that specifically effects the GNSO. So we're looking at questions such as, you know, should



there be a process for developing policy advice other than, you know, consensus policy for which we use the PDP. Should there be a framework for implementation related to discussions that are associated with GNSO policy recommendations?

So the working group has started the discussion in August of this year. and there's a real broad participation and interest in this topic with many participants from outside the GNSO as well. and the working group started off by reaching out to all the supporting organizations and advisory committees to ask them both for input and feedback on some of the charter questions that this working group had been tasked to look at.

And they're currently in their final stages of preparing its work plan which they're expecting to adopt or finalize in Buenos Aires.

In addition they have already created a number of sub teams that have started looking at things such as working, definitions, and working principles that will hopefully underpin the work as it moves forward.

If you're interested in knowing more about this topic the working group is also having a face to face meeting in Buenos Aires on the Wednesday, 20 November from 4:45 to 5:45 in the afternoon local time.

And then last but not least I just wanted to mention as well a policy development process that has recently been completed or at least moved into the implementation stage which is the blocking of a domain subject to UDRP proceedings.

This effort basically addressed the fact that currently there is no requirement to lock names in the period between the filing and commencement of UDRP proceedings.

And UDRP doesn't talk all about a lock as such but it mentions a status quo. But there's no definition of what it actually means which has resulted in different interpretations and as a result as well complications in that regard.

So the recommendations by this working group were unanimously adopted by the GNSO council as well as the ICANN board. And the recommendations have now moved into the implementation phase.

So as a result we've formed an implementation review team that consists of community members that were involved in the development of these recommendations.

And staff has started working on development of the proposed implementation plan which eventually will be published for public comment as well.

And maybe just to mention that before I hand it over to my colleague is that we've created a new GNSO has started a new initiative to ensure people can easily stay up to date and follow the development in a time line fashion through our GNSO Twitter feed.

So you see here the address for that. So if you're interested in GNSO issues and would like to receive regular updates on what's going on and when there are opportunities to either participate, or comment, or see when transcripts or recordings are posted, you know, please follow us on Twitter and hopefully we'll see many of you back there.

So with that I'll hand it over to my colleague Bart Boswinkel if I'm not mistaken yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you very much. Good day everybody. I will provide you with a high level overview of some of the hot topics to be discussed by the ccTLD community in Buenos Aires so a bit of change of tone I would say.

As you will see is I've just put a limited number of topics to our policy related the framework of interpretation working group and the study group and the study group of country names and the results of their work.

One is more operational. And I know some of you may be interested in that one that is a discussion around the ccTLD financial contribution.

And I have included a limited update on the joint or cross community working groups in which the ccNSO is participating.

Let me start off with the framework of interpretation working group. So what is a framework of interpretation and what does this working group do?

This is not a working group that will develop a new policy. It's more - it on the interpretation of existing policy relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

So in fact it develops interpretations of RFC5091 and preferably in a consistent and coherent manner. And RFC 5091 is dating back as some of you will know until 1994. And is the policy for delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

Now where is it? At this moment the working group has just published its interim report on revocation. And this is probably one of the most contentious discussions in the ccTLD environment.

It is what is vocation? It is the re-delegation without the consent of the ccTLD manager. And as most of you will know the ccTLD manages a delegation and re-delegation is policy based and there are no contracts in place.

So re-delegation is without the consent you can imagine that we delegation is without consent of the ccTLD manager is and will be a contentious issue for

the ccTLD community and probably for community At-Large in the respective countries and territories.

So when is it possible? The working group have identified two separate events say first of all when there is substantial misbehavior by the ccTLD manager and secondly when there are persistent problems with the ccTLD manager.

And thirdly and this is again a condition. The ccTLD manager is on boarding or able to rectify this problem.

So under these conditions a revocation may be possible. But as you can see it is as I said it is contentious. And it's a very nuanced and delicate discussion.

So if you're interested please read the interim report. And the working group is seeking public comments on its recommendations. And it will be discussed at the ccNSO meeting on Tuesday in Buenos Aires.

The second one which I want to talk about is in fact the results of one of the working groups of the ccNSO and that's the recommendations of the ccNSO study group on the use of country names and territory names as TLDs.

The final report of this working group has just recently been published and the ccNSO Council has adopted the two recommendations.

And these recommendations may be relevant to other SOs and ACs as well and therefore I've included them.

The first recommendation is to invite other supporting organizations and advisory committees to create a cross community working group.

And the purpose of that and the goal of that working group is to review the current representations of country and territory names in the different policies so ranging from new gTLD, to the IDN ccTLD policy and the current the RFC 5091 and how they represented, et cetera and to try to come up with a harmonized framework of definitions if at all feasible and see if it could be applied across the different policies.

Because one of the issues the and observations that the working group noted or the study group noticed is was the diverging and non-coherent definitions of country and territory names across the different policies.

And the second recommendation is to extend the current rule in the applicant guidebook to exclude the use of country and territory names as new gTLD until this working group comes up with a result and presents this to the respective SOs and ACs.

So in the BA at the BA meeting the other SO and ACs will be invited to participate in such a working group.

And you will and they will receive a straw men as a start of the discussion of this cross community working group.

Finally on a more substantial part the ccTLD financial contributions to ICANN as most of you know this has been a long standing and contentious issue not just between ccTLDs and ICANN but other stakeholders have had and are still interested in the development of this one. And hopefully at the Buenos Aires meeting this long standing discussion will close.

What happened is the ccNSO finance working group together and in close collaboration with ICANN staff has developed what is called a Value Exchange Model.

The two main characteristics of this model was that that it's two way. And so therefore reciprocal it's not just what ICANN is say the benefit of ICANN for the CC community but the other way around the ccTLD benefit for the ICANN and broader community as well.

And that's in particular in regard to the multi-stakeholder model and reinforcing it both globally and locally.

And secondly the second part characteristic is the different components identified and that's shared, specific and global.

The second major deliverable and that will be discussed at the - at Buenos Aires for finalization is a new guideline around the financial contributions.

Again two main characteristics of the new financial guideline for the ccTLDs the voluntary goal remained eminent in the guideline the voluntary nature of the contribution and the banded model. And it will be a banded model.

The working group has just had a Webinar on the various aspects of their work. And the - a link to the Webinar can be found on the ccNSO Web site.

Now just some small parts on really joint working groups in which the ccNSOs participated the current status of the DSSA and the joint IDN working group in which the ccNSO and GNSO participate in the DSSA working group intends to publish its final report just before the Buenos Aires meeting.

And will send a letter to the participating SOs and ACs with a suggestion to accept the final report as the final report of the DSSA. And as a result the DSSA will close.

With regard to the joint IDN working group they work the - is preparing its final report on universal acceptance of IDN ccTLDs of excuse me IDN TLDs so both ccTLDs and gTLDs.

And these and this final report will be submitted to the respective council so the ccNSO and GNSO council.

I've included some links and some more background information. The interim report of the framework of interpretation, the final report, the ccNSO finance working group will produce its final report over the next couple of days and then the ccNSO meeting's agenda.

And now I have the privilege of handing over to our guest speaker Louis Lee the Chair of the ASO. Louis go ahead.

Louis Lee: Thank you very much Bart. Hi. As Bart has mentioned I am the chair of the ASO Address Council to provide the ASO update.

The ASO Advisory Council consists of 15 members with three from each region and one person from each region being elected each year.

Tomohiro san was reelected for the APNIC region. Hans Petter Holen leaves the ASO AC in order to focus more time as the new deputy RIPE chair however he will continue with the ICANN community as the ASO appointee to the 2014 ICANN noncom.

Replacing him will be (Phyllis) who is also from the RIPE region. And you may recognize her name from her previous work on ICANN staff for community participation.

In the ARIN region Jason Schiller has been reelected for a three year term. And in the Lacnic region (Alajandro) is being replaced by (Jorge). (Alajandro) is continuing his work in the lacknic region as the Lacnic board member.

In AFNIC they will be - we will be having elections in AFNIC region in their November meeting.

Now the ASO AC will not be formally meeting at the upcoming ICANN 48 meeting but several of us will be attending the meeting.

We are expecting to conduct face to face meetings at an upcoming ICANN meeting next year. Additionally many of the NRO executive committee members will be in Buenos Aires.

In Buenos Aires we will be participating in the SO, AC (high level) interest session on Monday's session.

And we are also having open meetings with ATRT 2 the At-Large Advisory Council and with the ICANN board.

We will be participating on Monday in the Hablamous the IPv 6 the Latin America which is let's talk about IPv 6 in Latin America.

While several of the RIRs the Regional Interim Registries were formed prior to the formation of ICANN 15 years ago about ten years ago the RIRs came to together to create the Member Resource Organization.

This was created as a visible framework for cooperative joint activities such as education, outreach, and global Internet governance also to facilitate the work that the ASO and the ASO Address Council.

And during the ICANN meeting we will be commemorating the 10th anniversary of establishing the MRO.

If you'll notice we do not have a global policy in the works. Most of the work right now in policy development is in the regional areas.



And a lot of those activities also include creating frameworks for transferring IP address space between regions or between members of the region. And at this point I'll hand over to Barbara Roseman.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you and thank you again for participating in the update. This will be a brief update on activities of the Root Server System Advisory Committee.

They are currently meeting at the Vancouver IETF. They have had both and RSAC executive meeting and a larger caucus meeting.

They have two documents in the works right now. One of them is a basically outline of service requirements for Root Server Systems and that's RSAC 001.

And it is basically ready to publish. But we're waiting and IAD document that is going to be published synchronously.

And the second document RSAC 002 is a description of the measurements of performance that not performance of the single root server operator but performance of how the root zone system is being distributed throughout the various root server networks.

And these are measurements that all of the root server operators have agreed to participate in and provide data for.

And should give us some good background on whether any introductions of changes to the root zone create disturbance in how the root zone is distributed.

The executive committee also resolved a rather relatively problematic issue regarding membership definitions.

And has created a membership committee currently comprised of three of the root service operator representatives to address the remaining issues around the larger caucus formation and that would be the invited participants to the larger work party area of the RSAC.

The RSAC engagement in ICANN in Buenos Aires is that there will be several executive members in attendance.

There's no formal meeting taking place. And they had sessions arranged with the ATRT2, the government advisory committee, and a discussion that is taking place on re-formation of the technical liaison group.

In Singapore they are expected to have a full RSAC meeting which will comprise the full executive group and some participants from the caucus.

And with that I'm going to hand this over to my colleagues Julie and (Steve) to talk about the security and stability advisory committee.

(Steve):

Thank you Barbara. With my colleague Julie we will review of the SSAC activities since Durban and some highlights for Buenos Aires meeting.

The SSAC since Durban has published two advisories, SAC 60 IDN various, and SAC 61 registration data directory services.

I will provide a brief introduction to these advisories. And advise you to participate in the SSAC session in Buenos Aires where these reports will go into detail.

Recently ICANN has published two important reports on IDNs. One of them is a procedure to determine what allowable code points and variant generation rules to be included for the root zone and the other on the user experience implications for active variants TLDs.

This is an important issue because simply put the Internet only have one root zone. It is shared by everyone. And it needs a set of label generation rules that ensures from a security and stability perspective minimal conflict, minimal risk to you all users, and minimal impact minimal potential for incompatible change over time.

The SSAC document has represented 13 recommendations. And here to highlight a few for detail they are listed in the reports.

The first principle the SSAC articulates is that ICANN should exercise a principle of conservatism with respect to allowable co-points and number of active variants.

So the allowable co-points are building blocks for IDN strings. The SSAC report goes into detail on how this principle can be applied.

The second highlight of the recommendation is ICANN should ensure there's a secure, stable, and objective process to handle a situation in which the community may disagree with ICANN's variant calculation. I think our past history, you know, told us that's an important process to have.

Third for the stability of the root zone ICANN encouraged SSAC encouraged ICANN to make sure later versions of the label generation rule set is backward compatible to avoid incompatible results with existing and historical allocations.

This is also important because there will be software viewed on the label generation rule set. And over time, you know, it's important to have backward compatibility for those software as well.

The fourth recommendation is focus the label generation rule for the root zone but encourage its adoption at registry and other levels to bring consistency of the IDNs.

And finally to ensure EBRO and TMCH support variance. So those are the highlights of the SSAC recommendation.

Next SSAC also provide comments on the registration directory service of the EWG Working Group's initial report.

This is an important issue because registration data directory service is very important for the community.

And the current service Whois service is not able to meet the community needs. This is highlighted as back as for example SSAC 33s, SSAC 37, and SSAC 51.

And the Expert Working Group was convened to address this issue. And they proposed a model called Aggregated Registration Data Directory Service moving forward.

The highlights the SSAC provide comments in the four areas on the purpose of the registration data, the availability of risk excuse me for a centralized system, authentication and access control and data accuracy issues. Those are detailed in the report.

In addition to these advisories the SSAC has been working actively working on three advisories the SSAC advisory on name collision -- that will be discussed in Buenos Aires -- the SSAC advisory on DNS abuse, and finally the SSAC advisory on Root (unintelligible).

Next I'm going to hand over to my colleague Julie to talk about some highlights of SSAC for the Buenos Aires meeting. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much (Steve). And just to let you all know we do have some events some sessions in Buenos Aires. And you're welcome to attend these sessions in fact we encourage you to attend.

There will be a SSAC public meeting a public session on Thursday the 21st at 8:00 AM. And we will cover our current work, and some of the projected work and newly published advisories in detail.

There's also two related events on DNSSEC that's security extensions for the DNS.

There is a beginner session DNSSEC for Everybody a Beginner's Guide on Monday the 18th. And for anybody who doesn't know about DNSSEC it's an excellent session to attend.

And we also have the DNSSEC workshop which will go for most of the day on Wednesday with a variety of presentations from beginning, to intermediate, to expert. So we encourage you to attend that as well.

Thank you very much. And now I'll turn things over to my colleague Olaf Nordling who will provide a GAC update. Thank you.

Olaf Nordling: Thank you very much Julie and hello everybody in time for a few words about GAC which I support from the stop side together with Jeannie Ellers.

And while the GAC it stands for as you know the Governmental Advisory Committee. And it currently has no less than 129 governments and 28 IGOs - Inter-Governmental Organizations as observers.

The governments are full members. The IGOs are observers. And these numbers are growing. So to be perfectly correct it's 29 IGOs as of the day before yesterday.

The GAC they meet face to face only at ICANN meetings. And of course in view of the numbers you realize that they need quite a sizable room.

And of course they perform intercessional work through conference calls and email and in working groups as well.

And their mission here in life in the ICANN life is to provide advice to the ICANN board on public policy matters or public policy aspects of whatever matter it services.

For the upcoming meeting in Buenos Aires while we can note that for the last five, six meetings the recent activities and the advice really been focused on new gTLDs and various aspects of that which has kept the GAC very, very busy indeed.

And the way the advice is handled is usually in dialogue with the board in multiple steps and in particular with the board's new gTLD Program Committee.

There are quite a few topics to address but when it comes to new gTLDs there are finalization of advice on safeguards which I mean safeguards for certain categories of strings that are related to particularly sensitive or the regulated activities that needs finalized.

And also another dialogue that's been going on for quite some time on protection of IGO names and acronyms on the second level for new gTLDs.

So those are two hot topics for the GAC to address in Buenos Aires. They are by far not the only ones. The GAC has a really cool agenda starting on Saturday and closing before Thursday potentially on Thursday.

And most sessions are open. So you are welcome to in most cases welcome to come to some (unintelligible) which is the room they have so you'll see them all in person.

GAC work typically takes quite some time. But they do really their best to cut through the red tape. And on that note I would like to hand over to my colleague Heidi Ulrich for providing insights about ALAC.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you Olaf. Hello everyone my name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Director for At Large. And I'm delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the At Large Advisory Committee or the ALAC.

And the At-Large community that have taken place between the meetings in Durban and Buenos Aires as well as provide a preview of At-Large activities that are being planned to take place at the ICANN 48 meeting.

For those who may not be very familiar with the organization of the At-Large community I'd like to take just a moment to review its structure.

At the base are the At Large Structures or ALSs now numbering at 161. ALSs are organizations that work closely with local end users throughout the world on ICANN related policy issues. They provide input to ALAC policy advice statements and are active in outreach activities.

At the next level are the five regional At-Large organizations or the (Relo)s They serve as the umbrella organizations for the ALS's in their particular region.

The (Relo)s select two ALAC members as well as their own officers to help in the organization of (Relo) activity.

The (Relo)s serve as an important point in ensuring two way information exchange between the ALSs in the ALAC.

And at the next level is ALAC. That's the 15 member body within ICANN that represents the interests of Internet users.

They develop policy advice statements in response to public comments. And frequently send policy advice statements directly to the board.

A total of ten members are selected by the (Relo)s. And the remaining five are appointed by the noncom.

And between - beginning in 2010 ALAC and the (Relo) chairs selected one director to the ICANN board. That process is now beginning for the board director seat to be filled in 2014.

Moving on to ALAC policies since Durban the ALAC produced 18 policy advice statements in response to open public comments between the meeting in Durban in late October.

And I'm just going to highlight three of those very briefly. The first is the At-Large statement I'm sorry the ALAC statement on the study on Whois privacy and proxy service abuse.

In its policy advice statement the ALAC stated that support for the study on Whois privacy and proxy service abuse and the clear support that the study provides for the development of a strong privacy and proxy provider accreditation (unintelligible) as well as for accuracy and verification requirements covering all Whois information including those who use privacy and proxy service providers.

The next is the ALAC statement on the confusingly similar gTLDs. In this policy advice statement the ALAC urges the board to revisit the issue of new gTLD - new TLD strings which are singular or versions of the same word so



that ICANN does not delegate strings that are very likely to create confusion among Internet users.

The third is the ALAC statement on the preferential treatment for community applications and restraining contention. The ALAC stated that new gTLD applications with demonstrable support, appropriate safeguards and strong emphasis on (extra) community service should be accorded preferential treatment in the new gTLD string contention resolution process. The policy advice development process that the ALAC uses as outlined on the graphic to the left on the slide includes close collaboration with the five (mailos) and the same active working groups.

And all of that ensures that ALAC statements reflect the views from the edge of the At-Large community. More information on all of the ALAC statements is available on the At-Large correspondent page at the link provided on the slide as well as highlights are noted in the monthly policy update. I'd like to now briefly talk about the ALAC and RALO activities since Durbin, there have been several.

The first is a process with the election of the board director selected by At-Large has started. There are two working groups, the board member selection process committee which serves as an oversight committee and the Board Candidate Evaluation Community which reviews the candidates. They've been established just recently and they will be holding their first call this week.

The second is that the At-Large community coordinated their activities at the 2013 IGF held in Bali last month and members of At-Large organized several workshops including those held by (Asalo) and (Apeorello) as well as other groups. They were very well attended and in addition At-Large volunteers were staffing the ICANN information booths and we are expecting a couple of applications for new ALS's coming into that activity.

There have been also several activities that are related to the second At-Large Summit were the ATLAS II that is scheduled to take place during the ICANN 50 meeting in June 2014. The ATLAS II survey which over 90% of ALS representatives have completed, will contribute to the planning of the meeting agendas. A new beginner's guide for ALS's will be presented in draft form during the Buenos Aires meeting. This guide contains information targeted to ALS's that enable them to engage effectively in At-Large.

And this is part of the plan being made for the Summit. And also four briefing sessions for At-Large were held over the last couple of months on topics of interest to all of At-Large and again serve as capacity building tools for the ALS's. And the topics that are listed there on the slide include ICANN At-Large and Internet ecosystem that was a very well attended briefing session. Also on IPv6 which (Deanthone) spoke at the introduction to portfolio management and ICANN labs and finally the - a new ALS introductory webinar for new ALSs.

And recording and transcripts for all of these sessions are available on the (slope) provided on the slide. And finally At-Large activities in Buenos Aires - during the meeting in Buenos Aires At-Large will be holding 23 sessions as well as of course interact with other members of the community including the ICANN Board, the ccNSO, the ASO, the NomCom, the NSCG and the ATRT 2 Group. (At least) At-Large will also be holding several ATLAS II planning sessions to move the development of the second At-Large Summit forward.

And the (Schackrello) will be holding a showcase and reception on the theme of an Inclusive Internet with Active Participation of Internet Users. And in addition to speakers including Fadi Chehadé and others senior ICANN staff, the event will feature an update on and (Lackrello) activities and future (tanko event group) and an assortment of Argentinian food and wine. You all are very welcome to that - to attend that event and it's going to take place Monday 18 November between 1830 and 2000 in the Golden Horn Meeting Room.

And this concludes the At-Large update and I give the floor of my colleague Rob Hoggarth, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much Heidi, good day everybody. You know while these pre-public meeting webinars focus on a number of substantive policy issues, structural overviews, status updates and some of the previews or introductions we're doing for the next public meeting.

Another important element of our policy development support function over the years has been the responsibility for supporting resources that ICANN provides to all of your communities to make the various policy engines functions. These functions include anything from the basic conference bridges and Adobe Connect rooms that we're using today to our role as staff to be the stewards and the facilitators of the advice and policy processes that you all use in your various ICANN communities.

And it's been very obvious over the past couple of years that we need to give our core functions - these core support functions a higher focus, a bigger profile and more resources. And so what you're going to see over the coming months is some additional focus on the part of our policy team to really focus on how we can improve those resources, coordinate better with a number of your communities to try to identify some of those.

We've actually started a small team to help us focus particularly on those needs and that's part of my presentation to you all today. Carlos Reyes and I are two of the early adopters of this focused area of additional engagement and we hope that you'll see more and more outreaches as we sort of shift some of our focus and some of the time that we spend to more of these activities.

And the fundamental philosophy we're taking to all this is the time that you all devote to ICANN processes are really ICANN's most important and most

valuable resource. I mean the time that you spend to be involved in working groups, to gather information, to attend ICANN meetings is very valuable. And it's important from us as a staff perspective to really give you the resources to help you do your job more effectively, make those contributions more efficient and really help you focus candidly on the substance and not having to worry as much about the administrative pieces.

And so part of the work that we're going to be devoting more time and attention to is, you know, identifying and improving the tools that we offer you all to help you do your job better. Just to give you a preview of some of the things that we'll be talking more about in Buenos Aires but I hope that we'll be engaging with all of you on a more regular basis is really talking about, you know, improving the engagement resources that we have.

I think you'll be pleased see of the coming months improvements and changes to not only the infrastructure of the public comment periods but some further modifications to the various timeframes and processes that many of you have given us feedback about. We're also going to be looking at, you know, expanding the toolkit of resources that we provide in terms of the capabilities. I've talked with a number of your colleagues already about a community regional outreach pilot program that we've started.

We're also investigating opportunities to provide more administrative support to some of your groups and teams. None of this is happening overnight but I think what you'll see is just more engagement from all of us on your behalf to be more proactive in identifying those areas where we can improve things. One of the areas that we've gotten a lot of feedback on recently is the opportunity on an annual basis for individual communities to come forward with specific budget request for the coming fiscal year.

That's an area where we've identified that there can be some substantial improvements that we're going to be focusing on. Some of you may be aware that Fadi Chehadé had a number of executive roundtables early in his work

with ICANN that was very valuable for gathering feedback, for gathering input, for helping staff understand some of the challenges in the community and vice a versa. And so we're hopeful to continue to do some of that work and continue to do some follow-ups.

It also includes more regular contacts between senior staff and the various community volunteer leaders, many of you who devote a lot of time it's very important to have that connection with ICANN staff on a more regular basis. And, you know, increase staff support as well in terms of just being able to have the folks and the resources that are available to all of you again to help you do you work better.

So this is just really a very short commercial and sort of head's up to all of you, we really want to do a better job engaging, have that much more core function of what we do for all of you. And so I invite all of you when we connect in Buenos Aires or just on telephone calls and working groups or in some of your community calls that we have this dialogue and that Carlos, myself, David Olive and all of the members of the Policy Team are very focused and very interested in making the support better for you.

And now David I think I can flip it back to you to give folks an opportunity to have some comments or we can answer some questions, thanks.

David Olive: Thank you very much Rob and members of the team, (Natalie) would you please un-mute the line so that people can ask some questions, raise your hand I'll be happy to recognize that.

We also have been answering the questions you've put in the chat and that will also be made available as part of the recordings and transcriptions so you can refer back to the as well. If someone would like to raise their hand I would be happy to recognize you - any questions or comments? With that we did want to note again I think we've answered most of the questions that you put

in the chat and I see that (Ranalia) and (Mikey) have also asked - some are going to be answering those directly for you as well.

If you are thinking of more questions or if not we will then proceed to remind you that the best way to stay updated is to look at our monthly policy update. It comes out in these languages as well, it is a great I think and quick source of information on policy activities and policy development matters within ICANN. It's also a possibility that you should also put the My-ICANN as well to get information directly to your mailbox.

Again I'd like to thank the members of our team and they're here if you would not - many of you deal directly with some of those in support GNSO or the ccNSO or At-Large, this is the entire team and they put great effort to make this a good and informative session for you and we again thank you for your participation. If indeed you have any questions you can always contact us that [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org) and we're happy to answer any questions that you may have.

With that I see (Latisha) and others kind of thanking us and I appreciate that. I would like to get one last call for any other comments or questions. And with that I would also like to thank our special guest speaker, we're honored to have the chairman of the ASO Council to help us learn a little bit more about the work and the activities of the ASO generally and in Buenos Aires.

Man: You're very welcome.

David Olive: With that I would like to say we hope to see many of you in person in Buenos Aires or participating remotely there. We welcome all and everyone to those sessions and with that I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning. Again thanks for your participation and engagement.

END