

**Pre-Los Angeles Policy Update Webinar  
02 October 2014  
First session: 1000 UTC**

David Olive      Thank you. I'd like to welcome everyone to our pre-ICANN 51 Policy Update Webinar today, the 2nd of October, and I welcome all our participants.

As you know, the policy team provides this background briefing before every ICANN meeting. This is our subject matter experts that you'll be able to hear and talk to today who are working with the supporting organizations and advisory committees as they are presenting proposals and advice to the Board of Director, and in some cases providing information to the broader ICANN community.

Our Webinar will consist of some previews of ICANN 51, some of the particular focuses, and then we'll go into the substantive topics that should be discussed by the various supporting organizations and advisory committees as they do their work face-to-face at ICANN 51.

So with that, we look forward to welcoming everyone in Los Angeles either in person or remotely, and remote participation is a possibility and available on most sections, as you can see on the ICANN (Greetings) team Web page. We welcome you in either in-person or remotely.

Just some quick housekeeping. We're going to mute the lines so that there's no interference. There'll be questions at the end of the session, and we'll ask

you to press star, 1, to record your name and be put in a queue to ask the questions live.

However, if at any point during the time you'd like to ask a question, please put it in the chat and we'll make every effort to answer it in the chat or make sure that it's addressed at the end of the session.

With that, I'd just like to briefly show you some of the previews of ICANN 51. This is an important meeting for the general change of leadership within the various supporting organizations and advisory committees. Various members join or depart from these councils and executive committees, and so there is a leadership training program for these new incoming members of the councils and committees.

Monday of course is our opening session. We'll have guest speakers and our CEO will also present an overview of activities to date since our last ICANN meeting and some previews of the future.

Also on that day, the supporting organizations and advisory committees have gotten together to create a session - a 90-minute session in the morning on high interest topics that we'll be looking at the (laws) of the advisory committees in the policy development process as well as some of the new issues likely to be raised in a next round of our new gTLD program.

Tuesday is an important day. Many of the constituencies and stakeholder groups are meeting individually, but they come together to meet the Board of Directors and talk about issues of interest. And, that's a busy session ended by some lighter program music night.

Wednesday, we have a GAC open forum, that's our Government Advisory Committee. Our other advisory groups are meeting that day, as shown here.

And Thursday, we have our public forum and community recognition and Board meeting.

Special sessions focusing on topics that are being addressed of course will be accountability and governance cross-community working group, enhancing the ICANN accountability session on Thursday, and obviously the session on the transition and status of the NTIA stewardship transition on Thursday as well.

Briefly, I wanted to go into the core of our policy team work, and of course the primary role of ICANN is to coordinate policy development relating to the global Internet systems of unique identifiers.

ICANN's open and transparent policy development mechanisms promote a well informed decision based on expert advice from a diversity of views of all our stakeholders. And, we are appreciative of the community members like yourself who participate in this bottom-up (unintelligible) approach because the results are recommendations for the coordination of the domain name system. It's a very important function and we want to make sure that those proposals are fair, effective, and carefully considered to preserve obviously the stability, security, and resiliency of the Internet.

Policy recommendations are formed and refined by the ICANN community, by you people here on this call, in the supporting organizations, and of course influenced by the advisory committees as well as public inputs. And here are the supporting organizations that people know, the address support organization, the country code names supporting organization, the generic names supporting organization, and our advisory committees at large and the government, the root server systems advisors, and the security and stability advisory committees.

I'd like to use a simple graphic that shows the - a complexity, but also the activities of ICANN, and you see policy development is an important part of - and core function of our operations.

The goals of this Webinar would really - provide an update of policy work to date. Some of the issues that will be addressed in Los Angeles to encourage your obviously participation and understanding of these issues. Show you where there's opportunities to provide your input. Answer any questions and solicit feedback. And of course, our Web hash tag is there at - on the screen.

Topics covered in this session. We of course will rely on our subject matter experts from the policy team to provide you with the details. We're going to first focus on some of the cross-community working groups.

This is combining the efforts of the various supporting organizations and advisory committees in looking at specific topics, and these are the four that are currently underway, dealing with some of the guidelines for this just through the IANA transition, the use of names in country TLDs, and of course an important government affairs and generic names supporting organization work.

In terms of the generic names supporting organization, the following issues are being discussed in various stages of the policy development process, and we'll tell you a bit about the highlights of these.

Within the country code supporting organization with the ccTLD, operators, some of their issues are listed here.

The address supporting organization we can't forget our names allocation and actually the numbers allocation system on the ASO will be talked about and some of their activities while in Los Angeles.

The (unintelligible) advisory committee will also be meeting there with their experts and some of their activities will be highlighted.

The group that's dealing with security and stability will be working, that's the SSAC. An overview of the government advisory committee and of course our At Large.

With that, I'll turn it over to my colleague who will talk about the cross-community working groups and joint efforts.

Mary Wong: Thank you, (David). Hello everybody.

David Olive I think Mary Wong is next. Mary, please.

Mary Wong: Thank you, (David), and hello everybody. Welcome to our Webinar. As (David) said, my name is Mary Wong. I'm a member of the policy staff.

And before we go into some of the current cross-community efforts that (David) described, we thought that we would start off by talking about an effort that's underway not just in one of the supporting organizations and advisory committees, but as a joint effort that involves the GNSO, the ccNSO who chartered this group, and that also has participants from the ALAC as well as the SSAC and a number of others as well.

This effort was chartered by the two groups that I mentioned with invitations to the other groups because this is an important topic across numerous supporting organizations and advisory committees. And you all know, whether you're new to ICANN or a veteran, there's been an increasing number of issues that cut across SOs and ACs that have common interests and that require them to work together.

So there's a need to ensure that the collaboration works and is effective.

As many of you also know, however, each SO, each AC has its own remit, its own scope, and its own operating procedures. That is not to say that there haven't been cross-community working groups, or CWGs in the past. It's just that because there is an increasing reliance on these groups on those issues of common interest that a number of SOs and ACs decided that it would be very, very useful to get together to develop a common framework of operating principles to guide future cross-community working groups.

As I mentioned, the ccNSO and the GNSO formed this group within invitations sent out to all the other SOs and ACs. This was fairly recent. You see the date was March 2014. And you see on this slide that this is the objective. That there'll be a final general framework that will guide the formation, the chartering, the operations, the decision-making procedures, as well as termination and follow-up actions for future CWGs.

This group is in the process of reviewing the prior CWGs that I had noted and mapping them to a typical lifecycle of a typical working group.

This group will also be meeting at ICANN 51 in Los Angeles to present to the community what they've done to date with the goal, as I mentioned, to produce those guidelines and those templates that will correspond to each phase of a typical working group.

And without further adieu I'd like to pass you on to my colleagues. I believe it's Markia Konings who will take you through one of the current CWG efforts. But as we mentioned, this seems to be an important effort of interest across SOs and ACs and in the community, and so we would invite you to attend this particular CWG session at ICANN 51 on Wednesday morning LA time with the details in the full LA schedule.

So on that note, Markia, all yours.

Markia Konings: Thank you very much, Mary.

So my name is Markia Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director and team leader for the GNSO based in the ICANN office in Brussels, and I'd like to welcome you all in and thank you for joining us in our Webinar today.

So I'll be talking at you first about the cross-community working group to develop an Internet assigned numbers authority, or also known as IANA. A stewardship transition proposal on naming-related function.

It takes three lines on the slide, as you can tell.

So why is this important? I think as many of you are undoubtedly aware, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, or also known as NTIA, announced on the 14th of March of this year its intent to transition some of the key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community.

So as part of that announcement, the NTIA asked ICANN to convene a multistakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the US government's stewardship role with regard to the IANA functions and related root zone management.

So - and the IANA functions cover different areas, and namely numbers, protocol, parameters, and names, and as a result also involve different effected communities, the idea is that each of those directly affected communities take the lead in developing a transition proposal that relates specifically to their area of interest.

And in doing so, they're expected to take into account the four principles that NTIA has put forward as a requirement for the final transition proposal, which are support and enhance a multistakeholder model, and maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS, and meet the needs and

expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services and maintain the openness of the Internet.

As so the formation of this specific cross-community working group which has been formed at the initiative of the generic names supporting organization, the GNSO, and the country codes supporting organization, the ccNSO, it's basically a response of the naming community to this specific request to develop a transition proposal that specifically focuses on the domain name system.

So the cross-community working group is currently information. The charter has been adopted by the GNSO, the ccNSO, the At Large Advisory Committee, or ALAC, and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the ASAC, and is under consideration by the Governmental Advisory Committee, or GAC.

A first meeting of this group is scheduled to take place coming Monday on the 6th of October, and will be followed by a face-to-face meeting at the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles, which will be open to anyone interested on the Monday, the 13th of October, from 12:15 to 13:45 local time.

In addition to members appointed by the chartering organizations, the CWG is also open to anyone else interested to participate in this important effort. And so if you're interested and would like to join this effort, you know please contact my colleague (Grace), her email address is here on the screen, and she will be adding you to the mailing list.

In addition, you can find further information on this effort on the dedicated Wiki pages that have been created by following the links that you see here on this screen.

And with that, I'll give it over to Bart to talk about the next cross-community effort.



Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. So my name is Bart Boswinkel. I'm involved with the ccNSO. A Senior Policy Advisor. I will take you through the cross-community working group on the use of names of countries and territories as top level domains.

The background of this working group is longstanding. It's a follow-up of the ccNSO study group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs, and the recommendation of this working group was - of this study group was to convene a cross-community working group in order to further develop a harmonized framework on its use. Their findings were there are some issues regarding the different uses of country names and that they divert, so hence the recommendation to form this working group to - the cross-community working group to develop a uniform definition or framework on the use of country names.

And especially - but first step was to check whether this is feasible.

So as I said, this is on the use of country and territory names, and the country and territory names, the working group is focusing on are those that are listed in the ISO 3166 standard.

So what it means is other geographical indicators such as regions or subdivisions of some countries are not included and are out of scope of this working group. And what is also relevant for its scope is this working group focuses on top level domains and not on second - on the use of country and territory names as top level domains, and not at second or other levels. Again, to avoid misunderstanding.

Current status. The working group just published its progress report, so here you can find some detail - in the progress report are some details on what has been achieved so far since the London meeting. But, the working group has more or less defined its baseline for further work, so it accepted and

reviewed the policies identified by the study group and accepted and reviewed the typology on - of the country and territory names developed by the study group, and used both as a baseline to - for the discussion.

Next main activities. So as of the Los Angeles meeting, moving forward, is first of all reconfirmation, and so revisit and review of the issues identified by the study group. And once this is done, they can really start working on a - on their definition of framework.

So the first step in the definition of framework will be the feasibility of - understand the feasibility of such a framework.

In Los Angeles, the working group will meet and one of the major topics for discussion is setting this - the timeline, the schedule, and agenda for between the Los Angeles meeting and Marrakesh, and start the discussion on the issues.

Further information, you can find here. As I said, the progress report has been published. And if you're interested, the working group meets on Thursday morning 8:30 until 9:30 in Los Angeles.

Now I'd like to hand over to my dear friend and colleague Olof Nordling, who will take you through the next cross-community working group.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Bart, and hello all. My name is Olof Nordling, and I'm supporting the Government Advisory Committee and will tell you a little about the GAC GNSO concentration group on GAC early engagement in GNSO policy development processes. And I think - well, the title says it all. The GAC and the GNSO have different roles. The GNSO producing policies for gTLDs, and the GAC producing advice on public policy matters.

Now at times they may have common interests in certain topics like Mary mentioned earlier on. So they have a joint interest to improve their

cooperation and this has emerged in the desire to explore and enhance ways to get the GAC early engaged in the GNSO policy development activities.

And this is something that has been highlighted a need for it by both the ATRT I and II, the accountability and transparency review teams.

So this was launched, well, quite some time ago. This concentration group, which we tend to call it, launched after the - just after Buenos Aires meeting, and they advanced very well since then, although this is to be seen as a long haul process.

They early on decided to divide the activities into work streams. They have a handful of participants from the GAC side and an equal handful of participants from the GNSO side. And developing first of all sort of a mechanism - a machinery for improved actual cooperation on day-to-day matters to see that they're mutually informed.

And secondly, to see what are the options for the GAC to be engaged in the GNSO PDPs? Well, so to speak, the what, where, when, and how for doing that?

A first very tangible achievement is a pilot project, as has been agreed, which is to establish a GNSO liaison to the GAC. It already launched. And there are other recommendations that are being developed and will be addressed in Los Angeles.

First, as part of the joint GNSO/GAC meeting in Los Angeles, which is from 2:00 to 3:00 pm on Sunday in the GAC room, and second also separate, concentration group meeting to take place between 7:30 and - 6:30 and 7:30 pm the same Sunday, and that will happen in the GNSO room.

And there is a lot more if you're curious about these activities to read at the Wiki and we have a charter, and while they are recordings of the previous meetings that have been taking place.

So you're certainly more than welcome to attend the concentration group session taking place on the Sunday from 6:30 to 7:30 in the GNSO room.

More about the GAC later from me, but now I hand back to Marika to tell you a little more about the GNSO as such.

Markia Konings: Thank you, Olof.

So as Olof already said, we will now start focusing on the more specific policy activities of the Generic Names Supporting Organization, or GNSO. As we only have limited time available today, as you'll also be hearing about the other groups, we're only going to highlight some of the ongoing activities, noting that we'll have nearly 60 GNSO-related sessions as scheduled for the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles.

So with that, I'll turn it over to my colleague Lars who will talk - will be talking to you about our first topic related to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy.

Lars, you may be on mute.

Lars Hoffman: Hi Marika, it's Lars. I'm sorry. Yes, I was on mute indeed.

Hello everybody. I'm going to give this short overview of the IRTP Part D PDP working group. First, a bit of background for those few among you who are not familiar with the IRTP. The inter-registrar transfer policy, it's a GNSO consensus policy that was first developed in 2004 and has been under review since 2008. This being the fourth and final of those reviews.

The IRTP is an important policy (not least) by the fact that the transfer-related complaints after the second largest number of those received by ICANN compliance.

And yes, actually, the second most - the second most (complaints) received by ICANN compliance. There was in fact 6333 alone in the past 12 months.

This Part D has been chartered with six questions, four about the transfer dispute resolution policy, the TDRP, one question about the IRTP penalties, structures, and one about the continued use of the Forms of Authorization, the FOAs.

You might remember that the initial report had been published in March this year, and during the following public comments and reply period, four comments were submitted to the group. The working group has of course reviewed all these comments in great detail and in fact some of these have led to some intense and very fruitful discussions. And it concluded its final report just over a week ago.

The report contains 18 recommendations. It has been submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration during the next Councilor meeting that will take place in Los Angeles.

I'm not going to read through all the 18 recommendations, but that gives you a quick overview about the most important points that the group recommended.

As you can see from the slides, the working group recommended reporting requirements for the TDRP rulings. You can find details of these in Recommendations 1 and 2. The working group addressed multiple (HOP) scenarios in Recommendations 3 and 4. And those are situations of when alleged non-compliance transfer takes place. That is then followed by one or more compliant ones before it is detected and a TDRP is launched.

The TDRP statute of limitations has also been extended in Recommendation 5 from currently 6 to a future 12 months.

The TDRP has also been modified in Recommendation 10 where registries have been removed as first level resolution providers. The working group decided not to allow for registrant-initiated TDRPs, but the list of use cases is (annexed) to the report to guide future policy development in this area.

The working group has also recommended to improve the display of information for registrants on transfer-related issues. Details for this can be found in Recommendations 11 and 12.

And the group after some debate decided to maintain the forms of authorization. And finally, the group has also recommended the future database review of the IRTP, though this should not take place until after all the recommendations from this as well as previous IRTP PDPs have been implemented and have been in operation for 12 months.

The next step, this is - as I said, the final report was published last week, and the picture shows, as Marika told me earlier, James Bladel, the Chair of the working group there in the picture. And the GNSO Council will consider the report in LA and if adopted a public forum will start and before the recommendations are forwarded to the ICANN Board, which then decides on whether to adopt them in the - at its next meeting, probably in Marrakesh.

And you can find the final report and all other information on the GNSO Web site and the Adobe Connect room you also see direct links to the initial and final report.

And that is all for me. Thank you very much, and I'll pass you on to my colleague, Julie Hedland.

Julie Hedland: Thank you very much, Lars, and welcome everybody. Thank you for joining us. I'm going to speak briefly on a policy development process relating to the translation and transliteration of contact information.

And just some background. There is a working group that is chartered to determine whether it is desirable to translate and/or transliterate all contact information all contact information into one language and script. It started its work in December of 2013. It has analyzed community feedback.

There are also some other efforts underway that the group is monitoring relating to the expert working group and a feasibility study on translation and transliteration of contact information, and these are Whois-related efforts that may affect the work of the working group.

This is important because of the continued internationalization of the domain name system with a growing number of users relying on non-Latin scripts and the need for standardized query of internationalized registration data, the assurance of its functionality, and the ongoing reforms of gTLD directory services, that is for - since the work of the expert working group.

This makes the need to establish consistent GNSO policy on translation and transliteration of contact information very important.

Recent developments are that the working group Chair created a draft Strawman and this is being used to produce a draft initial report. This will be presented in Los Angeles for discussion.

And after Los Angeles, the group will produce an initial report that will be put out for public comment. This working group is open to everyone. You can see the contact on the screen if you wish to be involved. You can join our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles. That will be on Monday, October 13th, at 15:00 local time, and there's the link to the information.

And here are some further information links. The charter, the Wiki page, and where the draft issue report is posted.

And now I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Mary Wong. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Julie, and hello again everybody. It's my privilege to take you through a few of the other working group efforts that are underway in the generic names supporting organization, or GNSO.

And the first up is about the accreditation of service providers for privacy and proxy services. It's a very long name for a working group, so it's been shortened to PPSAI.

Before I start, just a brief explanation of privacy and proxy services.

Essentially, a privacy service is a service that you can sign up for when you register a domain name that allows you to hide some of your contact details from public view in the global Whois directory.

A proxy service is somewhat similar, except that the difference for our purpose here today being that all of your contact information is masked or hidden from public view in the Whois database.

This is an important issue. It was highlighted by the community several years ago, including as part of the negotiation for the new registrar accreditation agreement, or the RAA. As many of you know, the new RAA was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2013, and this particular issue on the accreditation of privacy and proxy services was one of the issues that was highlighted during the negotiations, but was an issue that remained outstanding.

And, ICANN has committed to create an accreditation program for these services.



Because this issue was not finalized, there is a temporary specification that is attached in the 2013 RAA, and here you see on this slide that that temporary spec runs through January 1st, 2017, or the start of the actual accreditation program, whichever first occurs.

As a result, after the approval of the new RAA by the Board, the GNSO started a PDP, or a policy development process, at the Board's request on this one particular issue.

We have a link to the charter I believe in the next slide. If not, I'm happy to send it to anyone who's interested. There are seven categories of questions that were highlighted by the GNSO for the working group to tackle, and some of these are listed here.

Those of you familiar with the issue will realize that there are some issues that have been outstanding in the community for awhile and they're fairly difficult, and these include for example the use of relay and reveal procedures, as well as what happens if a provider's accreditation is terminated.

The working group has been working and meeting regularly since its incorporation by the GNSO Council, and the aim at the moment is to produce its draft initial report for public comment, as all initial reports are published for public comment in a working group, and the aim is to do this by early 2015.

As a result, as you can imagine, the LA meeting, coming up in the next two weeks, is a fairly significant milestone for this group. Here you see some of the information on the workspace, on the temporary specification that is currently in place until this group completes its work and its recommendations possibly adopted by ICANN to develop into the permanent accreditation program.

As such, we invite you to attend the working group's open session in LA. And this is on Wednesday the 15th of October in the morning LA time. And we encourage you to attend to provide your feedback to this group as they move ahead to drafting the initial report.

We'll move on now to another policy development process, or PDP, and this is about the protection of international governmental organizations, or IGOs, and international nongovernmental organizations, or INGOs, in terms of their identifiers such as their full names or their acronyms in all generic top level domains or gTLDs.

And this means not just the new gTLDs that are being launched at the moment but also the so-called legacy gTLDs such as dotCom, dotNet and so forth, that we are all familiar with and, as I mentioned, are going to be joined and are being joined by numerous new gTLDs that ICANN has launched.

Why is this an important issue? Well, this PDP was initiated by the GNSO some time ago, in October 2012. And if you look at some of the IGOs and some of the INGOs, and here we've highlighted two of the INGOs which is the International Red Cross Movement and International Olympic Committee, they have expressed on numerous occasions, including through the Government Advisory Committee, or the GAC, the need for their identifiers to be protected at both the top and the second levels.

The GAC's advice on this focused on the new gTLD program, but as I mentioned, the GNSO PDP covers not just new gTLDs but the legacy TLDs as well.

Prior to the GNSO's PDP being completed the ICANN Board, as you see here on the dates June 2011 through July 2013, had passed several resolution directing that a few interim or temporary protections be put in place for the IGOs as well as for the two INGOs highlighted by the GAC, that is the

Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee, in the new gTLD program in the interim as the GNSO continued its work.

In November 2013 at the Buenos Aires meeting, the GNSO Council unanimously adopts all 25 of the working group's consensus recommendations. And I should say at this point that this was what we call an expedited PDP and the working group met every week, actually, after its chartering and produced an initial report within a year of its incorporation.

Following the GNSO Council's adoption of the consensus recommendations these were sent on to the ICANN Board. Because the GNSO's recommendations deferred, in some respects, from the GAC advice that had been received on the same topic, therefore there were some inconsistencies between the GAC advice that was produced and the GNSO's consensus-based recommendations, the Board asked this New gTLD Program Committee, or the NGPC, to develop a proposal that would take both into account.

This was developed and sent to the GAC and notified to the GNSO shortly before the Singapore meeting in early spring of this year. Following from that discussions have continued across the organizations and affected parties and more recently in June, just before the London meeting, the New gTLD Program Committee, or the NGPC, sent a letter to the GNSO Council asking it to consider amending the remaining recommendations that were inconsistent with the GAC advice.

And this is a process that is foreseen by the GNSO's existing procedures. We've highlighted here if you need to look it up or you'd like to look it up that in the GNSO's PDP manual which you'll find a link to from the GNSO's Webpage, this is in Section (unintelligible). And the GNSO is currently considering the NGPC's request.

This is a fairly complex topic and because of lack of time, as Marika mentioned earlier, I will just note here that the remaining recommendations that have not yet been adopted by the ICANN Board and that are the subject of the NGPC letter relate generally to the protection of the acronyms or the abbreviations of IGOs at the second level as certain names pertaining to the Red Cross particularly the National Red Cross Societies.

That brings us into September, and as I mentioned, discussions continue and the GNSO Council will continue to talk about this issue in the meeting in LA as well.

With regard to those recommendations that are not inconsistent, that's between the GNSO and the GAC, these have been adopted by the Board as I mentioned previously, and for these particular recommendations, the not inconsistent ones and the ones that are adopted, an implementation review team is starting to be formed. And some of you may be interested in participating on that IRT when that is formed.

And coming back again to note that GNSO's PDP covers both new and legacy gTLDs and this is one task that the IRT will be asked to look at.

One thing else that I'd like to highlight here is, in fact two things, pardon me. First of all in terms of the process that I mentioned for the GNSO if it does decide, the Council that is, decides to recommend modifying the original GNSO consensus policy recommendations the procedure that I refer to does prescribe that the GNSO Council cannot do this unilaterally, it needs to consult with the original working group that developed that recommendation as well as seek public comment for it. So as I mentioned, this is a topic for the GNSO Council in LA.

The second thing that I wanted to mention before moving on to the next working group, which is actually a related effort, is under the second bullet point here that with regard to protection for the identifiers for IGOs and

INGOs it's not just a matter of protections at the front end, if you like, for example, through reserving their names such that they're not available for public reservation or registration.

But there's also something called curative rights which is should a third party register a name that matches the protected name of an IGO or a protected INGO there are policies in place, which may be familiar to many of you, such as the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, which is an administrative proceeding whereby the protected organization can seek to have the domain name canceled or transferred, or in a new process I'll speak about in the next slide or two, essentially suspended.

And those are curative rights because they are considered to take place after there has been a third party registration of a protected name. That was a consensus recommendation that came out of the original PDP.

And that recommendation was that the GNSO should actually look further into the issue of ensuring effective curative rights protections for these organizations and therefore the next effort I'll talk about is that particular PDP that the GNSO Council has in fact initiated.

Before I do that, if you're interested in the status of the original PDP recommendations, both those that have been adopted and are moving into implementation and those that are outstanding and still being considered by the GNSO Council and the Board, here is some further information.

And on that note I'll move right to the Curative Rights Protection PDP Working Group. This slide highlights some of the comments that I had made with regard to what happened in the first PDP that developed the original consensus recommendations. And as I noted, the curative rights issue was something that was highlighted by that particular working group.

And as I mentioned, curative rights includes protection under the existing UDRP or Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, which is an ICANN consensus policy, in fact I believe one of the oldest ICANN consensus policies and therefore binding on ICANN's contracted parties. So essentially if you register a domain name through a registrar any sort of dispute at the second level will be governed by the UDRP.

For the new gTLD program a complementary or supplemental dispute resolution policy called the Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure, or the URS, was developed and is based on the UDRP. But it does defer in a number of respects and one of these respects is the remedy. Under the UDRP the remedy is cancellation or transfer of a domain name if the complainant wins. Under the URS, as the name suggests, if the complainant wins the remedy is a suspension of the domain name.

Why is this important for IGOs and INGOs? And here on this slide I highlight some of the problems. For an IGO, which is basically an international organization constituted by governments and states, their status inherently means that they are immune from national jurisdiction whereas under the UDRP and the URS submission to a court of national jurisdiction is something that a party to the dispute has to consent to. And so this clearly is an issue for IGOs.

For both IGOs and INGOs they may also have a different issue which is that the UDRP and the URS were both developed essentially to protect intellectual property rights primarily trademark rights. And so in order to use the UDRP or the URS one needs to have a trademark or a similar right.

And as you can imagine while some IGOs and INGOs may have registered their trademark not all of them do and certainly not all of them have to. So this is a second and different problem. And these were the problems that were highlighted by the original PDP working group and passed to the GNSO Council to request an issue report.

As some of you know, under the GNSO's procedures an issue report that scopes out the possible issues and that is sent out for public comment is a mandatory proceeding step to a PDP.

Ultimately, in June 2014, just a few months ago, after publication of the issue report, after reviewing public comments and after looking at the final issue report based on the public comments, the Council voted to initiate this particular PDP and chartered a working group to deal with it.

In this particular slide we highlight here the specific question that has been passed to this particular working group which primarily asked them to think about whether the existing UDRP and URS should be amended to deal with the issues specific to the IGOs and/or the INGOs or if not, would there be a possibility of developing a separate very narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure modeled on the existing ones that would be applicable only to IGOs and INGOs.

I'll note here that, as some of you know, that there is actually a further effort that we're looking ahead to next year in 2015 which is a potential review of all the rights protection mechanisms that are both representative and curative. That will include the UDRP and the URS. This is not that effort.

Clearly there are some supplementary overlaps that we will need to think about but I wanted to highlight that this particular effort that has just been chartered by the GNSO is specific to the IGO and INGO problem and is not part of the larger effort, like I said, we're looking ahead to in 2015.

As with the other working groups this working group will also be meeting in person at ICANN 51 on Wednesday in the morning. Here is some further information on the charter for the working group on what its done so far as well as the call for volunteers if you would like to join this working group.

So on that note I will hand things back over to Marika to talk about policy and implementation. Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Mary. So as I think many of you are aware there has been an increased focus over the last couple of years of how to deal with policy and implementation related questions such as, you know, what happens if a policy issue is identified during the implementation phase? Who decides whether something is policy or implementation? And do we have sufficiently clear processes in place to actually deal with these kind of questions?

So as a result of those conversations the GNSO Council formed a working group to focus on a number of questions that specifically relate to policy implementation in the context of the GNSO.

So the working group spent quite a bit of time on developing their ground work, and as a result they produced a set of working definitions and principles that are underpinning their deliberations.

As a result of some of their discussions on the charter questions on whether there should be alternative processes for the GNSO to provide guidance or input apart from the existing policy development process the working group is considering recommending a number of additional processes such as a GNSO guidance process, a GNSO input process and potentially a GNSO fast track PDP process which would allow for more flexibility in the way the GNSO provides formal input to the Board or others in relation to gTLD issues.

The working group has now also started focusing on some of the implementation-related questions it's expected to address such as how consultations between staff and implementation review teams should take place; what processes should be in place for the GNSO Council to deal with implementation-related issues or policy questions that are raised during the implementation of a policy; and how are implementation review teams



expected to operate to just give you an idea of what topics are being considered.

So the working group is targeting to public its initial report for public comment in time for discussion during ICANN 52 in February of next year. And as such it's very keen to hear from the community during its face to face meeting in Los Angeles which is scheduled to take place on the Wednesday the 15th of October from 4:30 to 6:00 local time.

So if you're interested in following the conversations of this group or just want to read a bit about the background to this initiative, you know, please check out the links on this page.

And I'll now very briefly cover some of the other projects that will be discussed in Los Angeles and which you may have an interest to attend.

So first of all there is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group. The GNSO Council formed this group following the last ICANN meeting in London with the task to review the first round of the new gTLD program and discuss and reflect upon the experienced gained with the ultimate objective to actually identify which issues will need to be addressed before a future round can kick off.

So the discussion group is currently in the process of collecting issues so that it will be in a position to categorize these, gather as much information as possible and then eventually put forward recommendations to the GNSO Council on how these issues should be addressed for example, by recommending the initiation of a policy development process on certain topics.

So the discussion group has also scheduled an open meeting that is taking place on Wednesday in Los Angeles from 8:30 to 10:15 local time.

The Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group is a non-PDP effort which is looking at standard methodologies of reporting and metrics that would assist fact-based policy development and decision making as well as assessing once a policy has been implemented if it actually did what it was intended to do.

So now the working group has completed its review of previous GNSO efforts in relation to data and metrics used and are now in the process of preparing for further conversations with contracted parties concerning collaboration in relation to metrics and data requests for policymaking. They also have an open meeting which is taking place on Monday the 13th of October from 10:30 to 12:00 local time.

And although another project initiated by the GNSO, but as a requirement under the ICANN bylaws, I also wanted to briefly mention the work that's underway in relation to the GNSO review which formally kicked off earlier this year.

So the Council established a GNSO Review Working Party, which is acting as a liaison between the Board's Structural Improvements Committee, which is responsible for managing the review, as well as the independent examiner which is tasked to carry out part of that review. And the group has been meeting every two weeks for the last like two or three months to discuss the 360 assessment survey and next steps after that.

Please note that the survey, the 360 assessment, is still open until the 17th of October so if you have not participated yet, you know, please consider participating as your input is really important as part of this effort.

So the working party will also have a meeting in Los Angeles on Sunday from 1700 to 1830 local time to discuss the latest developments in relation to the survey as well as next steps as part of the review process.

So that's not the least the purpose of gTLD registration data policy development process. Recognizing the importance, or as you mainly probably know and Whois was created in the early 80s as a mechanism to contact those responsible for operating a network resource on the Internet.

However, since then, you know, Whois has been used for many additional reasons and we've also seen the introductions of additional scripts. But few changes have actually been made to the underlying protocol or the services using the protocol. In addition, issues such as data accuracy, reliability, accessibility, privacy and readability have been raised many times as well as discussed extensively but without a clear solution on how to address those.

So as a result of that and recognizing the importance of addressing these issues also inspired by the recommendations of the Whois Review Team, the ICANN Board requested an issue report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to such data.

And then parallel to this request the Board also directed the creation of an expert working group, or EWG, as it has been referred to, to look at these issues.

So the recommendations of the expert working group are expected to feed into the final issue report and help inform the PDP deliberations. So now that the expert working group has published its final report the GNSO Council and the Board are expected to start an informal conversation on what the next steps should be in this policy development process and how the EWG recommendations will fit in. And a first meeting is expected to take place in Los Angeles to start off that conversation.

So and with that we've reached the end of the GNSO topics for today. If you have any questions, and I think some of you have already started posting

those in the chat, you know, please feel free to ask them either at the end of the webinar or in the chat and we'll do our best to answer them.

And with that I'll hand it over to my colleague, Bart Boswinkel.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. Let me take you through some of the topics the ccNSO and the ccTLD community at large present in Los Angeles will start discussing.

But before doing this I wanted to share with you two slides, without going in too many details, to just show you the diversity of the ccNSO itself but also of the broader ccTLD community.

So again, first of all, the ccNSO membership, 152 members out of 250 plus ccTLDs but this is - this figure is a bit distorted. And secondly, again, to show you just the diversity is how the ccNSO Council is comprised, say, not only with NomComm but based on regional diversity as you can see. And there will be an election soon.

So what it's really about this time is on the hot topics for the ccNSO and the broader ccTLD community. I will briefly touch upon on the IANA stewardship and enhancing ICANN accountability. It has been discussed already in the context of the cross community working groups, and it's just to show you how the ccNSO is involved.

I will touch a bit more on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group and where it's at and briefly on other topics, so that means where some of the other working groups are and which working groups have been established within the context of the ccNSO.

IANA stewardship, again, I will not - Marika has alluded to it in, say, in the previous presentation, the cross community working group. You can see how

the ccNSO community and ccTLD community is involved in the stewardship transition process and what is important.

A little bit more on a specific coordination committee established by the ccNSO, as many of the other supporting organizations and advisory committees have been facing the problem of how do we manage the two processes, how do we share the information with the broader community?

This is in particular relevant for the ccNSO, as I said, the ccNSO is 152 members so there are ccTLDs out there who are not member of the ccNSO; they may be a member of one of the regional organizations but that's not clear.

So the ccNSO has established what is called a coordination committee with the purpose to coordinate the efforts of all ccTLDs, of the ccTLD community at large and inform the broader ccTLD community especially on the development in the IANA stewardship transition process and engage the ccTLD communities in these processes.

So the membership of this coordination committee will be ex officio in order to ensure that the information is the latest and this can be shared with the broader community. So this is not so much providing input in any of these processes but it is more a way of channeling information into these groups into these different processes and from these different processes to the broader community.

Its membership, as I said, is ex officio so that is members of the different working groups and coordination groups established through the processes and also observers from the regional organizations. Information on this working group can be found at this - at its own webpage.

Now focusing on the ccNSO meeting in LA and regarding the two processes, there will be a session to provide an overview of the current initiatives. As this

is a moving target the program working group of the ccNSO thought it would be very useful to try to provide an overview where the different processes are at this stage and there will be a panel discussion on Wednesday afternoon on the ccTLD perspectives on IANA stewardship transition.

And the panel discussions and the other meeting are open to everybody who's interested. So the ccNSO meetings will be on Tuesday and Wednesday. More information, again, this is - you can read this at your leisure.

Now the second major topic for the ccNSO meeting in Los Angeles. There is what is called a Framework of Interpretation Working Group and this working group focuses on the interpretation of existing policies so it's not creating new policies and the existing basic policy document and policy around the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs RFC 1591.

Again, this working group hopes to present its final recommendations in its final report to both the ccNSO and the GAC at the Los Angeles meeting so in that sense this is already say you could qualify this working group as a cross community working group; it has some elements of it.

Topics, again, is for your leisure and I've alluded to them at previous webinars. Where the working group is at is the working group has reached full consensus on all its recommendations hence there will be no diverting opinions in the final report.

The working group will - the final report will include the recommendations and the framework of interpretations of RFC 1591 around consent, re-delegation and significantly interested parties and what they are. For your information, significantly interested parties alludes to what is also called the local Internet community and revocation is a term of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group prefers of unconsented re-delegation and deals with that topic.

Other activities, the ccNSO has created what is called the (SAKEA) Working Group, this is to implement a contact repository to inform and (warn) the ccTLD community on security incidents. Shortly the working group itself has moved forward quickly and shortly there will be a call for volunteers to assist the working group in outreach to the broader community, ccTLD community as the success is demonstrated, say, as many ccTLDs subscribe to that email list as possible.

The SOP will meet. It has provided input on ICANN's draft strategic plan and it has provided input on the ICANN fiscal year 2015 operational plan and budget and it will discuss with ICANN staff how the input has been taken into consideration. The technical working group has prepared the agenda for the ccNSO Tech Day and will meet again. And then finally some committees, the ccNSO has organized for its administrative work.

As I said and has been alluded to, the ccNSO also participates in some of - in the cross community working groups so I will not pay much attention to them. And finally, you can find some general information on the ccNSO at these different URLs.

So I now want to hand over to Barbara to inform you on the ASO.

Barbara Roseman: Yes, thank you. The ASO, Address Council, as you've been told before, has 15 members; three from each region. And one person is elected each year to - from their different membership and they're currently involved in those elections right now. So we will have a new set of people or the same people returning for the beginning of the year.

They've recently completed an effort to produce an infographic that shows the RAR and ASO relationship to ICANN and the global policy process. This will published shortly on the ICANN Website and should be available at the

ICANN 51 meeting. It's a fairly complex infographic and I would not expect you to be able to see it clearly here but it should be available soon.

As for their participation at ICANN 51, they are not going to be holding a formal meeting but many of the ASO AC members will be in attendance and they will also be meeting with the ICANN Board.

Additionally the five CEOs of the RARs, which make up the NRO Executive Council, are also going to be attending ICANN 51. And there will be an information session on Wednesday, 15 October which is on the schedule, and we expect that they should have some good participation there.

I'd like to hand this over to Steve to discuss the Root Server System Advisory Committee.

Steve Shen: Thank you, Barb. The Root Server System Advisory Committee consists of root server operators and root zone managers who provide advice and information to the ICANN Board and the community on topics that are broadly related to the Internet's root server system. Today I will provide a quick update on its progress.

As a result of the last round our RSAC organization revealed it has been going through a restructure process. The goal of that process is to clearly define membership, to have - to structure open and transparent process for producing work and making decisions and to improve the staff support.

This restructure process is nearing end. The latest development is that RSAC approved and published RSAC 001, the operational procedure, last week. With the support staff we have also streamlined internal processes to have open and transparent decision making.

Another part of the restructure effort is to populate RSAC caucus. RSAC caucus is a structure built to make sure that the RSAC discussions and



advice includes not just the root server operators but DNS and infrastructure operator experts from across the Internet technical community.

The caucus was established in July this year and currently consists of 52 technical experts. There has been substantive - two substantive work items under consideration, the RSAC 001 that sets out service level commitments for root server operators in terms of availability, specific characteristics about DNS response and provisioning.

And RSAC 002, which describes a set of common metrics which we encourage all root server operators to adopt and to measure. These work are expected to complete in November 2014.

In terms of the engagement RSAC has appointed two members to the IANA function stewardship transition coordination group, or the ICG group, and the RSAC has also appointed new liaisons to the ICANN Nominating Committee.

At ICANN 51 RSAC will have several working sessions throughout the week. One event I want to highlight is a public information session on Wednesday, October 15, which will also convene the newly formed caucus for the first time.

So that's a quick update on RSAC. Next I'll pass it to my colleague, Julie, to talk about SSAC. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. This is Julie Hedlund and I'll just quickly give an SSAC update, that is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. We do have some activities recently. These are the IANA function stewardship transition work, public suffix list work party. SSAC had a workshop at the Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul. We will have DNSSEC sessions at the LA ICANN 51 meeting. And here is a link where you can find the SSAC reports.

And we do have some events that you are encouraged to attend at ICANN 51, the DNSSEC for everybody, a beginner's guide on Monday the 13th, the DNSSEC workshop on Wednesday the 15th and the SSAC public meeting which will be on Thursday the 16th.

Just to speak briefly about the IANA function stewardship transition and the work SSAC is doing there, I'm not going to go into the background because my colleague, Marika Konings, covered this earlier in this webinar.

So I'm going to move ahead and of course you will have these slides, you can look back at them but this is some detail on what is in the current IANA functions contract. These functions include the domain name system root zone management, the Internet numbers registry management, the protocol parameter registry management and the management of the INT, International Treaty Organizations, dotINT, top level domain.

And again, I'm not going to go into all of these details, you will have the slides. But most importantly the SSAC came out with a publication SAC 67, on the 15th of August.

This is an important report that established a baseline of understanding, for those interested in how the upper most level of the Internet system of unique identifiers is managed, describes the activities included in the IANA functions contract, describes the functions performed under the IETF MOU. And the report focuses on the IANA functions contract and describes all of the activities related to the IANA functions as they are currently performed including those that lie outside of the IANA functions contract.

So this is an informative document and we certainly urge you to read it and should help to inform the discussion on the IANA stewardship transition. The SSAC is also working on a report on the IANA functions contract focusing specifically on the contract.

This report will provide an overview of the key elements of the IANA functions contract and document the role that NTIA currently plays with respect to the IANA functions based on current public contractual information. Look for this document in October.

And now I would like to move ahead to my colleague Olof Nordling who will provide an update on the GAC. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Julie and hello again. So the Governmental Advisory Committee, or the GAC, has quite a number of - 141 governments and distinct economies as members and 31 IGOs as observers. And these are increasing figures so there will be handful more announced in Los Angeles.

They meet face to face at ICANN meetings and more and more work is conducted between the sessions remotely. That's a growing engagement and growing work. And their mission is to provide advice to the ICANN Board on public policy matters or on public policy aspects on any matter.

So in Los Angeles what's going to happen, well, the GAC hopes to conclude on the remaining issues with the new gTLD program in Los Angeles although we have to realize that, for example, issues like IGO protections tend to linger on.

There are other topics on the table and of course what everybody talks about, the GAC does as well, and that's the IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability both from a procedural perspective and on substance and also considering joining the cross community working group on the stewardship transition.

Whois is sort of a staple food interest matter for the GAC. And there is - there will be a public session - a community session more omnibus all things Whois on the Monday which was very much prompted by requests from the GAC.

And there will be Whois discussions and sessions for the GAC internally as well.

Two character domain names, that's a topic that was prompted by an influx of so-called RSAC requests for the use of two character domain names from new gTLD applicants and registries. And that is something the GAC would have to relate to and discuss and has asked the Board to stay on execution of those until they have - can provide advice.

Also human rights and ICANN, this matter was initially discussed in London and there will be continued discussion about a Council of Europe, which is one of the observers within the GAC, a draft document on that particular topic.

There will also be two information sessions for the community will take place on Wednesday morning, a GAC open forum, improved version of what was launched actually in London so it's an hour and a half to inform about the GAC work.

And also a special session on geographic names and this is not for the current round but for future rounds. And there is a draft document that will be presented for comments and discussions in Los Angeles to the community and that will be between 9:30 and 10:00 on Wednesday.

The GAC will have meetings with the ALAC, with the GNSO, with the ccNSO, as has been mentioned by Bart, and of course with the Board which is, by tradition, a particularly well attended by the whole community. So come early if you want a seat for that one, which is late afternoon on Tuesday.

There are also other activities. There will be elections, for the first time actually, of chair and three vice chairs because previously they're all been appointed by acclamation, single candidates and acclamation, but in this case

we have two candidates for chair and six for vice chairs. Those elections will take place on Tuesday.

And there is quite a laundry list of things to do according to the ATRT 2 recommendations that are GAC related. And they are being addressed by and will be discussed by the Board GAC Recommendations Implementation Working Group, that's BGRIWG, an internal working group on working methods, a specific working group that has been established to cooperate with the ICANN global stakeholder engagement and the government engagement department, in order to fulfill a couple of those sub recommendations that are on the table, and of course, as mentioned earlier the GNSO GAC consultation group for early GAC engagement in GNSO PDPs.

They have a full agenda from Saturday midday until Thursday midday. And all their sessions are open except for the communiqué drafting session which takes place on Wednesday afternoon. So for most of their sessions you're very welcome to the GAC meeting room which is in Plaza Pavilion.

And with that I will hand over to Heidi Ulrich will - to give you an update on ALAC. Heidi, take it away, please.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, Olof. Hello everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At Large. Today I'm joined by two my teammates, Ariel Liang, At Large Policy Coordinator; and Sylvia Vivanco, Manager At Large Regional Affairs.

We are 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 ICANN meetings in London and Los Angeles. We will also provide a preview of the At Large activities that are being planned for ICANN 51.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the organization of the At Large community I would like to take just a moment to review its structure. At the base are the At Large structures now numbering 180. These organizations 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.

The five regional At Large organizations serve as the umbrella organizations for the At Large structures in a particular region. They serve as an important role in ensuring two-way information exchange between the At Large structures and the ALAC.

The ALAC is the 15-member body within ICANN that represents the interests of Internet end users, they develop policy advice statements in response to public comments and send policy advice statements directly to the Board.

A total of ten members are selected by the regional At Large organizations; two from each of the regional At Large organizations, and the remaining five are appointed by the Nominating Committee.

And beginning in 2010 the ALAC and the chair of the regional At Large organizations have been given the ability to elect a director to the ICANN Board.

I would now like to hand the floor over to Ariel who will provide an update on ALAC policy activities and activities on the implementation of recommendations from the second At Large Summit. Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thank you, Heidi. My name is Ariel Liang, At Large Policy Coordinator. Over the past three months the ALAC has submitted ten policy advice statements in response to ICANN public comment requests which brings to a total of 34 statements this calendar year.

In particular, the ALAC has endorsed a standing statement on the introduction of two character domain name that helps streamline the process of responding to future similar public comment requests. Seven community members from diverse background and geographic regions drafted this statement. To read more please visit our correspondence page [atlarge.icann.org](http://atlarge.icann.org).

Besides engaging in policy advice development, the ALAC has been kept very busy with the follow up work after the second At Large Summit, also known as ATLAS II.

In London 150 At Large structure representatives from 70 countries worked together in thematic groups and produced the final declaration, a key deliverable of the summit. It contains 43 recommendations for the ICANN Board, staff and community stakeholder groups on ways to improve their practices.

Leading up to ICANN 51 the community has been focusing on transforming the 43 recommendations into concrete actionable pieces easier for the recipient to implement. Ranging from the technology taskforce to the future challenges working group, different facets of the community have taken on this task.

The ALAC also created (unintelligible) implementation taskforce to oversee the transmission of this task and ensure that the recommendations be carried out in a primary and truly bottom-up fashion. In Los Angeles, the ALAC will brief the ICANN Board on progress of this important work.

To get the latest updates please visit our post ATLAS II activities work space in the community wiki.

Over to you, Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much, Ariel. Now just to go over what's happening with ALAC at At Large in ICANN or at the ICANN 51 meeting, we're just going to go briefly over some of the activities.

During the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles At Large will be holding 27 formal meetings as well as interact with other members of the community during numerous other public meetings.

The ALAC will be meeting with the ASO, NRO, the Board, the ccNSO, the GAC, the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, the NCSG, the NomComm leadership, both the 2014 and 2015 chairs, the SSAC, and senior ICANN staff.

There will also be an At Large roundtable with a session on privacy and proxy issues and one session titled Ultimate and Innovative DNS. This roundtable will take place on Wednesday the 15th of October between 10:00 and 11:30 in the Olympic meeting room.

Also at the end of the ICANN 51 meeting Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, who has served as the ALAC chair since December 2010, will step down. He will be replaced by Alan Greenberg for a one-year renewable term.

Also Rinalia Abdul Rahim will take her place on the Board Seat 15 as the Board director selected by the ALAC and At Large. She will be replacing Sebastian Bachollet who has served since December 2010.

And also of note, which is not on the slide, during the meeting in Los Angeles the At Large structures will serve as hubs for remote participants, this is the first time. They're going to be doing this on Thursday the 16th of October. And over 20 At Large structures have applied to serve as hubs.

I will now hand over to Sylvia Vivanko who will update you on the activities of the five regional At Large organizations during ICANN 51. Sylvia.



Sylvia Vivanko: Thank you, Heidi. Hello everyone. My name is Sylvia Vivanko, I am Manager of At Large Regional Affairs. I would like to speak to you about the Regional At Large Organization, the RALOs, activities at ICANN 51.

AFRALO, ABRALO, LACRALO and NARALO will hold their meetings face to face at ICANN 51. AFRALO will hold the AFRALO African joint meeting on Wednesday, 15 October from 1400-1530 local time with the theme the IANA functions stewardship transition and ICANN accountability seen by the African community.

This meeting will have the participation of Adiel Akpologa, AFRINIC CEO, and Pierre Dandjinou, Vice President for Africa and AFRALO leaders.

APRALO will hold its monthly meetings on Wednesday, 15 October from 8:45 to 9:45. One of the highlights of this meeting will be the discussion of the implementation of the APRALO APAC hub pilot framework and the specific steps to implement this strategy.

Then LACRALO will hold its monthly meeting on Tuesday, October 14 from 1215 to 1345. This meeting will include, among other issues, a presentation and conversation with Rodrigo de la Parra, Vice President for Latin America and the Caribbean on regional strategies and synergies with LACRALO.

Finally, NARALO will hold its monthly meeting on Wednesday, October 15 from 11:30 to 12:30 local time and this time (unintelligible) finals ALSS, At Large structures will participate in person to discuss such as outreach activities and engagement.

And I would like to invite you all to this very special NARALO outreach event that will take place on Wednesday, 15 October from 1830 to 2030 local time at the Olympic meeting room on the theme Our Internet Our Stories Our Network: First Nation of the World.

The keynote speaker will be Jacqueline Johnson Pata. She's the Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians. And this event will showcase how NARALO is striving to engage the First Nations Native communities. You will learn more about NARALO outreach activities to engage this important group as a stakeholder within the ICANN community.

This event promises to be a great opportunity for networking, and you will be also watching an artistic performance, the traditional First Nation's hoop dancing and enjoy refreshments so please join us.

And now I will turn it over to you, Carlos, for Q&A. thank you.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Sylvia. This is Carlos Reyes. And at this time we will be transitioning to our question and answer session. For those on the audio bridge if you would like to press star 1 and this will bring you into the queue and at that point if there are questions the operator will help us identify you and will have the opportunity to ask your questions to the policy development support team.

Coordinator: Hello, this is the operator speaking. Just a reminder who is connected as a speaker as a guest speaker can speak directly and does not need to press star 1, only the people who are on listen-only mode. Thank you.

Carlos Reyes: Well it doesn't seem like we have any questions at the moment. We did receive some questions ahead of time that were prepared for the policy development support team.

We received a few questions regarding the IANA transition that is currently underway. And for those questions we have referred the questions to Theresa Swinehart's latest blog post as well as the IANA stewardship transition Website both here on the slide.

We also received a question about the proposed ICANN bylaws change regarding GAC advice. And the answer is posted on the slide here as well as more detailed information. And finally we received some questions regarding the 90-day claims period for new gTLDs. And, again, we'll refer that to the new gTLD site as well as the latest blog post from the GDD team.

And with that it doesn't look like we have any questions at the moment so we'll go ahead and continue and I'll transition to David Olive to conclude our Webinar for today.

David Olive: Thank you very much, Carlos, and for all those attending today. We provided a rather dense amount of information but don't worry, we will be able to post soon the slides and the recordings so that you can go back and refer to them as well as using the various links if you want to add input to any working group or any topic that may be as well as other ways to contact us.

Of course the most effective way we think is to subscribe to our policy update. This provides the latest activities on the policy development and advisory area at ICANN and can be delivered to you directly by email.

We also have a special edition coming out for the Los Angeles meeting as we do for - before every ICANN meeting, again to focus attention. It's available in the various languages listed here. You can also follow us on Twitter. Other questions can be at [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org). We're happy to answer questions in that way.

And also to note that for those who may not be familiar with some of the working groups, the GNSO have a newcomers webinar series that's done monthly to provide a background information and introduction to various chairs and people on the working groups. It's a great way, is an informal setting to get to know more and possibly encourage your participation in their work. And that next session is listed here on the slide.

And our policy development team we have 23 subject matter experts and secretariat support experts; also assisting us are a few consultants who provide services for the team and for you and we're happy to be able to provide this facilitation service to our supporting organizations and advisory councils as they continue their important work for ICANN.

On occasion we do not have very substantive sessions, rare that that may be, and this is not our rehearsal for an LA movie called Policy at ICANN. That, unfortunately, is not taking place yet. Instead, we ask you to come and attend directly the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles or remotely for more on the ICANN and policy development within our organization.

And with that I would like to thank you for that and to say that we look forward to seeing you in Los Angeles or hearing you remotely. And with that I would like to wish everyone a good morning, good afternoon or good evening wherever you may be. Thank you for your participation and engagement.

END