

**Pre Singapore Policy Update Webinar  
29<sup>th</sup> January 2015 10:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

David Olive: I'd like to welcome everyone to today's Policy Update in preparation for ICANN 52 meeting in Singapore. Thank you for joining us on this call. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support. And I'm conducting this webinar from ICANN's regional headquarter hub in Istanbul.

You'll be hearing from many of the policy development support team members who are scattered across the globe. And we are happy to present this briefing to you today.

In addition to providing information on the policy development activities expected at ICANN 52 we'd like to draw your attention to the meeting outlook. We have of course our opening ceremony on Monday with the supporting organizations and advisory committee's special topics on that day.

Tuesday is an important day for constituencies. They'll be meeting amongst themselves and with the members of the Board of Directors for interaction and information sharing.

On Wednesday, which is a - the main meeting day for various councils you see the activities for that day and in particular our Asia Pacific RALO has a showcase that will be able to talk about the activities in that region.

On Thursday of course we have the ICANN public forum, our community recognition and the ICANN Board meetings.

A few notes on this session, it will be made available both the recording, the transcripts and the slides. You see in the chat room where you can locate that after the recording so you can review things. We'll be covering a lot of material but you'll be able to review them at your own leisure.

And if you want to ask a question you can type it into the chat and we'll try to answer it as quickly as possible and there will be a chance for asking questions at the end of the presentations.

Of course at ICANN 52 a big focus is on the IANA stewardship transition and the IANA accountability processes. And here are a few of the many meetings that will be there for people to listen, learn and partake and participate in these important two developments. Again, either in person if you're going to Singapore or online, these will be available through our meetings team remote participation.

Turning now to policy development support, these activities relating to the technical coordination functions are formed and refined by the ICANN community through the three supporting organizations listed here, and influenced by the four advisory committees as you see on this chart.

All policy activities are comprised of volunteers in a bottom up multistakeholder and open and transparent process. And these stakeholders include companies that offer domain names to the public like registrars, companies that operate top level domain name registries, Internet service providers, intellectual property interests, business users, noncommercial

users such as academics and nongovernmental organizations or nonprofit organizations as well as individual Internet users and of course governments.

The volunteer policy development activities usually start at a group level, form around the policy development, policy advisory or ICANN-related issues and many of these working groups are open to all. During this time we have about 70 working groups across the supporting organizations and advisory groups focusing on various ICANN policy and related issues.

Of course part of this is public comment. They're sought at several stages of our policy development process so that interested community members can provide their views and inputs. And during our period recently there are 14 public comment processes open for the opportunity for ICANN community members to input on the policy development side.

With that I will turn to the substance of our webinar. We hope to update you on the current policy work, review those issues that are being discussed, brief you on ways to become involved and provide input as well as to answer any questions. And please note our hashtag, ICANN policy.

With that I thank you for joining us and I turn it over to my colleagues who will provide the detailed information. Now, Marika, I turn the floor over to you.  
Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. Hello, everyone. Thanks for joining us today. So my name is Marika Konings. I'm based in the ICANN office in Brussels and I'm a Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO.

So we'll first focus here on a number of initiatives that are undertaken jointly by the different ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. And the first one of which is the Cross Community Working Group to develop an Internet assigned numbers authority, or also known as IANA, stewardship transition Proposal on naming related functions, which is a mouthful.

So 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 last year its intent to transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community.

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.

As the IANA functions cover different areas, namely numbers, protocol parameters as well as names, and as a result involve different affected communities, the idea was that each of those directly affected communities would take the lead in developing a transition proposal that relates directly to their area of interest. And in doing so they would need to take into account the four principles that the NTIA has put forward as a requirement for the final transition proposal.

So the cross community working group which has been jointly formed by the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the GNSO; the Country Code Supporting Organization, the ccNSO; the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC; and the Security Stability Advisory Committee, SSAC and the At Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC, is basically the response of the naming community to this request to develop a transition proposal.

And they are specifically focusing on the IANA functions that relate to the domain name system. After weeks of intense deliberations, including a face to face meeting in Frankfurt last year, the CWG published its draft transition proposal for public comment on 1 December.

Following the closing of that public comment forum the CWG has been very busy reviewing the input received, which included, for example, an intensive

work weekend on the 10th and 11th of January which consisted of eight hours of CWG meetings.

As a result of the diversity of comments that have been received in the public comment forum, the CWG has needed more time than originally anticipated to analyze and consider these comments in detail including a number of alternative proposals and ideas that have been put forward.

Furthermore, the linkage between the CWG and the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, which my colleague will speak about in a little bit, has become more apparent which has also resulted in enhanced communication and the coordination between the two groups, which is also taking additional time.

Regardless of that, the CWG is keeping up the pace which has resulted in a lot of meetings. For example, I think this week alone consists of 12 hours of conference calls dedicated to this work.

So some of the key aspects the CWG is currently working on is obtaining legal advice on relevant aspects of the proposal, further conversations with the CCWG Accountability on the linkage between the two efforts and of course further work on developing the details of the transition proposal.

So the CWG is planning to publish a discussion document prior to the ICANN meeting in Singapore to allow the community to provide further input on some of the key issues the CWG is dealing with.

So for those of you that are interested to learn more about this topic there are a number of meetings scheduled in Singapore, as you can see on this slide. But I also wanted to flag here that in order to brief the community on the discussion document I mentioned before, the CWG has now scheduled two webinars that will take place next week on Tuesday the 3rd of February. And

for those interested I can post a link to information about these webinars in the chat.

And with that I'll hand it to Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. As said, say, Marika alluded to the first of the two major cross community working groups, CWG Stewardship; and I'll provide you a brief update on the second major one, the CCW on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability.

To give a sense of this group, this cross community working group includes 161 members and participants from all ICANN regions, from the GNSO, Governmental Advisory Committee, At Large, the ccNSO/ccTLD community and the Address Supporting Organizations with co chairs from the At Large, ccNSO, and GNSO and in addition it includes seven external advisors, one Board liaison and one ICANN staff member.

So why do people consider this so important? Probably the best way to understand is looking at the purpose of the working group, this group is focused on enhancing ICANN's accountability in the absence of the contractual relationship with the US so, read for this one, currently the NTIA ICANN IANA function contract and the perceived backstop that this contract provides.

As seen - as you can see from the purpose statement, the scope of the CCWG is broken into accountability mechanisms related to the IANA functions contract, so Work Stream 1; and more broader accountability mechanisms which is included in Work Stream 2.

Now in moving forward the CCWG has structured its way into four work areas and they've produced a couple of documents, which I'll allude to in a minute and in the overview of the current - of the current status.

So the first one what they've done is develop an - provide an overview of the current existing accountability mechanisms. The second one, which again Marika alluded to is they've been very engaged with the CWG Stewardship in order to identify areas of common interest and coordinate moving forward. And this has resulted, for example, in the joint statement of the co chairs.

And a further work product until now is identifying and categorizing the contingency so read the risk - read risk. In order to prepare for the stress test of the mechanism that will be developed. This is one of the, say, items they have to work on according to the charter.

Working on further - further, they've been working on the definitions and scope of what should be included in the work because that needed some refinement in the view of the CCWG. And finally, and that's the major two products in fact is identifying and listing items or mechanisms that are already been proposed for Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 mechanism. And the major product to date, as a result of the face to face meeting this group had in Frankfurt two weeks ago, is identifying the requirements for the mechanisms to be included in Work Stream 1.

Now as already said, this group will have some meetings at the Singapore meeting; two three-hour working session. And at that meeting they will focus on the mechanisms for Work Stream 1 that need to be based on the requirements that have been identified.

They will continue their coordination with the CWG Stewardship, again, review the timeline under which they've been working because it became clear that first of all it's dependent on independent legal advice, which they've been working on as well; and they will seek independent legal advice as soon as they've got a - some specific questions and seek input from the external advisors.

So moving forward the sessions of the CWG during the Singapore ICANN meeting, working sessions are on Monday and on Thursday morning both in the main hall. And they will brief the different communities as well. And as you can see all the material, etcetera, can be found at the CCWG Accountability wiki space, which is included in the slides.

And now I'll hand over to my dear friend and colleague, Olof, to talk about other cross community working groups. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you so much, Bart. And my name is Olof Nordling supporting the GAC. And there are quite a few other joint activities and let's start with, nothing less than the GAC GNSO Consultation Group; not a cross community working group but consultation group on GAC early engagement in policy development activities.

And as the name indicates the purpose of that exercise is to improve the information flow between the GAC and the GNSO with a view to facilitate early engagement of the GAC in the policy development activities of the GNSO which in turn would lead to less complications later in the day when it reaches a more advanced stage.

This consultation group has been active since over a year and has already produced some immediate results like, for example, the appointment of a GNSO liaison to the GAC to help in this exercise. His name is Mason Cole. Well known to many of you.

And there are plenty of other recommendations that have been developed and those will be addressed in Singapore in - for one joint GAC GNSO meeting on Sunday, the 8th of February from 3:00 to 4:30 pm. And there will also be a consultation group meeting to further advance the work and take stock of where - achievements on the Monday between 12:30 and 2:00 pm in the meeting room Indiana is the name of that one but it's still in Singapore.

With that, over to the next one and that is Mary Wong who will introduce that.  
Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Olof. Hi, everybody. This is Mary Wong. And we started in Turkey, moved over to Europe and now I'm speaking to you from the ICANN office hub in Singapore. So welcome, everybody.

I'm here to speak to you first about another cross community working group and this one is somewhat different from the others that you've heard about in a couple of ways. One is that this group started before the two active groups that my colleagues Marika and Bart were speaking to. And in many ways those two cross community working groups as well as a number of others that have started or are just starting, really does attest to the fundamental reason why this group was chartered by the ccNSO and the GNSO in the first place about a year or so ago.

It was realized that because of the nature and the number of issues that cut across the various supporting organization and advisory committees in the ICANN community, that yet while we were using cross community working groups there really wasn't a unified framework of operating principles for these groups.

The good thing is that when this group started looking into past experience and some of the success stories, including some of the more recent ones that some of you may have been on, they found that there were really developed at least a number of practices and customs that have been very useful to the chartering of the more recent groups.

But it was felt by the two chartering organizations that having a document that sets out a template, a set of checklists, essentially as the title of this group has it, a framework that will assist future groups in a number of the phases of the typical lifecycle of a such a working group, so for example, the formation

and the chartering, who, how and what; the operations, what are the rules of engagement?

What do we do when there is no consensus? What do we do with the final report? Who has to approve it? What is the Board's role? What is the follow up after the group has done its work?

The five phases ultimately was what the group came to that really constitutes a typical cross community working group is what this CWG is looking at. And you see here on this slide that they're developing an initial checklist for the first two phases which they hope to present for community feedback during the Singapore meeting on the Wednesday and hopefully by receiving constructive and quite a lot of community feedback they will be in good shape to try to publish an initial checklist for all five phases by ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires.

So on behalf of this cross community working group I invite you to join us in the (More) room on the Wednesday remotely or in person. And please let us know how we can take forward this very important work.

And so on that note we're heading back to Europe and I'm handing off to my colleague Lars Hoffman. Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Mary. Hello, everybody. My name is Lars Hoffman. And I'll conclude the section on the cross community working groups with an overview on the Cross Community Working Group on Country and Territory Names as Top Level Domains.

This CWG is tasked to draft a harmonized framework for the use of country and territory names and recommend next steps to both the GNSO and the ccNSO.

The group has been active for about six months and is currently preparing a strawman options paper that it'll discuss for the first time in Singapore and that is supposed to lay out some of the possible routes towards such a framework.

The CWG also has submitted a letter to the GAC whose sub working group on the protection of geographic names deals with somewhat overlapping issues to this CWG and so there's hope for coordination between the two.

The working group - the cross community working group will meet in Singapore, as I just said, face-to-face on Monday at 12:15. The session is obviously open to anybody as is membership to the group. And it is currently looking to complete its work hopefully by ICANN 54 in Dublin.

And with that I'm passing it back to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Lars. So now we'll start focusing on the policy activities of the Generic Names Supporting Organization, or GNSO. So in addition to the work that is ongoing on the stewardship transition and enhancing accountability, as we've been speaking about before, there are quite a few other activities ongoing.

However, as we only have limited time in today's webinar we're only going to highlight some of these activities noting that there are nearly 50 GNSO related meetings scheduled for the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles.

So with that I'll turn it over to the first topic we'll be talking about and that relates to translation and transliteration of contact information. And the floor is all yours, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Marika. And hello again. This PDP working group is work in 2013, as you can see on the timeline, and has been tasked to address two main

charter questions. Firstly, whether it's desirable to translate or transliterate contact information data into one single language or script.

And then secondly, if such a translation transformation should be mandated who should decide who should bear the burden of such a translation or transliteration.

Just as a quick side note, instead of translation and transliteration the group has decided to use the word transformation; it also marked on the slide, you can see so I'll be using transform or transformation for the presentation and that's also in the initial report.

As you can see the initial report was published in December last year, just a month ago, and is currently open for public comment. The public comment period will close on 1 February, so this Sunday. So if your group for yourself intend to submit a comment please make sure that it's been submitted by Sunday 2359 UTC.

And as with all other working groups the group is open to everybody. You can join until the group submits its final report which is currently envisaged to be completed by May 2015. Obviously that will also depend on the amount and the content of the comments that will have been submitted to the group.

In its initial report the working group kind of laid out the various arguments that members have brought forward, in favor of and in opposition to mandatory transformation of contact information.

And here on the slides are list of the few, for example, mandatory transformation would allow for a more easily and searchable database. And such a recommendation would also avoid possible flight of bad actors to a database with the least translatable language.

Argument opposing a mandatory transformation include that such a thing would be nearly impossible to achieve in a consistently accurate way as it would mean that the transformation of mostly proper nouns.

Also there would be a considerable financial burden if transformation was to be mandated and that would probably affect mostly currently underserved regions as those least familiar with the Latin script. There is more arguments here on the slide and also more on the report. And I encourage you to read the report to see in detail the group's thinking.

And finally the initial report obviously contains some preliminary recommendations notably the working group at the moment does not recommend mandatory transformation of contact information rather it recommends that registrants ought to use any script or language that their local registrar supports and thus any future new or reformed registry directory service should be able to receive data in scripts other than Latin or ASCII, as it's also referred to in technical terms.

And also to allow for the best use ability of the data submitted, the entries should be tagged so that any requester of information knows what script has been used and can thus perform any necessary transformation him or herself if and when required.

Again for a full list of the recommendations please refer to the initial reports. The link is up on the slide and can be found on the GNSO on the ICANN Website. There's also links to the public comments and the group also has a webinar to go through the recommendations and the thinking of the group in greater detail. There's also links on the screen.

And with that I'm passing it on. Thank you very much.

Mary Wong: Hello again, everybody. This is Mary Wong again. And thank you Lars. So my role here is to talk to you about another policy development process, or PDP,

that is ongoing in the GNSO, and that is we hope approaching a critical phase in its work in which we hope to get a lot of community feedback as well.

This particular working group, known as the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group - and I think I got that right - that's a mouthful and it's called for short PPSAI, as a result, was chartered by the GNSO Council something like less than 18 months ago, you see the timeline here, to develop certain policy recommendations. And according to its charter it is a follow up from the negotiations for the 2013 RAA, which, as you know is - was completed and the 2013 RAA is actually now in operation.

But because there were a number of issues that were identified that were not addressed the Board asked the GNSO to commence a PDP once the 2013 RAA was completed. And with some work done following those negotiations the remaining issues were identified to be those relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy services.

Now these are not the same; a privacy is not a proxy service and vice versa. But in short what both of these types of services allows a person, being a domain name registrant, to do is to mask some or all of the contact details from the public globally accessible Whois system.

And there's a number of details about how they operate that will go into the group's report, and that has also been studied by other GNSO and other efforts in the past.

Essentially though, where we are now, if you see the timeline here at ICANN 52 next month is that the working group has, since its chartering, really gone in depth into a lot of the different types of issues that relate to the accreditation of these two types of services.

I should say at this stage that ICANN had already previously committed to having such an accreditation program and so it was up to this particular PDP working group to develop a high-level policy recommendations that would guide the implementation of this accreditation program.

I want here also to add, as many of you know, that at the moment in the 2013 RAA, which I noted is in effect, there is a temporary or an interim specification that governs the operation of the services. This interim specification is due to expire either on 1 January of 2017 or upon the implementation by ICANN of its accreditation program. And so in many ways that timeline is driving the case and the work of this particular group.

As I said, this group is planning to present some, if not all of its preliminary recommendation to the community in Singapore with the hope that following or shortly following the Singapore meeting the group will be able to complete its preliminary deliberations and so be able to publish an initial report for public comment in the same way that Lars has spoken about the - I keep calling it the transformation working group - but the translation and transliteration of gTLD contact data working group, they have their initial report out.

Just as a side note, again as most people know, for these working groups the initial report is put out for public comment. The working group then analyzes all the public comments received in its preparation of its final report which is the one that's ultimately submitted to the GNSO Council for its review and hopefully approval of the consensus recommendations that are in that final report.

So I'm pleased to report, no pun intended, that the PPSAI Working Group has reached preliminary consensus on a number of key recommendations. And I won't read through all the bullet points on this slide. But you see here that we've divided them into a number of categories. These categories follow the

categories that were identified in the working group's charter scope. And the working group did proceed deliberately through each category.

And you'll notice also, for those who have been following the process or who have been involved in one way or another with previous Whois work or with the RAA, that two of what I think I can say have been the most difficult substantive issues concerning the workings of Whois and particularly the role of privacy and proxy services in Whois and the process include the relay of electronic communications and the reveal or what the working group has chosen to call either the disclosure to a requester or the publication publicly in the Whois system of the customer's identity.

As I noted before, a privacy and a proxy service, to varying degrees, allow a customer's identity to be masked in full or in part. So we're very pleased that the working group has reached preliminary agreement on a number of these categories.

And again, you see here that some of the key recommendations are going to be very helpful in refining the implementation of the program. So by not distinguishing in principle between both services they're probably going to be treated much the same way in an accreditation program.

And I want to highlight here that once a provider becomes accredited the idea is that they will go on a list that ICANN will publish and update. And a provider will have to commit two including certain mandatory provisions in its customer agreement.

There will also be some obligation to validate or verify customer data in accordance with the accuracy specification in the 2013 RAA. And also in accordance in terms of it being a model with the RAA there needs to be designated point of contact for the reporting of abuse by third parties. And there's going to be certain requirements developed for how that can be done.

As I noted previously, relay and reveal, being two of the more difficult issues that GNSO and ICANN community has faced in the past, here are some of the key recommendations with respect to the types of electronic communications that have to be forwarded on a mandatory basis.

What happens if in forwarding these electronic communications there is a persistent delivery failure, which is a term that the working group does attempts to define, is the requester who wanted its request relayed informed? And following a relay, what if there is a request for a revealed or a disclosure of a customer identity?

What if there is a request that rather than disclose the customer's identity that the customer actually becomes unmasked and its contact details are fully published in the Whois?

What happens if a customer breaches its terms of service with its provider and its service therefore get suspended or terminated? In all of these questions one of the additional important questions obviously is safeguards against abuse and of course safeguards for the customer as well.

And so the working group has reached a number of preliminary agreements on all of these important issues and they will be presented to the community in Singapore as well as in the initial report. And on these issues working group looks forward to everyone's comments.

There are a number of issues also on which the working group has not yet reached consensus, and they are summarized on this slide. There is a view within the working group by some members that while a distinction may not be made between privacy and proxy services perhaps a distinction could be made between registrants who are registering a domain name for certain types of commercial activity versus those who are registering a domain name for other purposes.

There is also no agreement, at least none that's final, as to what the minimum mandatory requirements should be to ensure the contactability of the provider is and to ensure the provider is responsive to requests including the request to escalate, I'm sorry, if a relay request has failed persistently.

And also the working group is currently discussing quite to do and what sort of mandatory recommendations for minimum requirements should apply when a provider receives a review request. And like I said, that could be a disclosure or a publication request, from certain types of third parties including from law enforcement and similar agencies. And you see here some of the questions that the working group is dealing with.

And they're continuing to deal with these types of issues in the run-up to Singapore. And in Singapore they hope to have time, during their session, to have a discussion on this after presenting some of their initial agreements. And so I hope on their behalf that you'll be able to join this working group on Wednesday morning remotely or in person.

Here are some links on which you can find a summary page of the activities and the draft report including those points on which there were consensus and those on which the working group has yet to reach consensus.

So on that note then I'm going to hand you over back to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Mary. So next we'll be turning to the Policy and Implementation Working Group. So there has been an increased focus over the last couple of years of how to deal with policy and implementation related questions such as what happens if a policy issue is identified during the implementation phase.

Who decides whether something is policy or implementation? And do we actually have sufficiently clear processes in place to deal with these kinds of questions?

So as a result of those conversations the GNSO Council formed a working group to focus on a number of those questions that specifically relate to policy and implementation in the context of the GNSO. So the working group has now published its initial recommendations report for public comments.

So in short, the working group is putting forward the following preliminary recommendations for community consideration. In response to one of its charter questions, which asked for recommendations concerning a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, the working group recommends adhering to the principles outlined in Section 4 of the initial recommendation reports, when policy or implementation related issues arise in the implementation phase.

These principles cover principles that apply to both policy and implementation, those that primarily apply to policy and those that apply primarily to implementation.

Furthermore in addition to the only formal process that GNSO currently has, which is the policy development process or also known as PDP, the working group also proposes three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberations.

Namely, a GNSO input process, or GIP, which just to be used for those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide nonbinding advice, which is expected to typically concerned topics that are not gTLD specific and for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date.

In this context nonbinding advice means advice that has no binding force on the party it's provided to. So for example, this process could be used to provide input on the ICANN strategic plan or recommendations from an Accountability and Transparency Review Team.

It is the expectation that that input would be treated in a similar way as public comments are currently considered by the entity to which the input has been provided.

Secondly, there is a GNSO guidance process, or GGP, which is to be used in those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide binding guidance to the ICANN Board that which is not expected to result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties.

So binding guidance in this context means advice that has a binding force on the ICANN Board to consider the guidance. And it can only be rejected by a vote of more than two thirds of the ICANN Board if the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

It is expected that this would typically involve clarification of or advice on existing gTLD policy recommendations. This could be in response to a specific request from the Board, but it could also be at the initiative of the GNSO Council to an issue that it has identified.

So four examples such a process could have been used in relation to the request from the ICANN Board to provide input on the dotBrand Registry agreement Specification 13, which the GNSO Council dealt with a while back.

And thirdly, there is the GNSO expedited policy development process. This one is intended to be used in those instances in which the GNSO Council intends to develop recommendations that would result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties that meet the criteria for a consensus policy as well as the qualifying criteria to initiate an expedited PDP.

Those qualifying criteria are proposed to be, Number 1, to address a narrowly defined policy issue that has - that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or, 2, to provide new or

additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that has been substantially scoped previously such that extensive pertinent background information already exists.

For example, an issue report for a possible policy development process that was not initiated at an earlier date, or as part of a previous PDP that was not completed, or through other processes such as a GNSO guidance process, as we referred to before. Further details on each of these processes can be found in initial recommendations report.

And, Number 3, as a result of the deliberations on the three implementation related charter questions the working group recommends that the policy development process manual be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board, but to allow the GNSO Council the flexibility to not create an IRT, or Implementation Review Team, in exceptional circumstances, for example, if there is already an IRT in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations.

Implementation review teams are formed of community members and are intended to work with staff to ensure that policy recommendations are implemented as intended in the policy recommendations to meet the intent of those.

The working group also recommends that the adoption of the implementation review team principals, as it has outlined in Annex H of the initial recommendations report and those are followed as part of the creation as well as the operation of implementation review teams.

To provide your input to the initial recommendations report you're invited to do so either through the traditional public comment forum, and you'll find the link on this slide, or through the survey is that the working group has

developed as an alternative way to provide your input. And the link to the survey is also available here on this slide.

The working group is also hosting a session at the ICANN meeting in Singapore to provide further details on this recommendation as well as answer any questions you may have. This session is scheduled for Wednesday afternoon from 3:30 to 5:00 local time and remote participation will be available.

So before I hand things over to my colleague, Bart Boswinkel, I briefly wanted to touch upon a couple of other initiatives that you may be interested in.

So first of all the IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process Working Group, this effort is specifically looking into whether to amend existing dispute resolution processes or create potentially new processes to address specific concerns that have been raised by IGOs and INGOs.

This working group is planning an all-day face-to-face meeting right after the ICANN meeting in Singapore which is intended to assist in meeting its target date of July or August of this year to publish an initial report for public comments.

The Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Part D PDP recommendations will be up for Board consideration at the ICANN meeting in Singapore. And provided that these are adopted that GNSO Council will form and implementation review team to work with ICANN staff to ensure that the implementation happens - conform the intent of the policy recommendations.

Last but not least, two other initiatives that are not meeting in Singapore that which intend to have reports out for public comment later this year are the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group, as you can see here on this slide.

If you are interested to learn more details about either those initiatives that I just mentioned or any of the other projects that GNSO is working on I would like to encourage you to visit the page that you see here up on the screen that aims to put all GNSO related information that should aid your preparation for the next ICANN meeting at your fingertips.

If you have any immediate questions please feel free to ask them at the end of our webinar or type them in the chat and we'll do our best to answer those. And with that I'll hand it over to my colleague Bart Boswinkel to talk to you about the Country Code Names Supporting Organization.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you again, Marika. It is almost a ccNSO/GNSO show on this part of the webinar. I'll just allude to a couple of things that will happen in the ccNSO/ccTLD community space in Singapore.

First of all, the Framework of Interpretation, those of you who've attended previous webinars will know this is a long and ongoing process and which we hope to conclude - or the ccNSO hopes to conclude very soon.

The second one is alluded to some of the sessions on ICANN IANA stewardship transition and accountability processes happening within the ccNSO and some miscellaneous topics.

So what will happen in Singapore regarding the Framework of Interpretation? The Framework of Interpretation has been submitted to the GAC and to the ccNSO Council prior to the LA meeting.

And in Singapore the Framework of Interpretation Working Group will seek support on its recommendations and on the framework itself from the GAC. And it's part of the ccNSO Governmental Advisory Committee joint meeting agenda on Tuesday morning.

So what is the current state of play with regard to the Framework of Interpretation? At the LA meeting the Council adopted the framework of interpretation and its recommendations conditionally meaning that they awaiting further support from the GAC.

The Framework of Interpretation recommendations are - and that's the importance and the urgency of this meeting - our specific element now in the discussions around, say, in the Stewardship Cross Community Working Group and in the Accountability Working Group. Those of you who are subscribed to the list will see this happening - this input from the ccNSO-appointed members on that group - on these groups.

So what is the Framework of Interpretation? Again, it is a recap of the previous webinars, it will provide color and depth through the current policy to increase predictability and transparency to the delegation and redelegations of ccTLDs. So it's not new policy.

And what is considered out of scope is the IANA functions contract itself. And what it includes and what is also very relevant in this case for the Governmental Advisory Committee is that applicable law remains paramount. So this Framework of Interpretation will not touch upon applicable law.

As I said, the basic policy document is RFC 1591 and this is an interpretation of that document. And its focus is on delegation and redelegation topics such as the consent of a ccTLD manager, what does it mean in case of delegation and redelegations? What are the definition of significantly interested parties, also known as the local Internet community? And a - provide clarity around the mechanism of unconsented redelegations so in the new vocabulary it's revocation and transfer.

A second topic I briefly want to touch upon is what will happen at the ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday around the IANA stewardship transition and accountability processes.

First of all, this is conceived to be of the highest priority of the ccTLD community at large so for members and nonmembers of the ccNSO. There will be two major sessions at the ccNSO meeting: one on Tuesday and one on Wednesday. I'll get into more details on these sessions.

And most, as with these high topics they will be conducted in the format of panel discussions to solicit the views of the ccTLDs present. The, say, you can see why it is of highest priority to the ccTLD community.

And, say, the CCs got involved in the ICG both working groups and also the ccNSO has created a kind - a coordination committee which includes all the members of the IANA stewardship and accountability cross community working groups but also the members of the cross community working group on Internet governance and it's chaired by the chair of the ccNSO, Byron Holland.

So what will happen at the meetings in Singapore? First of all, there is a special or there is a Council workshop which is not - which is closed but at this meeting the Council will discuss its decision making process moving forward once - how to deal with the proposal coming out of the cross community working group on stewardship and on the first report - final report of the cross community working group accountability because it is assumed that will happen either at - before or at the next ICANN meeting.

And the ccTLD community discussions will focus on the current state of affairs with the cross community working group stewardship on Tuesday 9 February and this goes back to the - say the report that Marika already alluded to and the substantive elements of the cross community working group on accountability which are already alluded and that will happen on Wednesday the 10 of February in the afternoon before the Council meeting.

So just some more - other topics the ccNSO will be discussing at the Singapore meeting, first of all there is the annual Council workshop in addition to the decision making process and clarification around it, the Council will discuss the roles and responsibilities of the councilors and discuss outreach and engagement of the broader ccTLD community in the activities of the ccNSO, in particular, and ICANN at large as well.

There will be a presentation of the - what is called the Security Email Working Group and this working group is focusing on creating a secure email system to alert and inform the broader ccTLD community on security incidents affecting them - potentially affecting them.

And the ccNSO's Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group will provide some more depth - color and depth to its input on ICANN's strategic and operational planning processes and will have a meeting where they will elect a new chair.

And as you know, the SOP Working Group is one of the standing committees of the ccNSO which have been active since 2009 and always has been able to provide input and feedback on ICANN's strategic and operational plans since 2009.

Another session that may be interesting for you is Tech Day. That's always held on Monday. It's for those that have more operational and technical inclination. It's, again, open for everybody. And the agenda will be published shortly.

And as always there will be discussion on very use topics relevant for the ccTLDs at the ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday. These discussion will include new developments with ccTLDs, what CC do with regard to marketing and some session around changes in policies and events that may have an impact on policies of individual ccTLDs.

And more information can be found on the ccNSO homepage and on the webpage dedicated to the ccNSO meetings itself so that's the first link. Those of you who are interested in the Framework of Interpretation and its possible scope and recommendations the report can be found on the webpage of the FOI and the input and previous input from the SOP can be found on the webpage of the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group.

And I'll now hand over to my colleague, Barbara Roseman.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you, Bart. This is Carlos Reyes. And I'll be filling in for Barbara Roseman. Today I'll be going over the Address Supporting Organization and Regional Internet Registries Activities.

Just as a brief overview the Number Resource Organization is a coordinating body for the five regional Internet registries. These five RIRs manage the distribution of Internet number resources including IP address and autonomous system numbers.

Also the NRO formed the ASO, or the Address Supporting Organization, through a memorandum of understanding with ICANN. Now each RIR consists of its own policy development process and anyone who wishes to participate can do so either in physical meetings or using mailing lists.

Since ICANN 51 these RIRs have had a variety of meetings in all their regions. Fifty policy proposals have been made in total and 19 of them have concluded with consensus within each region and they are now being implemented in each respective RIR.

Just as an example of a - of some of the policy proposals that have been adopted, APNIC and RIPE, so the Asia Pacific and The Europe RIRs have adopted various proposals to improve the registration process and reduce bureaucratic workloads.

AfriNIC and LatNIC which oversee Africa and Latin America respectively, the focus there has been mostly on the distribution of the remaining IPv4 resources and promoting the adoption of IPv6.

And ARAN, which covers the North American region, they're also preparing for the depletion of the remaining IPv4 pool which is expected to happen in 2015.

Also, AfriNIC completed work on new Whois implementation service and the RIPE NCC introduced a new management interface for their resource certifications.

Of course, much like the rest of the ICANN community each RIR has been focusing on the IANA function stewardship transition process. Each RIR has set up a variety of mailing lists to contribute to the process. But the RIRs also formed a consolidated RIR IANA stewardship proposal team, or CRISP, to develop a single Internet numbers resource community response to the request for proposal issued by the IANA stewardship transition coordination group.

To coordinate all of that activity a special mailing list was established that sought input and included it in the draft response which was submitted on the 15th of January.

And with that I'll hand it over to Steve Sheng for an update on the Root Server System and Advisory Committee.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Carlos. The role of the RSAC is to advise the ICANN community on matters relating to the operation, administration and security and integrity of the root server system.

To accomplish this mandate the RSAC recently completed a reorganization into two entities. First, the RSAC consists of 12 voting root server operator

representatives, three root zone manager partner representatives currently from NTIA, IANA and VeriSign, and three nonvoting liaisons from the Internet Architectural Board, the SSAC and the ICANN Board of Directors.

It is chaired by (Lars Leeman) from (NetNot), a Swedish company operating the Internet exchange point and (iRoot) and (unintelligible) from University of Maryland. Their pictures are shown on this slide.

The RSAC caucus, apart from the RSAC, consists of a larger group of experts, currently 53 of them, who RSAC turned to develop the actual advice. One such effort currently underway is to study the desirability and impact of changing the time to (live) values of certain records in the root zone.

Since ICANN 51, two work parties have concluded their work leading to the publication of RSAC 001 and RSAC 002, which I'll provide you a brief preview.

In RSAC 001 it describes best practice service to be provided by root servers. And it defines operational expectations that a user might reasonably anticipate from root servers. There are 18 of them in the advisory.

So together with a upcoming RFC from the Internet Architectural Board it replaces early guidance on root servers with a new set of service expectations that root server operators must satisfy.

The document is approved by the RSAC. It's waiting - it will publish in tandem with the upcoming IABRC so it will be available in two or three months later this year.

The RSAC 002 is an advisory on measurements of root server system. It identifies and recommends a initial set of measurement parameters for establishing a baseline and trend for the root server system. There are about six or seven parameters in this initial set.

And the implementation of them will form an early warning system that will assist in detecting and mitigating any effects associated with the growing size of the DNS root zone. So that's a quick update on RSAC.

Now moving on quickly to SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee issued SAC 69, the last of a three-part series of advice on IANA stewardship transition.

In this advice the SSAC describes the way in which NTIA currently contributes to the security, stability and resiliency, usually we call them SSR, of the IANA function activities.

And based on that it presents a set of questions and issues that it thinks the community must address in order to preserve the SSR of IANA functions through and beyond the transition.

It makes seven recommendations in this report which I'll go over quickly. The first three recommendations is geared toward the root zone management process and the root zone management partners. The first one is any proposal to replace NTIA's final authorization of the root zone change with an alternative be at least reliable, resilient and efficient as the current process. What the SSAC was saying here is the current process works fairly well and replacement needs to be lightweight, reliable, resilient and efficient.

The second recommendation is post the transition effective arrangements needs to be made between the root zone partners including the inter-organizational coordination if it involves more than one parties.

And finally while the focus today has been on the IANA, the SSAC recommends NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the root zone maintainer after transition as that's also a extremely critical part of the root zone management.

The next set of advice is geared toward the operational communities. These are names, numbers and protocols that are developing proposals. The first one is to determine whether or not the requirements and deliverables defined in the IANA functions contract should be retained. If so, which ones and whether additional controls are necessary.

The second recommendation is determining whether or not existing accountability mechanisms, outside the IANA functions contract, are sufficient and whether new mechanisms are needed. So these are kind of the two - the efforts the cross community working group are addressing.

The next one is for each of the operational communities to reveal and if necessary enhance its policy development process to ensure the instructions it provides to IANA are very clear and implementable.

I think the Framework of Interpretation work done at the ccNSO is very timely and reaches - and is very important for this providing such clear instructions.

And finally the last two advices are investigate and clarify the process for handling the possibility of government sanctioned restriction waivers following the stewardship transition.

And also, last but not least, to consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence in the performance of IANA functions might require additional mechanisms or other safeguards. So that's very quickly the SSAC 69. The SSAC will brief the community in Singapore of the advisory in detail.

Next, I will hand over to my colleague, Olof, to provide an update on the GAC. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Steve. And hello, it's me again. And let's talk a little bit about the Governmental Advisory Committee frequently abbreviated as GAC which is the advisory committee for the governments and IGOs. There are 148 governments as of right now and counting and 32 IGOs as observers in the GAC.

And the purpose is of course to provide advice to the ICANN Board on public policy matters or on public policy aspects on any matter. So what are they up to in Singapore?

Well as many others, perhaps all, well the IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability are very high on the agenda. And it should be noted at the GAC is one of the chartering organizations for both the stewardship transition cross community working group on names and the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability.

Matters on these will be discussed by the GAC on Sunday morning sessions. Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs, well Bart has already talked about it and it's certainly up to the GAC to take a position on it. And that will be discussed with the ccNSO session on Tuesday.

Human rights and international law and how that would be reflected in the ICANN work is of course a public policy matter which will be discussed in Singapore by the GAC. And there are also some remaining issues with the new gTLD program and it is in particular when it comes to what has already been mentioned on protection of IGO acronyms, Red Cross and Red Crescent national names.

But also on the implementation of - in detail of GAC safeguard advice by ICANN and discussions about country names on the second level as well as two letter second level domains will also be debated.

There will be a session for the community concerning geographic names, Lars alluded to that, and there is a GAC Working Group, nowadays it used to be a sub working group, on aspects for future rounds. And that will be on Wednesday in Singapore.

And there will be meetings for - between the GAC and the GNSO, ccNSO, the NomComm and the Board which is one standing encounter that occurs at every ICANN meeting.

There are other activities as well. And for example, a more internal nature, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team and the ATRT 2 report have particular recommendations which are under implementation by the GAC through the BGRI, as it's called; a particular working group on working methods within the GAC and government engagement strategy working group in corporation with the ICANN department GSE, and also like already mentioned, the GNSO GAC Consultation Group which is also a reflection of the ATRT 2 recommendations.

There will be a review of GAC operating principles. There will be an update on compliance and briefing on the DNS market which will occur on Thursday. And in short, well, the GAC has a very full agenda starting on Saturday midday and closing on Thursday at midday.

And all sessions you need to know that, all sessions are open for anybody to attend with one exception and that's the communiqué drafting session on Wednesday afternoon.

So you are very welcome to the GAC meeting room which will be - it's called Collier, and there you can enjoy the GAC proceedings in all six UN languages plus Portuguese. And with that I hand over to Heidi Ulrich and to talk about ALAC.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much, Olof. Hello everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At Large. I'm based in the ICANN offices in Los Angeles. And today I'm joined by two my teammates, Ariel Liang, excuse me, At Large Policy Coordinator based in the Washington DC office; and Sylvia Vivanco, Manager At Large Regional Affairs based in Lima, Peru.

We are delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the 15-member At Large Advisory Committee, known as the ALAC currently chaired by Alan Greenberg, and the At Large community consisting of the five regional At Large organizations and currently 182 At Large structures.

We will be providing a preview of At Large activities that are being planned for ICANN 52. So today I'm going to be starting out with ALAC hot topics in Singapore.

And the ALAC will be implementing a new strategy for their activities at ICANN public meetings beginning at ICANN 52. This strategy focuses their discussion on two or three hot topics in order to allow sufficient time for discussion on these topics.

And in Singapore the two main topics will be the following: the first is the NTIA IANA functions stewardship transition and weekly calls of the At Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function, Transition Working Group for short, have been held since August 2014.

And these frequent meetings have allowed the ALAC position to be developed through a bottom-up process. The ALAC favors an inside ICANN solution rather than creating a Contract Co. And this hot topic will be discussed during ALAC meetings on Sunday and Tuesday.

Also the Transition Working Group will be meeting on Tuesday, the 10th of February at 1730 to 1900 which is different than what is listed on the slide.

The second hot topic is ICANN accountability and transparency. The ALAC position is to ensure strong accountability and multistakeholder involvement in all ICANN decisions. This hot topic will be discussed during the ALAC meeting on Sunday and Tuesday.

I would now like to hand the floor over to Ariel who will be providing an update on the ALAC policy advice development activities and provide more details about the ALAC's work on the two hot topics as well as their ongoing issue of the public interest commitments. Ariel.

Ariel Liang:

Thank you, Heidi. This is Ariel Liang, At Large Policy Coordinator. Since the end of ICANN 51 Alan Greenberg, a former ALAC liaison to the GNSO, has become the ALAC chair who oversees ALAC policy advice development activities.

Over the past four months the ALAC submitted five policy advice statements. Two statements are concerning public interest commitments. During the public forum at the ICANN 51 the ALAC called for a freeze on the most sensitive Category 1 TLDs as defined by the GAC until appropriate public interest safeguards are put in place.

To reinforce its position the ALAC submitted a follow up statement in November last year. Gaining momentum, the ALAC advice has rallied support from the Business constituency, the GAC and other sources.

Last week the ALAC met with members from the Board's new gTLD progress committee and engaged in a productive discussion on the PDP constituencies policy and ICANN compliance follow up measures related to the public interest commitments. ALAC's concerns will be further discussed at the upcoming NGPC meeting.

In response to the public comment request on the IANA naming related functions draft transition proposal the ALAC submitted a substantive statement that (unintelligible) an internal to ICANN proposal. The ALAC believes that ICANN can reliably perform the IANA services and should continue to do so unless it is incapable or unwilling to carry out these functions. To ensure that this happens additional accountability measures need to be put in place.

The ALAC position has been developed in conjunction with the IANA issues working group within the At Large community. The working group hosted 13 teleconferences since ICANN 51. In addition three webinars were held to enhance At Large members understanding in this issue.

Furthermore At Large members have been actively contributing in the Enhancing ICANN Accountability Cross Community Working Group in (unintelligible) an ALAC member has been working as the co chair.

Over to you, Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, Ariel. And now I'd like to talk a little bit about ALAC and At Large activities in Singapore, the actual meetings. During the ICANN meeting in Singapore At Large will be holding 22 formal meetings. The ALAC will be meeting with the ICANN Board of Directors on Tuesday the 10th of February between 8:30 and 9:30 in the (Padong) meeting room.

ALAC topics to be discussed include their hot topics of NTIA IANA function stewardship transition and the ICANN accountability and transparency issues as well as progress on the implementation of their recommendations from the second At Large summit.

Meetings will be held with the ccNSO, GAC as well as the NomComm and SSAC leadership. Senior ICANN staff will also be presenting updates on such

topics as the GSC and government engagement activities, the fiscal year '16 budget process and information management activities.

At Large working groups will be meeting face to face to facilitate progress in both policy and process activities. And also of note that is not listed on the slide following the successful interaction of hubs during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles during the meeting in Singapore At Large structures will be serving as hubs for remote participants on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday of the ICANN meeting. And nearly 20 At Large structures and ISOC chapters have applied to serve as hubs.

I will now hand the floor over to Sylvia Vivenco who will update you on the activities of the five regional At Large organizations during ICANN 52. Sylvia.

Sylvia Vivenco: Thank you, Heidi. This is Sylvia Vivenco, Manager At Large Regional Affairs. And I will talk about the ARALO activities in Singapore. AFRALO will hold the AFRALO African joint meeting on the theme ICANN accountability on Wednesday 11, time 1400 to 1530 pm.

APRALO will hold its monthly meeting on Tuesday the 10th, time 1330 to 1430 pm. One of the highlights of this meeting will be the signature of the corporation agreement with dotAsia. There will be a discussion of the progress and implementation of the APRALO APIC hub pilot framework. And approximately 20 self-financed (unintelligible) will attend this meeting.

NARALO will hold its monthly meeting on Thursday the 12th, time 10:00 to 11:00 am. Among other issues NARALO will sign an MOU for cooperation with the North American Registry (Area).

The RALO chairs will meet with the ALAC in a leadership team working session on Wednesday the 11th from 7:00 am to 8:15 am. This meeting will discuss the strategic objectives of At Large and RALO actions to implement those objectives.

Then there will be a RALO Secretariat meeting on Wednesday, 11, from 1200 to 1330. As discussed (unintelligible) the five RALO Secretariats will hold a meeting where several cross-RALO issues will be discussed; the main ones are the At Large 360 review, the new At Large outreach documents, performance metrics, (unintelligible) recommendations and relationships between the RALOs and RIRs.

You can see the full agendas on the link provided in this slide. And now I would like to invite you to the 8th RALO Singapore Showcase 2015 celebrating diversity.

This is a APRALO event scheduled for Wednesday 11 at time 1800 to 2100 at the meeting room VIP and Stanford Ballroom. This is a community celebration inviting the ICANN community to learn more about the achievements of APRALO.

This evening will showcase how APRALO is engaging a diverse community of 36 (unintelligible) spread out in Asia and the Pacific Islands in 21 countries. And approximately 20 APRALO (unintelligible) will attend this event in person. This will provide you an opportunity to meet and greet all these members personally.

The speakers of the event include ICANN's president and CEO, Fadi Chehadé; ICANN's Board Chairman, Steve Crocker; ALAC's Chair, Alan Greenberg; APRALO's Chair Siranush Vardanyan, and other community members who will also speak at the event.

Please join us for a very special music and dance (unintelligible) performance by students of the Malaysian School (unintelligible). And we will also have a Chinese calligraphy demonstration by brush and ink. And given that the entire meeting is taking place during the Chinese New Year festivities we will take this opportunity to celebrate the Chinese New Year as well.

So please join us to see APRALO's cultural diversity and to celebrate the achievements of the At Large community. Thank you and over to you, Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, Sylvia. I would now like to open the floor for questions from the participants to the policy development support team. So if you have any questions and you're on the audio bridge please press star 1 now and record your name clearly. If you're on the AC room please just type a chat in the pod and we will reply to you on the pod or verbally.

Once again if you'd like to ask a question from the audio bridge please press star 1 and record your name. Thank you. While we wait for some questions from the participants we can start addressing the questions that we've received before the webinar.

The first question we received was regarding the NTIA IANA functions transition process. And we've provided a link to the NTIA IANA functions transition and enhancing ICANN accountability processes Website.

And the second question that we received was about Whois related policy discussions and providing information and update on this topic and on the working groups related to Whois. And the Governmental Advisory Committee, so the GAC, has recently asked the same question. And in response ICANN staff prepared an overview that can be found on the documents provided on the slide.

Do we have any questions so far? Okay I'm told we have no questions for the moment so the third question that we received prior to the webinar was about how we can balance the domain industry and is it possible to publicly open the domain auction results?

For information about this we referred you to the Contractual Compliance and new gTLDs Program Auctions Websites that are provided on the slide.

Do we have any questions so far? Okay we don't see to have any questions for the moment and I see no questions on the AC room either. To stay updated with the policy development support work and the team please contact via email using the [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org) email address or you can also follow us on Twitter using the Twitter handles that are provided on the slide there.

Please also subscribe to our monthly policy update using the link that's provided on the slide. The monthly policy update is available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

If you're new to ICANN or to the policy development process and would like to take part in working group work please also join us for the GNSO newcomer webinar session which are basically an informal get together which are chaired by community members where newcomers may ask questions about joining working groups and where more experienced community members can also join to brush up on their basics.

The next session, as noted on the screen, is scheduled to take place on the 12th of March. And the announcement will be sent out after Singapore so in February.

With that I would like to turn it to David Olive to conclude the webinar. Thank you very much.

David Olive: Thank you, Benedetta. And my policy team members and I want to thank all our participants for being part of this session. We have presented a lot of material in these - some 90 minutes. And I think that we'll allow you to at least reflect on and select those topics that you would like to be more involved with

or more interested in and we hope that our presentations helped you to focus on those interests and those areas.

But it also shows how busy you, as our volunteers in the community, are in the various supporting organizations and advisory committees and working on ICANN matters both policy development, the transition, accountability and others. And so we thank you for that interest.

In terms of the policy team here we have some information about the 27 staff members we have in the various countries supporting the working groups and councils and policy development and advisory matters.

And here are some of our people. And you heard from them from Singapore, Los Angeles, Washington, Istanbul, Brussels and other places, and so we thank you for that. And we look forward to seeing you in Singapore, if you're attending in person, or to hearing you online as remote participation is always available.

Again, thank you for your time and attention and we're pleased to present these materials to you today. Thus I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon and good morning wherever you may be. See you soon online or in person in Singapore. Thanks everyone.

END