

**ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
25 February 2010 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar 25 February at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-pre-nairobi-policy-update-20100225.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

David Olive: Thank you and welcome to the ICANN Policy Update Webinar. My name is David Olive. I'm Vice President for Policy Development at ICANN and we thank you for joining us for this update on policy matters before the Nairobi ICANN meeting.

This is the second: policy update Webinar which is now set to be a recurring event ahead of - an ICANN event in order to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities to help prepare and focus our efforts.

In addition to the policy update Webinar our policy team is also in the process of preparing an outreach Webinar that will focus on new comers and provide an introduction to how the policy development takes place in ICANN and how one can get involved and participate. (Stay tuned) will be providing more information in the future.

There is a lot of information contained in this presentation as you can see and we will be recording this and the slides will be available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information that is here.

A few housekeeping items will be important and that is to say to reduce interference we ask you to put your phones on mute. There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the session at that point we can unmute the phones and we can proceed with that question and answers.

This is an Adobe Connect room for this session in which the slides can be viewed and questions posted and there is a link to that in the email that we sent you on the meeting details.

This will be an opportunity - there will be an opportunity as I mentioned to ask questions at the end of the meeting, however, you can submit questions during the presentations in the check box that you see below the Adobe Connect window.

The policy staff will do their best to answer your questions in case they arrive after the meeting or if you want to follow up on questions based on the presentations please contact us at the policystaff.icann.org address.

And please not use the call button, I'm told, we have to be careful about using the call button on Adobe Connect it's there to facilitate the recording of the session.

At the end of the meeting if you ask a question please state your name and you'll be added to the queue or raise your hand provided by the Adobe Connect software. You can raise your hand and change the icon on the left hand corner.

The goals of this session as we see we will to be provide that input and many of you are planning to participate in the Nairobi meeting either in person or remotely recognizing that this is a meeting that many participants will also be participating. Remotely we have special attention to the enhanced remote participation of the network.

We have a more standardized approach a more level playing field for all participants irrespective of the bandwidth they have and work to create a more equivalent experience between those participating in the (unintelligible) details of (unintelligible) services these can be found on the Nairobi Web site.

In addition to the number of policy related activities that will be highlighted throughout this presentation we'd like to talk to you about such things as a new gTLD update, an expression of interest panel session, affirmation of commitments discussion as well as the fiscal 2011 operating budget and plan and the abuse of the DNS forum.

And for further information, of course, there's details at the Nairobi program. The policy development at ICANN as we see in Slide 5 and 6 focuses on what you're most aware of the bodies responsible for this development.

The GNSO, the Country Code Supporting Organization and the addressing organizations that review and develop recommendations on Internet policy address matters.

In terms of advice provided at ICANN and in addition of the supporting organizations that have the capability of developing policy recommendations there are a number of advisory committees that provide advice to ICANN.

In the next few slides we'll show you an overview of the topics covered during this session, it might be worth pointing out that it's just a selection of the activities going on in the different supporting organizations and again further details and information can be found on the Supporting Organization Web sites within ICANN.

At this stage I thank you for participating in this Webinar and I'll turn it over to members of our (policy team) to provide additional details in the specialized areas that they're covering at the moment. I think now Rob Hoggarth will be next and I turn it over to you Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much David, welcome everybody, good day to all of you whether it be morning very early or late evening. Slide 11 just briefly shows you again some of the current issues that are being discussed within the GNSO that a number of which we will be talking about today.

The GNSO has a very full plate of substantive policy and other organizational issues that it's working on. And currently we have just about 20 we list here on the Slide 17 Working Groups of work teams under way.

The topics range from very technical and specific issues for example, like inter-registrar transfer policy to much more general organization and management type issues like the GNSO restructuring and improvement area. And what we'll try and do today is touch on all of those at a useful high level for all of you.

Just one warning and admonition as you see the photo up before I am much shorter and actually have much less hair than that photo. You'll all - those of you who will be attending Nairobi will quickly see that. Let me focus my few minutes of the presentation on the GNSO improvements effort.

We thought it was important to touch on that first because it really touches on basically all of the work that GNSO Council does in that the GNSO improvements effort has been intended to work in a number of ways to maximize stakeholder participation in the GNSO as that community works on generic top-level domain policy.

To really make sure that the policy development is consistent is well informed and that everyone in the community who's participating in the policy development process has all the information that they need as well as the tools to work through and really work effectively and be able to focus on the substance of issues.

And then more broadly a recognition that it's very important as policy is being developed that the GNSO communicate with other parts of the ICANN ecosystem with other parts of the ICANN community to make sure that the discussions that they're having are consistent with what's going on in other parts of the organization.

And quite frankly to make sure that others are aware of what's going on in any given point in time. Now, the best way that we've been able to manage and sort of address the issues with respect to GNSO improvements as part of the this three year review process is to group them in five general categories.

The five main areas that the Board asks the community to focus on were to really look at adopting a Working Group model for policy development. That was to essentially take the GNSO Council out of the legislative type functions that it had evolved into.

And to really push out a lot of the policy discussions to the community where the Council would then become much more of a coordinator, a strategic manager of policy development setting the priorities, establishing the goals and then letting individual members of the community work collaboratively to develop that policy.

Another important area was the enhancement of constituency groups. That has translated much more broadly now as we've gotten into the implementation of the improvements into how stakeholder groups operate, how GNSO constituencies operate.

To make sure that there's a level playing field throughout the GNSO community so that each individual community has the tools and the capabilities, the support from the staff that's necessary so again so that they can really focus on developing the policy and contributing their points of view.

Another major area, of course, is revising the policy development process as I noted with respect to the goals on the previous slide. A real need to sort of reexamine the process, the time tables, the mechanisms that the GNSO uses.

A fourth area was as I noted before, improvement of communication and that's been a real targeted area as the improvements implementation work has been (unintelligible).

And then finally that central block, the GNSO Council and restructuring the GNSO Council was a real sort of gaiting critical function because it touches on all the other four areas.

The next slide I won't go into a lot of detail but suffice it to say that the GNSO Council has evolved from that six-constituency model that existed previously.

So essentially a bicameral house structure and framework in which the contracted parties in the GNSO community, the non contracted parties in the GNSO community have opportunities in a balanced way to raise policy issues, to debate policy issues and to work to resolve any differences of opinion.

The real key goal there is to provide a balance to give the various communities a comfort level that no one can dominate the discussion, no one can unreasonably hold up the discussion and that there's a function and form that allows everybody to participate and work together.

To go into the details of this slide would be its own 45 minutes presentation. If any of you do have questions about that I'd be delighted to either take them through what you submit on the screen or to otherwise answer questions at the end of the session.

The current status of GNSO improvements right now is that we've accomplished some significant items in the GNSO Council restructuring portion of the effort.

The stakeholder group charters that have been developed by members of the community are in place on the contracted party side of the GNSO where those charters are permanent for the registries and registrars on the non-contracted side of the GNSO, in the commercial stakeholder group.

And in the non commercial stakeholder group the Board has approved some tentative transitional charters for those communities and they are actively going to be working throughout the course of this year to provide the Board with permanent charters going forward by the Latin America meeting.

The new Council was seated in Seoul and has already successfully conducted five meetings under their new operating procedures and under their new structure.

There continues to be work in developing and fine tuning the operations of the Council but so far the Council has been able not only to continue to operate but, I think, as you'll see on some of the other issues that we'll see going forward to operate quite effectively.

The current status and where much of the work is taking place right now, is in work teams and steering committees that were established by the GNSO as part of an effort to implement the recommendations that the Board approved.

The five main areas that are - where the work is taking place right now are a work team that's working on creating a new policy development process, a work team that's essentially working to develop that new Working Group model of policy development and so that's a very interesting exercise.

Revising the Council operating procedures have been a tremendous piece of heavy lifting that one of the work teams is - has been devoting a lot of time to and that work continues.

There's a lot of work taking place in a work team that's developing recommendations for constituency and stakeholder group operations to really address that previous goal in the other slide that talks about enhancing constituency.

And then finally a work team that has pretty much finished a lot of its work at this point enhancing communications efforts, communications work team has been working hard on providing recommendations and advice about retooling the GNSO Web site.

And they'll be talking in the very near future I think in the next couple of days about the communications mechanisms and tools to ensure that the Council communicates with other communities and ICANN effectively going forward.

In terms of next steps there are a number of pieces in the GNSO improvements effort that continue several years now after the review process began.

And I think what you'll be - what you should be looking for in Nairobi and then between the Nairobi meeting and the Brussels meeting is further efforts that staff will be working with leaders of the various GNSO constituencies to help them in their reconfirmation efforts.

That's an important concept that the Board introduced toward the beginning of last year which was really a focus on having existing GNSO constituencies, reexamine their operating rules and procedures hadn't been done in quite a period of time at least from a Board level of review.

And so that effort had been somewhat delayed given other implementation issues and so that will move forward. As I noted earlier, discussions about the permanent charters for the commercial stakeholders group and the non-commercial stakeholders group will continue.

There will be additional work and effort, some quite intense in that inter-sessional period continuing by the work teams.

And another aspect that it's important to note as part of the goal of maximizing participation was this effort on the part of the Board asking the staff to assist communities who may not currently be participating in ICANN or those who are interested in playing a much more focused role going forward to help them develop new constituencies.

And we've already fielded many inquiries, worked with a number members of the community to put in proposals for new GNSO constituencies and there's some others in the pipeline that you may all be hearing about in the coming weeks and months.

So we encourage and hope that all of you can continue to be interested in this topic, it's fundamental to the future work of GNSO policy development. And on the Slide 19 there we have some Web links for either contacting Glen the GNSO Secretariat to volunteer your time.

Or to otherwise just check out all the recent developments and some of the background information on GNSO improvement on the information Web site. And I will stop there Marika and pass it on to you. I'd be delighted to take any questions from anybody either in the little chat for box that's on your screen or at the end of the session. Thanks a lot.

Marika Konings: Thanks Rob. So I'll be talking to you about this. In the registrar transfer policy or also known as IRTP and the IRTP is a consensus policy that was adopted

in 2004 by the GNSO with objectives to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain and registrations between registrars.

As part of its actual implementation it was decided to carry out a review of the policy in order to determine what it was working as it was intended or whether there were any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvement.

And as a result of that review a number of issues were identified were then grouped together in five different policy development processes are also called PDPs that were titled (A2E) and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

Currently at PDP Working Group is considering the issues part of the so-called group B and hence the name the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group. So the IRTP Part B Working Group is reviewing a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain in registration that has been inappropriately transferred either as a result of a hijacking or other conflict.

And are also reviewing whether a separate process or provision should be introduced to address such instances. In addition, the group has also discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

As opposed to development process itself was initiated in June 2004 and since then the Working Group has been discussing the charter questions and parallel to soliciting public comments as well as constituency and stakeholder group input.

As required by the Working Group charter the ICANN compliance team has been playing an active role in the Working Group deliberation and has provided more data on the level of complaints and topics of which ICANN

receives in relation to the transfer policy to help inform the deliberations of the Working Group.

A drafted initial report has already been developed and that report aims to capture the different discussions and positions and the next the step for this Working Group will now be to agree on recommendations for the different charter questions and publish their initial reports for public comment and discussions. At this stage there's no meeting foreseeing this base in Nairobi.

This slide is just to provide you with a snap shot of the information that has been provided by the ICANN compliance team as referred to in the previous slide which confirms that issues related to unlocking of the domain and registration, the wrongful denial but also lack of understanding of how to transfer policy works are some of the main reasons of complaints received by ICANN from registrants in relation to the transfer policy.

And information like this has helped inform the deliberations of the Working Group as well as serving and supporting evidence as to why it is important to address these issues from a registrant's perspective.

So even though this Working Group is well on the way, new members are always welcome. And although you might want to hold out for one of the upcoming IRT, PDPs that will look to address issues related to (district) policy enhancements, penalties for IRTP violations and operational rule enhancements.

And in addition you'll find some links to background documents as well as a link to the Working Group workspace where you can find more information. So a second policy development process that's currently underway relates to post-expiration domain name recovery.

So this is an issue that was brought to the GNSO by the At-Large Advisory Committee which raise a number of questions in relation to the predictability and transparency of existing expiration and renewal policy (then practice it).

In addition to those issues, the Working Group is also addressing questions like do registrants have adequate opportunity to redeem their domain name and following expiration,

And is there adequate notice that a domain name registration is about to expire. This Working Group is also expected to make recommendations to the GNSO Council for best practices or and/or changes to existing or proposals for new consensus policies.

So in order to help inform the deliberations of this Working Group, a survey was conducted that reviewed the renewal and expiration practices of the top ten gTLD registrars which account for approximately 69% of gTLD registration.

The survey found that there's a lot of variation amongst registrars in relation to renewal expiration practices. And part of the Working Groups discussions now focus on this question, whether variation is a good or a bad thing. So for further details on the registrar survey, I would encourage you to visit the Working Group workspace where you can find for other details.

In addition the Working Group has reviewed and analyzed public comments as well as constituency and stakeholder group statements have been received. For this group also a first draft of the initial report has been prepared which captures the discussions and data gathered to date.

But the most difficult task is still ahead which is coming to agreement on recommendations for each of the charter questions if any.

So in order to help the group forward in this process we're now conducting a survey amongst the members of the Working Group in order to assess their views on the different charter questions, in order to determine where there is common ground and where there is further work to be done.

So this Working Group had an issue plan and an open Working Group session in Nairobi, but unfortunately due to the lack of attendance of Working Group members it was decided earlier this week to actually cancel that meeting.

So for those of you interested in the topics addressed by the post-expiration domain name recovery Working Group, I would encourage you to follow the deliberations of the Working Group by monitoring the workspace as well as looking out for the publication of the initial report that will be accompanied by a public comment period.

So next up is the registration abuse policies Working Group and as a background the observation was made in the GNSO Council that registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches to deal with registration abuse.

But the question was also raised does it actually matter. Furthermore, the question was asked, what role should ICANN play in addressing registration use? And what issues if any fall within the scope of GNSO policy development? In response, the GNSO Council (tasked) a pre-PDP Working Group.

Please know this is not a policy development process at this moment, but a pre-PDP Working Group as we've called it, to gather further information on issues such as what is the difference between registration abuse and domain name user use as distinguishing those two is important in order to determine whether consensus policies can be developed or not.

And what is the effectiveness existing abuse policies? And would there be any benefit to having uniform provisions in registry and/or registrar agreements in relation to abuse? As you can imagine, these are not simple questions to answer.

And the Working Group has actually made use of several sub-teams to conduct additional research and discussions to do some of the legwork on these questions. So now after many months of hard work, the Working Group has published its initial report for public comment and review earlier this month.

So the report itself consists of over 100 pages which detail the deliberations and findings of the Working Group on the different issues outlined before as well as an overview and description of the different abuses the Working Group was able to identify.

Much of this information serves as a backdrop to the focal point of the report which have the recommendations that are being put forward by the Working Group for public considerations and comments before finalizing these and submitting those to the GNSO Council for their consideration.

The recommendations included relate to issues such as cyber squatting, whether there is actually recommendations, initiate PDP to review the uniform dispute resolution process, UDRP, to address cyber squatting if appropriate, recommendations relating to WHOIS access and malicious use of domain names, et cetera. You see the different issues listed here on this slide.

And many of the recommendations in the report are unanimous consensus recommendations. But there are also a number of recommendations where no unanimous consensus was reached and several alternative views have been expressed.

So the registration abuse policies Working Group is there (for specially) interested to receive public comments and views on those recommendations where there are different proposals for discussion.

So as mentioned, a public comment forum is now open until the 28th of March. And everyone's encouraged to submit their comments there. In addition, Working Group will be organizing an information session in Nairobi on Wednesday, 10th of March from 4:00 to 5:30 in the afternoon, local time.

Following the close of the public comment period, the Working Group will review and analyze the comments received and update the reports where appropriate in view of submitting a final report in time for consideration by the GNSO Council at the ICANN meeting in Brussels. And with that, I'll hand it over to (Margie).

Margie Milam: Hello, everybody. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the latest policy development process that's been initiated by the GNSO Council. At their last Council meeting, they initiated a policy development on the issue of vertical integration between registries and registrars.

And this topic is important to the community because as many of you know there's implementation underway for the new gTLD program. And many new ideas for how to handle distribution in the new gTLD process has been considered.

When the GNSO Council came up with their initial recommendations regarding the new gTLD program, they did not address this issue of whether there should be rules and restrictions regarding whether registries should own registrars or registrars should own registries or, if that is allowed, what types of rules or restrictions should be incorporated into the registry agreement.

And so in connection with the implementation processes that are underway, the GNSO Council felt that it was (important) to address this issue and see whether a uniform policy should be adopted that would describe what the appropriate distribution models should be for the new gTLD program.

It's interesting to note though that the PDP process is looking at also existing gTLDs to see whether there are existing registry agreements, whether it be restrictions that are currently in place related to vertical integration should be reevaluated and changed so this issue addresses both gTLDs and existing gTLDs.

So recent developments, the GNSO Council requested that staff develop an issues report. And I provided the link to the documents. That gives a bit of background on the issue of vertical integration and describes how the policy development process (unintelligible) the current implementation process for the new gTLD program.

Essentially, what the issues report says is that that's a process that the GNSO Council is undertaking will go on a parallel track with the implementation process that's underway for the new gTLD program.

In other words, the ICANN staff will continue to develop the model then publish them for discussion in the community. And if the GNSO Council comes up with a policy that addresses this issue, that policy is accepted by the ICANN Board and approved by the ICANN Board that would then be incorporated into the new gTLD program.

The question that is described to the Board is whether the timing is quick enough to address the initial round of applications or if the GNSO Council were to come up with recommendations that weren't done fairly quickly, those policy recommendations might end up being incorporated in subsequent rounds or new gTLDs in other words, there may be different rules that apply

depending upon when the GNSO Council would come up with recommendations.

And so that's the current situation because it's a new policy development process the GNSO Council is currently finalizing the details of the charter and as soon as that charter is approved there will be a call for volunteers to participate in this process and if anyone has interest in this particular issue, we encourage you to join the group and work on this policy development process.

If you have an interest in participating in the implementation this is work that is being underway - gone - going underway you can also address the issue (unintelligible) since that will continue on on a parallel track.

I also want to talk about the registrar accreditation agreement because there's been some policy activity related to the registrar accreditation agreement. That agreement - the document that ICANN signs with all registrars and it describes the applications that registrars have to ICANN and to registrants there are certain provisions in the contract that describe how our registrar relates with a registrant.

And the GNSO Council has initiated a Working Group along with representatives from the at-large community to come together and evaluate the agreement and identify additional amendments to the RAA.

And this group has been working for about (unintelligible) months on identifying additional amendments to the RAA that could enhance ICANN's ability to obtain registrar compliance, there's a lot of compliance related amendments that have been proposed.

There's also been additional protections that have been suggested to protect our registrants and there are a number of amendments that are being

considered that would enhance security related issues and address some of the principles made by the (unintelligible) community as it affects registrars.

So for example amendments that might require enhanced due diligence on registrars that are applying for accreditation to make sure that they're credible and that they have positions, background checks so that ICANN knows who their contracting with to be a registrar.

So the recent developments are this group has broken out into two categories. One group one sub-group we call it sub-group A has worked on a registrant rights charter and this is a document that describes the rights that are in the registrar accreditation agreement that relates to registrants and that document is about to be finalized and will be published shortly.

A group has also talked about an aspirational charter and this is a document that members from the at-large community have suggested to talk about issues that may not be in the RAA at this time but might be something that would be appropriate for inclusion in the RAA in the future.

Marika Kinings: I think (Margie) just got disconnected so we'll just give her one minute to get back on line.

Margie Milam: I'm back can you hear me?

Marika Konings: Yes you can go ahead.

Margie Milam: Sure I'm sorry about that. So basically where we are we're talking about what we call an aspirational charter that may be worked on in the next few months talks about additional protections that might be appropriate to protect registrants.

The second Working Group which is sub-group three is finalizing the list of RAA amendments to suggest and is also prioritizing those amendments in a way that puts them in a few categories either high priority or low priority.

This document will be delivered to the GNSO Council along with recommendations on what the next steps would be to finalize these amendments and negotiate actual contract language into the RAA. The next issue I want to talk to you about is the (Special) Trademark Issues as they relate to the new gTLD program.

This issue is important particularly to the trademarks community because there's the concern that in the new gTLD program it might be an opportunity for our enhanced cyber squatting and infringement against famous brands or registered trademarks.

So approximately a year ago a group called the implementation recommendation team the IRT came together and it was a group of trademark experts that suggested a series of trademark protection for the new gTLD program and they issued an initial report around May of last year.

Those recommendations were evaluated and posted for public comment and several of them lacked consensus and some of them actually had significant consensus.

So the ICANN Board took those recommendations and sought - and asked the GNSO Council on input on specific aspects of trademark protection mechanisms that might be appropriate for the new gTLD program.

One of them is something called a trademark clearing house that is considered a database - centralized database where a trademark holders could submit their information on their trademarks to facilitate some (sunrise) protection like a (sunrise) registrations or IP claims notice.

There's also recommendation to initiate a uniform rapid suspension procedure and that would be a quick take down in the event of a second level domain name that is clearly infringing on a registered trademark.

The GNSO in response to the ICANN Board letter put together a Working Group called the Special Trademark Issues the STI group and they evaluated these recommendations and came up with modifications to these proposal that had input from a broader group of stakeholders or representatives from all of the stakeholder groups that participated in this.

And they developed a consensus position can modified the proposal slightly but yet came with consensus trademark account and a uniform and a representation procedure.

So I've provided the link to the report that was posted for public comment and in the recent documents that have been submitted prior to the Nairobi meeting there are proposed (unintelligible) that incorporates these recommendations.

We also will have a session in Nairobi dedicated to the trademark issue to discuss whether the proposals that are currently on the table adequately address the trademark issues.

There's also a public comment forum that's opened if any of you have comments on the latest proposal you can certainly participate either through the Nairobi session or through the public comments forum. And with that I'll turn it over to Liz Gasster who is going to talk to you about WHOIS study.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone and thank you again for participating Liz Gasster here. The first few slides that I'm going to share are really just general background many of you have seen before and then some of the later slides will provide an update on each study area that the GNSO Council has asked us to look into.

So as many of you know WHOIS policy has been debated for many years. There are many competing interests all of whom have quite valid viewpoints for example law enforcement, intellectual property owners, cyber security, technologists and first responders want accurate contact information.

Many individuals who register domain names and privacy advocates worry about privacy protection especially in other country - in countries around the world where privacy regimes are different.

Governments are very eager to have their legal regimes followed and service providers are reluctant to absorb new costs, registrars many earned revenue from various privacy services so WHOIS studied and the issue of who is quite important to many community members.

So the GNSO Council is suggesting that we pursue studies of WHOIS, hopes that study data, study (e conclusions) would provide an objective and factual basis for future policy making.

And back in March of 2009 the Council identified (5 broad) who is study areas, those study areas reflect key policy areas of concern and they asked staff to determine the cost and feasibility for each.

So the rest of my presentation is just an update on what we've don't with those five areas. So the first general area of study that the Council asked us to look at was WHOIS misuse, misuse of public WHOIS Data to assess the impact of public WHOIS on in contributing to or increasing harmful acts and there were really two studies proposed in this context.

One was a survey of registrants, registrars and research and law enforcements organizations to look at specific cases of misuse. And the second study proposed would compare harmful acts associated with public WHOIS information versus non-public addresses.

We issued an RFP on this study several months ago. We received three responses. We are analyzing these responses and we are just about done. We just didn't have time to make the deadline for Nairobi so we are going to provide cost and feasibility for this study area to the GNSO in the community probably in the late March time frame.

And we're just - and I'll provide perhaps some details at the Nairobi meeting but we just weren't able to have the analysis complete in time for the 15 day cutoff.

Then the second area of study that the Council asked us to look into is the area of registrant identification and once again there are a couple of different sort of and studies and visions in the package.

The study would look at how registrants are identified in WHOIS and the extent to which domains used by commercial entities are, you know, not clearly identified as commercial entities in WHOIS.

Perhaps their identity is obscured or suggest that the registrant is a non-commercial entity and then there is a piece of the study that would correlate this to use of privacy and proxy services.

So we also decided to use an RFP approach to determine cost and feasibility for this study and issued a request for proposals in October of 2009. We received five responses to this RFP and again we're just finishing up our analysis.

We'll have detailed information on the cost and our analysis late in March but just again we're not able to, you know, meet the time frame for the Nairobi meetings specifically.

The third area of study has to do with several different aspects of proxy and privacy services and I've divided them into two general categories, the first that I call an abuse study and the second that I refer to as a reveal study.

The abuse study - and we are going to go the RFP route for these studies too. We have not initiated RFPs yet, excuse me - battling a cold - so this first abuse study would study the extent to which domain names that are used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via a proxy or privacy service.

This could be a challenging study for the need for assistance from many input sources and would likely need extensive community participation so we've just wrapping up a draft RFP on this and we'll be releasing that shortly.

The second area related to proxy and privacy services this reveal area would measure the responses of proxy and privacy service providers to request to reveal information about a registrant or a licensee of the service.

This study is challenging because it seems to require that there be actual victims of actionable harm to originate the reveal request accompanied by evidence of that harm.

So we're continuing to assess how that study could be viable and that draft RFP is delayed we're going to kind of do the first study abuse study RFP first and it will probably be April at the earliest before that second RFP in this third area of proxy and privacy services be completed.

There was a fourth area proposed by the GNSO Council. It's a study that would take a look at non-ASCII WHOIS contact information and it would involve a technical analysis of how various client size software displays non-ASCII registration information essentially really geared at the challenges that could be created over time with increasing registrations, internationalized registrations in character sets other than ASCII text.

We are putting this study on hold kind of temporarily because there is a Working Group that the Board convenes a joint (FSEC) GNSO internationalized registrations data Working Group that is convened following the Seoul meeting and is in the early stages of considering kind of what we should require from internationalized registration data.

And the group is also discussing technical questions regarding data elements and how data elements might be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from registrations, information being displayed in familiar characters, excuse me, from local languages and scripts.

So that Working Groups work is underway and then a fifth area that the Council asked staff to look into this particular request came at a later date it was asked of staff in May.

And it is a slightly different kind of study it's a really a compilation of current WHOIS service requirements as specified in agreements with registries and registrars but also what might be future requirements based on previous policy discussions that have occurred over the years with regard to WHOIS.

So rather than trying to, you know, assess cost feasibility to do this particular study staff has gone ahead and begun this work and we do have a draft that is fairly far along and we will be sharing that draft with the GNSO Council in the, probably, late March time frame.

The resolution from the GNSO asked us to make sure to get input from other SOs and ACs so when we share the draft with the GNSO Council for its input we'll also be soliciting input from the SOs and ACs so keep an eye out for that in the late March time frame.

It will just be of course in draft form for the purpose of soliciting this input and then we'll produce a final report, subsequently.

Before I turn it over to (Bart) on the ccNSO policy issues, I'll just quickly mention that there will be two updates on WHOIS in Nairobi. The first will be on Saturday and that will be in the GNSO Working Group session.

And the second update which will be very similar and hopefully I'll be able to share a little more detail about some of our analysis on the first two study areas will be in the open meeting on Wednesday, the GNSO open meeting on Wednesday in Nairobi so I look forward in participating with you there remotely or in person. Now I'll turn it over to (Bart).

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Liz. Good afternoon, I'll give you a brief update on some of the main topics currently running in the ccNSO. First of all, it's probably very clear it's the overall - development of the overall policy on IDN ccTLDs, the second one is on delegation, re-delegation on retirement that's a Working Group.

And these are more substantive topics. And a third one is very interesting I think because it is straight the way the ccNSO works. It is a strategic and operational planning Working Group and I'll touch briefly up on some other issues.

Internationalized domain name CC, country code and policy development process, it's quite a mouthful. Why is it important? The focus of the IDN ccPDP is, in fact, on two issues. First of all and that's very clear probably, it's dealing with the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs and providing a broader framework for the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process.

The second one, which is not as obvious, is a change to the structure of the ccNSO to include IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO structures. Currently the - say when the ccNSO was created, it was, nobody ever thought of IDN ccTLDs and that the structure need to be open and flexible enough to include them.

So given there will be IDN ccTLDs in the near future and under the overall policy, this structure needs to be adjusted to include these IDN ccTLDs.

Where are we with the IDN ccPDP?

Hopefully by Friday, the Working Group or the chair of the Working Group will publish a draft paper which would set out some ideas and recommendations for the overall policy. Probably it's no surprise the policy will, more or less, build upon the Fast Track Process and it will be a refinement and an update of the Fast Track Process.

One of the major recommendations under the Fast - under the overall policies will be to equate IDN ccTLDs as ccTLDs. And what this implies that the whole delegation, re-delegation, retirement mechanism which currently applied to ccTLDs, will apply to IDN ccTLDs as well.

And therefore - and what it also implies is that the, say, the second area I just discussed about the about the overall policy is to include IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

It is - as a result, the overall policy will be very much limited to the selection mechanism of IDN ccTLDs. Most of you will be aware probably that ccTLDs are, more or less, defined through the ISO 3166 list. As soon as a two-letter code appears on the ISO 3166 list, it is eligible for delegation as a ccTLD.

However, with IDN ccTLDs, there is no such list and in the near future there will be no such list, so the overall policy need to address a selection mechanism, which is included in the interim paper as well.

And last but not least is that if you look at the chair paper it will - the IDN ccTLDs will be limited to non-ASCII scripts, or non-Latin scripts, so probably there will be a debate about this in the - at the ccNSO.

So I think I've covered most of the - if you look at the what will happen at the ccNSO meeting, there will be a major discussion probably on the proposal. That will be on (a) Wednesday morning and it's open for everybody to participate.

And at the same time there will be a sharing of experience under the Fast Track because that's one of the other elements that's taking into consideration the policy development processes is the experience, the community and ICANN has gained with the selection mechanisms under the Fast Track.

So that's about the policy development process. How do I get involved? (Do you) - you participate in public comment period and discussion and there is some background information.

A second substantive - a second topic for of substantive topic is the delegation and re-delegation Working Group. This is established in order to excuse me a moment, please. (Unintelligible).

Sorry. If you look at the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs, the ccNSO has established a Working Group to advise the ccNSO community whether or not to conduct a PDP to deal with delegation, re-delegation and retirement.

Delegation for those who are not familiar with it, in the cc environment means it is - if you look at these at the IANA definition, (you know, the) IANA (fossery), it's the assignment of responsibility of a TLD to a trustee.

Really delegation is, as you can read, the transfer of a delegation from one entity to another and retirement is decommissioning and this (were) - there are not very many examples of it, but there are some. This is when a entry on - this will be initiated when an entry on the ISO 3166 list ceases to exist.

Even the - if you look at the delegation, re-delegation Working Group and the topics they discuss, it is considered of existential of an existential nature to the ccTLDs.

As most of you probably are aware, delegation or the current or the incumbent ccTLDs enter into a voluntary agreement arrangement with ICANN there is no contract, but even then delegation, re-delegation occurs and the policy for delegation, re-delegation is therefore of great importance to ccTLDs because that sets the framework in which they can operate.

The current status of that working (up) is that they will produce a progress report on their findings and the - if you look at it, they it's moving more slowly than people would hope for in that Working Group.

Part of it is due that there is no authoritative source of documentation on what are the policies. And there is even not a clear description available publicly available of the current practices for delegation and re-delegation.

And this is so the Working Group is currently just at a fact-finding mission. The - this is what I've addressed already. If you look at, say, what will happen at the Nairobi meeting, there will be a workshop which is public which is open for everybody on Sunday afternoon to share experiences among ccTLD stakeholders on the on delegation, re-delegation and retirement issues.

The Working Group itself will conducts some meetings and it will be discussed at the ccNSO meeting itself on Tuesday afternoon and that one is open as well for discussion.

Again, how do I get involved? You can participate in public comment period, but there is (probably) - there will not be a document open for public comment in the upcoming weeks. And you can, of course, participate in public sessions in Nairobi either directly or through the remote participation.

The Strategic and Operational Working Group, why is this so interesting, I think, for all - for you? Looking through the list of attendees, I don't see many cc people on the participation list, so that was the experience of the first Webinar as well.

It shows a bit how the ccNSO works and especially this one this is considered one of the more successful Working Groups within the ccNSO environment. Its purpose is to facilitate input of the ccNSO (unintelligible) into ICANN strategic and operational planning processes.

The ccNSO has noticed a few say until a year ago that the ccTLD community hardly participated in ICANN's operational and strategic planning process.

And it was of concern to the ccTLD community as well as to the ccNSO council. And one way of trying to improve it was setting up a Working Group which could summarize and put on and yes increase involvement of the cc's in the planning processes.

Now the first step what they did is was in last year the Operational Planning Working Group however that Working Group or the operational planning work they stepped on a already riding train so it was more an experience or gaining experience.

The first cycle the really anticipated or started was the last strategic planning session and in order to improve and increase participation there was a workshop at the Sydney meeting and the results are publicly available.

And far more interesting is they conducted a survey among the ccTLD community which was the basis to identify say the strategic objectives within ICANN's strategic plan which are relevant for the ccTLD community.

So that's what I said. What will they do at the next meeting? They will start and initiate the facilitation and moderation with ICANN on the operational

planning process, it will be the first session in Nairobi on Tuesday morning and they will work on it over the next half-year and then start again with the strategic plan.

Other current Working Groups an interesting one probably for non ccTLDs as well is the Technical Working Groups, the Technical Working Groups sets up meetings on Monday a whole day and it's sharing operational and technical information some non ccTLDs participate and are invited to give a presentation as well.

A second Working Group with broader impact is the Incident Response Planning Working Group. This one was created as in the after math of the (convica) incidence and this is tried, this is working on a plan to respond in a coordinated fashion on DNS (attacks).

And a third interesting Working Group and this is the result of a Board resolution is the (ADOC) wild card study group on the adverse impact of wild cards using wild cards but on the other hand also want to understand and publish the reasons why some of the CCs use wild cards and what the (dab) respect is, they all these Working Groups will conduct sessions at the Nairobi meeting.

This is what I said already and I just yes that was the end of my part of this Webinar I want to hand it over to Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and thank you everybody and now we'll focus on the last end of the ICANN (unintelligible) numbers. Like IP addresses which are so essential for the internal workings of the Internet.

And of course they require policies as well for assignment and allocation and that's the area of the ASO, the Address Supporting Organization which has a very different structure from the GNSO and the ccNSO and I'll start by introducing that.

First of all well the IP address is the end user gets it normally from an ISP which in turn gets IP addresses in huge blocks or in bigger blocks from an RIR, Regional Internet Registry which in turn gets it's really huge blocks from the IANA (faction) of within ICANN.

So the RIR is a key player in all this and this is where the policies are actually developed and what is then an RIR? Well it stands short for Regional Internet Registries and of which there are five in the world.

One for Africa called AfriNIC, one for Asia Pacific APNIC, one for North America named ARIN, one for Latin America Latnic and one for Europe and the Middle East which is RIPP NCC.

They are organizations existing since a long, long time and with membership from the ISPs and those are the ones that you should remember that's where the actual development of policies take place.

They also cooperate through an organization called the Number Resource Organization or the NRO and through a memorandum of understanding between the NRO, the RIRs and the ICANN the ASO was established as a sanction which also it's clearly stated that should be handled by the Number Resource Organization.

So the ASO the Address Supporting Organization is taking care of and one could say it's an alias for some aspects of what the Number Resource Organization does. Simple isn't it.

So please of all this remember that the policy development is taking place within the RIRs there are quite a few polices developed within the RIRs and the vast majority of those policies are for regional assignments and allocations of IP addresses, ASNs and other parameters.

But there are a few which we will focus on here which are called global polices and the name sounds pretty vast but it has a very, very specific meaning. A global policy is only a policy that affects the IANA allocation of (unintelligible).

So there may be coordinated policies across the RIRs but they are then called but they don't affect the IANA allocations just coordinate the policies or policies in general.

There are two global policies in pipeline right now. One is for Autonomous System Numbers or ASM and another is for recovered IPv4 address space. And let's a look a little on those in detail.

First of all Autonomous System Numbers well that's basically the addresses that the ISPs use among themselves for bulk handling of trafficking you could say. Those are (unintelligible) ways in the internal workings of the Internet.

There are (dinosaur) already and established policy for ASMs and which takes care of the allocation and assignments of such for IANA to the RIRs and that includes the transition from what has been used before 16 bits ASMs to doubling the size with full compatibility to 32 bits that transition is already underway.

And the reason of increasing the space from 16 bits to 32 bits is of course the 16 bits were becoming, are becoming scarce so this is a needed development and very important from that perspective.

But there was a reality check once the policy was introduced but it turned out that quite a few of Legacy Equipment and Legacy Software couldn't trigger a deal with the third circuit 2 bits so there was a need to deferred with the full transition with a year. And the current proposal is just about that, deferring the full transition with a year.

And the current status of the proposal is that the RIRs have all a consensus on common text and the proposal has been adopted, where it says here in the slide, with three RIRs but actually since the day before yesterday four of them have formally adopted it. And the final adoption in the remaining one is absolutely imminent so it's soon to be adopted from the RIR perspective.

Then what happens, once it has been adopted in all our RIRs that proposal is then is reviewed by the NRO and the ASO address council and this is, one could say, is a due diligence fact.

Where it is verified that all the procedures have been followed in the policy development within the RIRs. And once they're satisfied that that's the case, well the ccASO address Council forwards the proposal to the ICANN Board for ratification. And once recertified by the ICANN Board it's handed over to IANA for implementation in practice.

So this is pretty imminent and to be expected to reach the Board this year within the coming months and be implemented very rapidly, this is a comparatively small step.

Now recovered IPv4 addresses, as you all know, we are running out of the IANA free pool of IPv4 addresses and this policy proposal actually addresses what would happen once the IANA free pool has run out.

It is now more than 90% (secreted) and the idea here is to give IANA a role for receiving and reallocating blocks that have been recovered from the RIRs. Actually they can already do that today but not in smaller chunks than so-called flash-eight which is 16 million addresses. This proposal would give a possibility to hand, for IANA to address smaller blocks than that.

In the current status regarding this proposal is a bit complex really because here, two different proposals have emerged where one has been adopted by three ethnic and (ALAC) and another has been adopted by (AREG), a

modified version and the difference is just is one could say, in one word but quite an important word. But mainly whether it's the voluntary or mandatory in certain cases.

All right then, well they are still considering and keeping the bulk of these proposals in the discussion (mode) and the (crystalis) is of course whether these two proposals can be consolidated into one joint global policy proposal. That's the status of that fund and the outcome is far from clear, while it was very, very clear in the ASM case.

So, last but not least, how do I get involved? Well, it's simple, policy development is taking place within the RIRs, so if you are interested in this, you should get in contact with your regional Internet registry, the one for your particular region.

And they all have very elaborate port marked policies available in process and the - of course these apply equally to the regional policies as well as for the global policies.

And each RIR, they may have the ISPs as formal members but (unintelligible) in policy development process is wide open to anybody and they conduct open meetings, quite a few two, three, four, depending each year. And they have open mailing lists where you can sign in, to be part of these port marked policy development processes.

So, with that little advertisement, I will bring you back to your regularly scheduled program and David Olive, I think as anchorman. Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Actually this is Scott Pinzon, Director of Policy Communications and we are heading now in the home stretch of our presentation and we will be able to take your questions in a moment.

I have just two quick announcements for you. If you have found this presentation useful and you would like to stay updated on policy issues and not just wait for one of these presentations before each international meeting, there are two ways you can stay updated.

First is policy update that comes out every month, sometime between the 15th and the 22nd, usually. You can read it online or you can subscribe to it to come to your email inbox.

If it's something you have looked at in the past and not looked at recently, you might be pleased to see that over 2009, we worked very hard to streamline the publication.

It's about 20% shorter than it used to be because formerly if nothing much happened in a certain area we would just repeat the article from the month before, well we no longer do that. So, you can really look at it and get a look at what is new in policy developments.

Another thing you would like to know about, that is a new development and in fact by joining this meeting you are hearing the first official announcement of it, is that ICANN policy team now produces a podcast that will be coming out every month, on the first of the month. Now the purpose of the podcast is specifically for people who are new to a given issue or new to ICANN.

As you know, many of these issues develop lots of paperwork, lots of drafts and if you are coming into the discussion after it's started, it's difficult to know where do you start to in order to figure out what's going on.

Well the podcast is designed specifically as a starting point for understanding an issue and unlike some of the things we do that are very long, each episode is meant to be absorbed in a coffee break or a short lunch, so it comes in at under 20 minutes per episode.

We handle one issue and basically answer five basic questions about it such as, what is it, who does it affect, why is it important, how can I get involved in that issue, those kinds of things.

So, it'll be live on ICANN Web site, starting next week, but if you would like to find it now there's a URL you can see there on the slide and it's also available on iTunes if you are in America, Canada, Australia or the U.K. And we hope to get it in other iTunes stores as time goes by.

So, on behalf of the policy staff, we want you to know that not every policy staff member was involved in this presentation but we all do stand ready to try and assist you and so at this time, we will go to your questions.

If we don't have enough time to cover your questions note that you can email us at policy-staff@icann.org, the whole policy team does see that address and we will route your question to the appropriate person who's tracking that issue.

And at this time we would be happy to open it to any questions you might have. You can either use the chat box or in some cases you may be able to actually speak on the phone. Okay I see (Adam) who's raised his hand what's your question Adam?

Adam Peake: Good evening and welcome David Olive if you're there it's good to hear your voice. It's a question for Bart really and it's about the re-delegation and delegation and re-delegation of Working Group.

It's a short question really, it's about the timing of the workshop for the Sunday afternoon.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Adam Peake: It's clashing with the AFTLD meeting which is going on at a different location which seems to me that you've got a prime audience who obviously can't be there.

And also as an ALAC member and someone interested in this issue we have our meeting going on at the same time I was wondering if there had been any request to move it, if there was any chance to move that workshop because it is an interesting one.

And for an ALAC member we'd like I think to help if we can with notions of the local Internet community. I know that you're not at that stage if this being a consideration for a PDP but I think that it's something we'd like to be involved with and of course the AFTLD meeting is a bit of a clash.

Bart Boswinkel: Let me first be clear this is a workshop by the Working Group and this we've looked at opportunities and unfortunately (sir) we have the general ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Thursday was impossible for other reasons. Monday is the tech meeting so it only left the Sunday. So if you look at the primary audience for whom this workshop was targeted the ccTLD community the only feasible day was Sunday afternoon knowing that even some ccTLDs will not be in Nairobi not arriving until Sunday evening.

But fortunately there is for those who are not attend the Nairobi meeting. There will be a remote participation and of course there is always the possibility to attend the ccNSO meetings itself dealing with the cc - re-delegation on Tuesday afternoon.

And that's open as well so it has been considered but at the time we planned the agenda it was unfortunate not doable to do it on another day.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much for that both Adam and Bart. Our time is almost up we have time for one additional question on the call itself and as I've mentioned you can always email us at anytime at the address on the screen.

Does anyone want to raise their hand or have a final question for us?
(Sebastian) has raised his hand.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much. (Unintelligible) vice chair elect I don't know if it is a conspiracy (elect ask) question.

But first of all I would like to thank you for this interesting meeting today. And I would like to specially emphasize that it's maybe one of first time we really included an ASO policy topics into those type of discussion and that's a good thing because I think I can just (one organization) taken care of domain names and IP and other numeric system in once.

My second point is that I know that also it's quite a long meeting already but I would like to ask you not to (unintelligible) topics (under) by the SO but the topic (under) by the AC could be also interesting at such a meeting. Because all - we decide not to talk about what's happening in the ACS, but I think it could also be very important.

And then I just want to take this opportunity to remind everybody that we are at large looking for feedback about question of our (director) to be elected in the near future and we have open comments up to the (6th of March) so I'll waste time to comments on (that issuance) and an important one.

Not just for ALAC and for (unintelligible) people for the overall ICANN community. Sorry it was not really a question but just once again I would like you to build on that meeting and to allow us to stay informed on all that issues. Thank you very much.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you Sebastian and actually I think the idea of doing presentation centered around the ACs is an excellent suggestion and we will huddle on the policy team and see what we can do about that.

Unfortunately, our time has run out if you enjoyed the presentation today or wish some other people you work with would hear it, it will be repeated in 4-1/2 hours so perhaps you would like to join us or someone you know will join us then.

Other than that we'll probably see you in or around Nairobi. Thank you very much for your involvement today and this concludes our meeting.

END