**ICANN Transcription Pre-ICANN58 Policy Open House session
Monday 6 March 2017 at 10:00 UTC**.
Note: 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-icann58-policy-06mar17-en.mp3

David Olive: Greetings and welcome to everyone. Thank you for joining us for this pre-
ICANN 58 Policy Open House on the 6th of March, 2017. It is my pleasure to
have the members of the Policy Development team host this welcome open
house to provide some background of information on policy and advice that
will be talked about at the ICANN 58 meeting in Copenhagen.

We have changed the format from our traditional one where we used to give a
90-minute session of a lot of data and a lot of briefing materials. Instead,
we've decided to refer you to our pre-ICANN 58 policy report and the GNSO
policy update for those details and substantive descriptions.

Instead, we wanted today, have an interactive format just limited to a 60-
minute session now and later on in a different time zone to exchange
information, answer any questions you may have of the senior Policy leads
supporting the supporting organizations and advisory committees in their
policy and advice development work.

So with that, we would like to try this new format out, have a more
interactive. We received some questions which we will go through. We will

first have the team leaders introduce themselves and the topics of high priority and then we will open it up for questions and interaction from you, our audience today. Would that I will turn it over to Marika and thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Thank you for joining us today for our Policy Update Webinar new style. My name is Marika Konings, and I'm the Vice President Policy Development Support for the Generic Name Supporting Organization, or GNSO.

As you have hopefully all read in the GNSO policy briefings, which were published in preparation for this webinar, there are many projects underway in the GNSO. These projects can basically be broken down into three different buckets.

First and foremost, the GNSO policy development process related activities. There are nine policy development processes, or PDPs in the various stages of the PDP lifecycle. The four listed on the slide are the ones in the working group phase.

All these working groups have face-to-face meetings scheduled at ICANN 58 which are open to anyone interested. So if you want to learn more about the status of work of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP, the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to Replace Whois PDP, or the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all Generic Top Level Domains, please join these working groups for their meetings.

The IGO INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group recently published its initial report for public comments so if

you want to learn more about the recommendations contained in the report or make your opinion heard about these recommendations please attend their session.

There are also a number of implementation review teams, or IRTs, that will be meeting at ICANN 58 to progress their work in relation to the implementation of adopted GNSO policy recommendations. Please check out the GNSO all of the briefings and the schedule for ICANN 58 to learn more about the details.

Then there is a second category of activity in relation to non-policy issues. This includes the implementation of the GNSO review recommendations, the work that's ongoing in relation to ensuring that the necessary processes and procedures are in place for the GNSO to play its part in the post-transition world of the empowered community and linked to that work the possible creation of a GNSO Standing Selection Committee to deal with the selection and nomination of GNSO candidates for the different review teams and post-transition structures. All these topics will also be further discussed at ICANN 58.

The last category relates to cross community working groups that the GNSO has chartered together with other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. One such cross community working group, or CCWG, concerns and new gTLD auction proceeds.

As you may be aware, over US$230 million have been derived from new gTLD-related auctions. The CCWG has been tasked to propose the mechanisms that should be developed in order to allocate these new gTLD auction proceeds. The CCWG recently commenced its deliberations and will continue those at ICANN 58.

Last but not least, I'll just mention the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top Level Domains, which makes for a smooth transition to the next speaker as the CCWG's joint charter with the Country Code Supporting Organization, or ccNSO. However, before doing so, I just want to encourage you to have your questions ready about any of these topics mentioned or any others you may have read about in the GNSO policy briefings for the Q&A session that will follow our brief introductions.

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

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. I'll just touch briefly on the topics that are listed here. The reason is, these topics will be high on the ccNSO priority list and they will have a more – and they are probably interest to the broader community present in Copenhagen.

The first one I want to touch upon is briefly on the policy development process, which is listed here, this will be the third policy development process initiated by the ccNSO and the ccNSO is currently at its stage to discuss whether or not to initiate it properly so a formal decision for a PDP.

In Copenhagen, the community present will discuss the topics that will need to be addressed through the PDP, that's one. The question whether to launch one or two policy development process, because it's not just about review mechanism but also retirement, and there is an interdependency there. And the argument could be one or two PDPs.

Thirdly, how to organize the work of the people active within the PDP, most likely it will be done through working groups and finally, have a brief discussion about a very tentative schedule for the PDP. It looks like the most

optimistic estimation is this – the two policy processes will run at least until 2019.

So the issue report will be published shortly and everybody attending and interested is encouraged to read it and discuss it at the meeting in Helsinki where the Council will take a decision.

Secondly, and this is more as a signal and signpost for the meeting, say, the ccNSO is very concerned around the implementation of the processes and mechanisms not just related to the empowered community but broader around the 1st of October bylaws. It has created a separate working group dealing with it but it has noted and will discuss with other communities that the, say, there is a strong need for cooperation and coordination among the community and broader to implement this.

So therefore it is part of the agenda of all the meetings the ccNSO Council and/or community will have with other communities present in Copenhagen. And it's on the Board ccNSO meeting.

And finally, just for reference as Marika said, the Cross Community Working Group on the Framework of Use of Country and Territory Names, this working group has produced its interim report, just before the – and published it just before the Copenhagen meeting. You are strongly encouraged to read it for various reasons, one of them it is – it provides a very nice overview of the evolution of use of country and territory names even prior to ICANN itself, so for historical – say, for yes, persona development, it's always very nice.

And secondly, because there are some recommendations in it and the working group definitely needs your feedback on the direction of future travel. And with this ends my overview of the ccNSO topics that are of interest and will

be discussed so I'd like to hand over to my colleague, Carlos Reyes, to inform you about the ASO proceedings in Copenhagen. Go ahead, Carlos.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you very much, Bart. Hello, everyone. This is Carlos Reyes. And I work with the Address Supporting Organization. As many of you know, the Address Supporting Organization conducts most of its policy development work at the regional level. However, the Address Supporting Organization Address Council, which is the group that oversees global policy development, will be conducting its annual meeting in Copenhagen.

There are no global policy development efforts underway. There are no proposals at the global level. But as you've learned from Marika and Bart, there are a lot of cross community efforts underway where the ASO is participating. So the ASO Address Council will be discussing those matters as well as other internal administrative issues next week in Copenhagen.

Something to note, however, the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee, will be meeting for the first time next week in Copenhagen. As part of the IANA stewardship transition, the Internet Numbering Services – Internet Numbering Community established a serve level agreement between ICANN and the five regional Internet registries.

This SLA essentially outlines the commitments that ICANN makes in terms of performing the IANA numbering services. This SLA came into effect on October 1, 2016 with the IANA stewardship transition. And to provide oversight of this SLA the IANA Numbering Services Review Committee was established to ensure that the IANA numbering services operator, in this case ICANN, continues to provide the IANA numbering services according to the SLA. So that group will be meeting in an open session during Copenhagen.

So those are really the high level updates from the Address Supporting Organization. I will see members of the Address Council as well as the numbering community throughout the week. And with that, I will transition to the Advisory Committees and we begin with the At Large Advisory Committee and the At Large Community and my colleague, Sylvia Vivanco. Sylvia.

Sylvia Vivanco: Thank you very much, Carlos. Hello, everyone. My name is Sylvia Vivanco, I am manager of At Large Regional Affairs. I will provide you with a brief overview about the work of the At Large community.

First, the work of the At Large Structures Criteria and Expectations Taskforce. Starting prior to the At Large review, the ALAC and regional leaders have been reassessing the criteria and expectations for organizations to become and remain an At Large structure. In the past At Large has focused on expanding the number of ALSs, which are the base of the At Large community.

As the number of ALSs has now reached 220, At Large now seeks to make existing ALSs more effective in policy advise development. As part of the effort, the ALAC will be improving the tools and processes to ensure full engagement of ALSs in ICANN activities.

During ICANN 58, the ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce, will provide an update on their work with a focus on communication expectations and processes.

And now I will turn it over to my colleague, Ariel Liang for further updates. Ariel.

Ariel Liang: Thanks, Sylvia. This is Ariel Liang and I also support the At Large community. The second topic of focus is the At Large review, and many of you may know that since May 2016, ICANN international – the independent examiner has been conducting their organizational review of the At Large community. And the public comment of its draft report is open until 24 of March this year. The draft report proposed 16 recommendations that ICANN believe will help improve the structure and effectiveness of the At Large community.

ICANN 58 (unintelligible) will hold a public workshop and this will provide opportunities for a community wide discussions on the foundings and proposed recommendations. In addition, the ALAC and the regional leaders will hold discussions with items about the draft reports and the At Large Review Working Party will also hold a working session to finalize the At Large responses to the draft report.

And the last topics of focus for the community is the Work Stream 2 issues in the CCWG Accountability. And many members of At Large have been actively helping to shape the outcome of the Work Stream 2 issues. Specifically, there are three members of At Large who are chairs or either cochairs of the Work Stream 2 subgroups.

So in addition to participating in the subgroup calls, At Large internal ICANN Evolution Working Group has been meeting regularly to both update At Large members on the Work Stream 2 activities as well as get feedback and support for At Large reviews.

At ICANN 58 the ALAC and the regional leaders will review and discuss the nine subtopics within Work Stream 2 in order to ensure broader understanding within the At Large.

And now I will turn over the floor to my colleague, Olof Nordling of the Governmental Advisory Committee. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Ariel. And hello from Brussels. It's time for a few words about the Governmental Advisory Committee, or GAC and its activities at ICANN 58.

So let's start with the Red Cross national names and IGO acronyms in the Governmental Organization acronyms. Protection of such identifiers as the second level domain names has been a recurring theme where the GAC and the GNSO have typically somewhat different views. These are now subject to facilitated discussions which will continue in Copenhagen and perhaps conclude, always the optimist here.

The GAC will also consider the Accountability Work Stream 2 topics like diversity, transparency and human rights. There will be discussions in GAC plenary and the GAC also has its own working group on the particular topic of human rights and the international law.

Now you already heard from Marika that are many policy development processes going on in the GNSO on subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, for registration directory services, just to name two very important ones from the GAC perspective. And the GAC is keen to provide public policy input to those in a timely manner regarding geographical names, access to registrant information, community applications, safeguards for regulated sectors and applicant support and more.

I'll stop there noting that these are just samples from the agenda of the GAC and of its working groups. And that agenda is truly extensive bordering to rock around the clock, just to quite Bill Haley and that dates me as well.

Let's now cross the Atlantic to Steve Sheng who will tell you about other advisory committees. Take it away, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Olof. And hello, everyone. I will provide a brief update on the two technical and security related advisory committees at ICANN. First the Root Server System Advisory Committee, the RSAC. Since ICANN 57, it has published three documents. The first document Number 23, focused on the history of the root server system from its beginnings in the early 80s to the present day with 13 letters, 12 operators and over 600 (unintelligible) around the world.

This document also contains the operational history for each of the 13 entities that operates the root server letters and provided by these entities themselves. It's a very nice read, if you want to have an overview of the system.

The second report Number 24, the RSAC defines key technical elements of a potential root server operators – of any potential root server operators. This will be a critical part of any potential root server operator destination process. And finally in RSAC 26, the RSAC report said the outcome of its third workshop focusing on the evolution, continuity and accountability of the root server system.

Moving on to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the SSAC, since ICANN 57 and has also published three documents. The first document is Number 91, it's a comment to an ICANN initiative on the identifier

technology health indicator. There will be further discussions at ICANN 58 on that.

In the second report, SSAC 90, the SSAC studied the risks to security and stability that arise from ambiguity in the use of the domain name space. And when those studies, it offers a set of observations and recommendations to mitigate some of these risks.

Now there are many risks related to the ambiguity but in this report, the SSAC focused only on the security and the stability risks. And finally, in the third publication, Number 89, the SSAC provided a detailed response to the comment from ccNSO on an earlier publication on the proposed guideline for the second string similarity review process.

All these publications will be discussed more at ICANN 58, and those are also available online.

With that I will hand it back to David for the question-and-answer.

David Olive: Thank you, Steve. And thank you Policy Team members for the brief overview. With that we'd like to open it up to questions. You can either raise your hand in the chat room or type it into the – raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room or type it into the chat.

We have two questions already from Jim Prendergast. His first question relates to, "With an eye toward the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, in the policy team's roadmap, what do you think this work will wrap up? I know it's difficult to predict, but it would be helpful. What is your current best thinking on that?"

Steve Chan: Thanks, David…

((Crosstalk))

Steve Chan: Sure.

David Olive: Thank you very much.

Steve Chan: This is Steve Chan. Thanks for the question, Jim. So the work plan for that particular PDP shows the initial report being delivered around 2017. And so then they're also targeting Q3 of 2018 for delivery of the final report to the GNSO Council.

I believe you're a member of that group so I think you're aware that the scope of issues is quite broad, there's nearly 40. And there's also a dependence on work from other groups such as the Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Review Team. There's also the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names. So to some degree we're also dependent on the work of other groups as well. But Q3 of 2018 is the target for the delivery of the final report. Thank you.

David Olive: Thanks, Steve. And we now go to – Jim is typing. Thank you. We'll now go to Jim's second question, if I may, before opening it up to others. And it relates to the facilitated dialogue for the protection of names at – for the intergovernmental organizations and Red Cross Red Crescent. And from the perspective of the Policy team who have the unenviable task of managing this, is there any kind of anticipated output from that session such as recommendations, documents and the like? Or is it strictly a dialogue?

Thank you, Jim, for that question. As you know, former Board member, Bruce Tonkin, was asked to try to facilitate a discussion on the protection of the IGO and Red Cross Red Crescent names. And he did accept that task. And we, in the Policy team and others, policy for the GNSO, GAC and others within ICANN, are supporting his efforts.

And again, I think it was a useful – it is a useful exercise to recall all the documentation, recall all the recommendations, recall all the information provided throughout those policy development processes so to collect them and focus the GAC and the GNSO on these matters in the hopes that they can move forward in their discussions. So it is a dialogue based on collecting the information and having them exchange that information, which will happen at ICANN 58 in Copenhagen.

Are there any other questions from hands up? Not. Okay, I know there were some questions raised during the RSVP process, and we're happy to go through them. And one particular question related to the empowered community and various mechanisms. And again, just to recount, the community has nine powers to ensure that the ICANN Board and organization are accountable.

Such powers including the budget and strategic plan, review and changes to bylaws, removal of individual Board members or the entire Board, approval of fundamental changes of bylaws and articles of incorporation, finding independent review and rejecting Board decisions relating to the ICANN review function.

With that I'll ask my colleagues who have been working with the community what other preparations are the various SOs and ACs who are a part of this doing as they move forward in this area?

Mary Wong: Hello, everybody. This is Mary Wong. And David, I assume that you'd like me to say a couple of things about this. I just wanted to emphasize for everyone that as noted by a few of my colleagues in their overview presentations, there are discussions that are ongoing within each decisional participant group in the community as to their preparation for these various new roles and powers.

As everyone knows, the new empowered community that is described in the revised ICANN bylaws consists of five decisional participants which are the three supporting organizations and two of the advisory committees.

So what I will say is that each group is indeed engaged in trying to find out whether they have existing processes that are able to handle their obligations under the new revised powers or it may need to modify any of their existing processes. So the work is being done at various stages and is being coordinated by the policy staff.

The only other thing I want to add at this point, unless there's any follow-up, is that we are talking about preparation within each of the five decisional participant community groups as collectively they form the empowered community. This is not quite the same as the empowered community administration, which comprises a representative of each of these five decisional participants, but by and large the empowered community administration is simply the administrative body through which these five participants would communicate as well as notify the board and such.

So the focus really rightly is on the work within each of the five decisional participants. And again, as noted by some of my colleagues, that's going on

and there will be some sessions at ICANN 58 to deal with those as well. David, thank you.

David Olive: Mary, thank you very much. I will now move to a question that is in the chat about when will the draft CCT RT report be available. And our information on this is that it will be available on the 7th of March so that is for your information.

Moving on to some other questions that were raised, unless I see any other hands in the chat, there was a question talking about the frequency of reviews, reviewing policy as we are developing them, as you the community are developing them through various PDPs. I maybe would turn it to Marika and see if she wanted to comment about that.

Marika Konings: Thank you, David. This is Marika. I'm happy to comment on that from a GNSO perspective and of course maybe some of my other colleagues want to provide input from the perspective of other supporting organizations. But from the GNSO side, there is no one-size-fits-all, there is no required period within which a policy needs to be reviewed.

However, there are a number of policies that actually contained within the recommendations a timeframe within which the policy is expected to be reviewed. So in certain cases this is triggered through a recommendation that was already contained in the policy but there are also other instances which may trigger a review, for example, if through data that is received from our Compliance team, it's obvious that there is an issue or a problem or there's a recommendation that it may – the policy may not be addressing the problem that was originally identified.

And of course it's, you know, within the remit of the GNSO community to that point in time trigger a review or start a review of an existing policy so I'm hoping that answers your question.

David Olive: Thanks very much, Marika. Now in an area that relates to ICANN and the protection of intellectual property on the Internet, an observer at a recent domain name system form in Kiev, there were interesting discussions about this matter. And I wanted to point out that one of the early and first few policy development processes approved had to do with the protection of intellectual property in the form of the UDRP, or the dispute resolution mechanism to try to make sure that there could be amicable solutions in an alternate dispute settlement mechanism on the domain names.

And this of course had led to other mechanisms of which ICANN does of course look to protect the trademark protection and copyright protection in the domain name system. I would also ask another person on our staff, Mary Wong, to me becoming a little more about some of the protections and the like. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you very much, David. And thanks for the question. So really just to supplement what you said, David, I think it's first important to recall that ICANN is not a content regulator so everything that is done by ICANN and the organization and the community is circumscribed by the ICANN bylaws that describe the scope of our mission in this respect.

That said, clearly the question of intellectual property protection is something, as David noted, has been in the ICANN community for a while and has indeed been tackled in various aspects as that relates to the domain name system, including the example of the uniform domain name dispute resolution policy that David mentioned.

So let me just point to a couple of other examples that illustrate how about question of intellectual property protection fits within ICANN's mission and has been considered or is being considered by ICANN including within the community work.

One is with respect to the new gTLD program, prior to the launch of the current expansion round, trademark protection was identified as an overarching issue and so some additional rights protection mechanisms were developed and put in place for this current round which are now being reviewed by one of the policy development processes that Marika mentioned early on within the GNSO.

Another example is that with a recently completed policy development process on the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers for domain name registrations, intellectual property interests worked with the various other stakeholder groups within the context of that PDP to come up with a framework whereby registrars and providers who receive requests from intellectual property owners can handle them through very clear guidelines.

So hopefully, these examples of completed and ongoing PDPs will illustrate the ways in which intellectual property concerns are being addressed within ICANN and within the scope of our mission. Back to you, David.

David Olive: Thanks very much, Mary. There was another question relating to the country code top level domains and country code operators on the role of ICANN in that. Bart, would you want to explain a little more about that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Thank you, David. And thank you for the question because that is probably – is one of the more topics that in cloud somewhere. So the role of

ICANN is effectively – ICANN as the organization effectively very limited. It is limited to performing the IANA or having PTI perform the IANA function as the IANA operator. And that is limited to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs so the changes in the IANA root zone database.

That's at a very high level. And the ICANN Board has a bit of a role in ensuring that everything went for according to due process. The decisions around individual ccTLDs is, and this goes back to the current policies – and long-enshrined policies – is a local matter. And the local matter is defined, as I said, through these policies like RFC 1591 and refined in the framework of interpretation of RFC 1591 but also very dependent on the local circumstances.

It really makes a difference if there is specific legislation with respect to the ccTLD or if there are not, if there is an agreement between the current ccTLD manager and the government and/or other members of the significant interested parties in the ccTLD or not. So it almost, from a ccNSO perspective, impossible and probably from an ICANN perspective, impossible to provide guidance and/or a clear answer on the specific circumstances with respect to a country.

That's all I have to say about this, David, so back to you. I hope this clarifies the question.

David Olive: Thank you very much, Bart. We appreciate that. Are there any other comments or questions in the room? Someone is typing. Any Geo names news? (Alexandra), I'm afraid I do not have any more news on that. Unless you're referring to the GAC Working Group, is that what you mean? Maybe my colleague Olof can provide some information.

Olof Nordling: David, yes, with pleasure. And hello, (Alexandra), looking forward to seeing you in Copenhagen shortly. And well, in general, geographical names, there are two activities ongoing and Marika and Bart mentioned one, which is the Cross Community Working Group on Country Names, which of course are geographical names.

But, within the GAC, there is a specific dedicated working group which you're well aware of, and they are I think in the wrapping up stage coming up with some final considerations to be looked upon, both within the working group in itself and working group meeting in Copenhagen and also in the plenary session for that topic in Copenhagen.

So well, yes, there are documents that are in very late stages of finalization, so there will probably be interesting discussions, yes, in Copenhagen on this. I think that's as much as I can say. Perhaps somebody else has input on what's moving regarding geographical names in other areas?

David Olive: Maybe Bart or Emily?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart speaking. As I said in my introductory note, and Marika alluded to it as well, is there is the Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names. And one of the concerns they expressed or – in their interim report is that currently you see at least two or three different efforts dealing with Geo names, of which, as Olof already said, country and territory names is just a subpart.

Because of this effort, and you got so many moving parts, one of the recommendations included is to have a discussion across the community how to consolidate all these efforts into one in order to ensure say the

harmonization of the different results, recommendations coming out of these efforts. So that's one topic.

The second one, and that was based on the methodology, the working group – the cross community working group used, is to seek input from community members through a survey to inform the discussion of the working group. One of the results of that survey is that, say, the interests and the sense of how to deal with the three-letter codes, for example, is very diverse and not just diverse between different communities but also within communities.

And that was – that caused the working group to spend a lot of time trying to come up with again, a harmonized acceptable framework to deal with it. And in a way the working group did not meet this. So one of the initial questions that was asked to the working group whether or whether not it is feasible to develop a harmonized framework just for the use country and territory names, is answered in the negative in the interim report for the – mainly for the two reasons I just mentioned.

And in the recommendations or in the draft recommendations of the working group, they asked the community, the broader community, how to move forward and how to ensure that, say, the issue they've identified will be addressed in a next effort to deal with this topic of country and territory names, but geo names in general. Thank you.

David Olive: Thank you, for the comments on that – on the Geo names, and thank you, (Alexandra) for raising that. On the issue of registries and their blacklist for registration domain names for famous trademarks, that is a GDD contractual compliance issue, not something that we in Policy focus on immediately so that does lead to the review of rights protection mechanisms. And I'd like Mary to say a few words about that please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, David. And thanks, (Anna), for the questions. As David noted, your first question about registries and some of their practices, it's a question of not just their contracts with ICANN but I think it's also important to remember that the registry as registry operators, have certain contractual obligations within their contracts with ICANN and that includes compliance with ICANN's consensus policies, which are developed through the multistakeholder bottom up consensus process, particularly in this case through the GNSO's policy development processes.

So I believe the conduct that you talked about really is not subject to the compliance – sorry to the consensus policy so it's not something that was developed or therefore not mandatory from an ICANN perspective. And whatever else may or may not be within the contractual framework they each have within ICANN.

But on your specific second question about the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, or UDRP, your question was whether that's a best solution to solve problems with relation to trademarks. And as David noted, and as Marika mentioned in her presentation, this is one of the topics that one of the newest GNSO policy development processes is considering and that is the Review of Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group where one of the policies they will be reviewing is indeed the UDRP and they will be doing that in Phase 2 of what is a two-phased PDP.

So that's not something that's occurring right now. Right now they're reviewing the rights protection mechanisms that were developed for the new gTLD program expansion round, but they will get to the UDRP probably in the early part of next year. So hopefully that answers your question. Back to you, David.

David Olive: Thank you very much, (Anna) and Mary for that discussion and interchange on the issue of the UDRP and WIPO and dispute settlement. With that, again, I ask are there any other comments or questions from people in the Adobe Connect room?

All right, with that I will turn to a final question that we received in advance, which talked about the Internet of Things and cyber security and some thinking by ICANN on these topics around that particular topic of the Internet of Things.

I think that is a new emerging and evolving topic and it's of course new usage of the Internet. I don't think people really know yet the effects on global adoption and there are no current expectations as to fundamental changes that might be needed in the Internet architecture at this point.

Obviously, as computers and mobile devices are connected to the Internet, security awareness is going to very, very important and ICANN will continue to ensure the security and stability of the Internet's unique identifiers and we would hope and have a continuing discussion as others look at the Internet of Things and its opportunities to have people learn about what the Internet of Things infrastructure is all about and look to existing security standards and best practices as they move forward so that the Internet will remain secure, stable and resilient.

Another element, of course, would be that Internet protocol version 6 can be considered the sustainable way to address the needs of the billions of new devices that may want to be connected and that's something that is also something to keep in mind.

And then finally, as the developers of the Internet of Things are looking at various approaches and applications, we also have to, again, think of the domain name security extensions, DNS SEC, would be available and how they can best incorporated in their devices.

And so I think that's some preliminary thinking that we are looking at at ICANN and others who are involved with the Internet and various organizations looking to these new developments in the Internet of Things.

With that, I would hopefully say that it is – use the questions that we've had to date and we hope we have addressed the questions that you raised in the chat and during this discussion. We would also like to hear your views of the new format. Again, trying to be more interactive and providing the materials in advance for you to study the specific details in hearing some of our subject matter experts relate to things going forward.

Thank you, (Alexander), concerning the Internet of Things, can you provide an update on ICANN's PKI and when we'll have DNS TLCs with the DNS SEC? That I'm going to have to refer to my security expert and we'll get back to you with a answer to that question.

Steve Sheng: Yes, David, this is Steve. I actually don't know the answer yet, but I can go back to the organization to find that answer for (Alexander) and provide that back to you. Thanks.

David Olive: Thanks, Steve, that's very helpful. Steve, as you know, works closely in supporting the RSAC and the SSAC and he will be able to hopefully provide an answer to that question. Christopher Wilkinson is typing so we will allow him to do that.

He comments that the Internet of things policy should include the question of the allocation and use of IPv6. All good points as we move forward on that discussion of how that will be further used going forward and the use of existing IP technologies.

If there are no other questions I'll give a last call to our community members on the line. We also would like to hear from you about the new format. We hope – it is an experiment. We wanted to make sure that we try the best methods of communication. And again, we will do this later in the day for our friends in the Asia Pacific region at a more convenient time to them so that they also can participate and hear the developments that are going to be taking place at ICANN 58 with the policy and advice development.

With no other questions, I would just like to conclude by saying that you, our community members, are participating in the – and helping to coordinate support of our unique identifiers for the Internet, for domain names and IP addresses through the various supporting organizations and advisory committees who develop policy or comment on policy or develop advice to the Board and the ICANN community.

And your work and contributions are vital for us. And the Internet functions for everyone because everyone is invited to help make that function. And our consensus policies developed through you and our stakeholders give the results both effectiveness and the greatest legitimacy.

And so we thank you for your continued interest in the policy and advice development processes, the issues that are currently before the ICANN community both at ICANN 58 and again in our policy forum coming in Johannesburg in June of this year at ICANN 59. And we encourage you to

work with us and make sure that your inputs are made known for they're very important to the process of our multistakeholder model.

So with that, I would like to thank all of you for attending this session, and wish everyone a safe travels to Copenhagen if you'll be attending in person, but also if you cannot, we would remind you that remote participation is available and the sessions are actively monitored and promoted through the schedule that you see of ICANN 58 so that you are able to have your voices heard even if you cannot physically be in Copenhagen, those inputs through the remote participation and obviously other public comment periods, are important to our process.

With that, I'd like to thank everyone and wish everyone a good morning, good afternoon and good evening wherever you may be. Again, this recording will be made available to you as well as well as some of the slides highlighting the key events at ICANN 58 and we look forward to our continuing dialogue and discussion with all of you. With that, I thank you. This concludes our webinar.

END