

**ICANN Policy Update  
WEBINAR  
09 June 2010 at 13:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar on 15 October 2009 at 12:00 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-policy-webinar-20100609.mp3>

On page:

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

David Olive ...newcomers and providing an introduction into how policy development takes places and how one can get involved and participate a week and a half ago.

For today's session there's a lot of information contained in our presentation. The slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information again at a convenient time.

In addition we'll also conduct a survey or poll at the end of the session. And we wish to listen to members of the community and make sure that the information we have provided is considered useful (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: All right. Thank you.

David Olive: ...there will be more details at the end of our remarks.

Woman: To return to silent mode press star 6.

David Olive: A few housekeeping matters for you. One, we ask you not to use the callback option that may be present in the Adobe Connect. It's better to use the conference bridge that you have on e-mail.

And to reduce interference we ask you to mute your phones. When asking questions at the end of the session you can unmute your lines. Again this is an Adobe Connect

room and you can view the slides and questions posted and you have that e-mail link to the Adobe Connect.

Again there will be questions at the end of the session and you can submit them either in the chat box at the bottom of the Connect window. During the sessions the policy staff will do all that they can to answer the questions. In any case we can use them at the end as well.

Please do not use the Call Me button on Adobe Connect, it is there to facilitate the recording of the session. And then finally at the end of the session if you want to ask a question please state your name and raise your hand using the Adobe Connect device and we will recognize you and take those questions

The goals for this session are as follows: We want to provide you an update and encourage you to participate, we want to review the issues that are being discussed in the ICANN Brussels meeting, inform you of other opportunities at that meeting and answer any questions you might have.

Many of you are planning to participate in the Brussels meeting either in person or remotely. And for those who will be participating remotely special attention has been paid to enhance participation in that capacity. For further details on remote services facilities they can be found on the Brussels Web site at the ICANN Web site.

In addition of course to the policy-related activities that'll be highlighted in our presentation today, there will be a number of other important sessions taking place in Brussels such as the new gTLD update; a session on the law enforcement amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement; a session on global VNS vulnerabilities, security and path forward from a group of experts; an affirmation to commitments discussion; a review of ICANN's fiscal year '11 operating plan and budget and the abuse of the VNS forum. For further details please consult the Brussels schedule on our Web site.

Policy development at ICANN as many of you on this call know is of course responsible by the bodies for these developments: The Generic Name Supporting Organization which develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domains, the Country Code Supporting Organization which has the ability to

develop policy recommendations applicable to the country code top level domains and the Address Supporting Organization which is to review and develop recommendations on Internet protocol address policies.

In addition of course to the supporting organizations that have the capacity to development policy recommendations, there are a number of advisory committees that provide advice to the ICANN board and they are listed on this slide.

In the next few slides we'll provide an overview of the topics covered on this session. It might be worth pointing out that there is just a selection of the activities going on on the different supporting organizations. At the end of the presentation we will direct you where to find additional information and details either on the ICANN Web site or the respective supporting organization sites.

I've just given the brief highlights of the Brussels meeting. We will also have some review of the GNSO improvements by Rob Hoggarth. Other policy team members will also be presenting and here is the list that we have today. Marika Konings will talk about intra-register transfer policy and some other details related to registration abuse.

Liz Gasster will talk about the who is activities. Margie Milam will talk about the registrar accreditation agreements and amendments to that. Margie will also talk about the vertical integration PDP relating to the new gTLDs.

Bart Boswinkel will talk about the PDPs involved with IDNs and top-level domains. Other activities in the ccNSO include delegation-re-delegation and some internal roles and responsibilities.

And finally we'll hear more about the global policy of the addressing supporting organization ASO by Olof Nordling who will talk to us about these and the global policy on IPv4.

With that I'll turn to my policy colleagues to talk on the details. And I now turn the mike over to Rob Hoggarth. Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much (David). Good day everyone. And to (John Barryhill)'s comment in the Adobe Connect session, we don't anticipate any crying on this session. We hope it's purely informational.

As (David) noted there are a number of issues from the GNSO perspective and I'm just going to lead in with a review of the GNSO restructuring and improvements.

But just in terms of an overall context to give you some appreciation there are currently active, as you see at the bottom of the current slide, almost 20 Working Groups or Work Teams underway within the GNSO on a variety of topics.

We clearly in a short Webinar like this can't give you details of all the issues in all of those groups. But you can find a list of them as well as e-mail archives on GNSO council Web site to learn more about some of the topics that we aren't talking about today. And of course most of us are here on the call so during the Q&A session you can ask about those as well.

I'm going to focus just very briefly at the beginning here on the GNSO improvements topic, primarily the implementation aspect of that. Because with the GNSO being the fundamental policy making body for gTLDs a lot of what goes on in terms of the operations and mechanisms in the GNSO are very important to ultimately how policies end up being discussed, how the discussions are structured, who participates and how they can be a part of it.

And so a general overview about the improvements process and where we are in that is probably a good introduction for many of you. I know from the attendee list that many people who are on this call have been participants in the now three-plus year process of GNSO improvements. Many of you are familiar with some of the foundational elements but would probably benefit from an update in terms of where we are on certain sections.

Fundamentally the reason for the GNSO improvements was the fact that the board and the community thought it was extremely important going forward that the GNSO work very hard to maximize participation of all the various stakeholders in gTLD policy development.

And to make sure that that policy development was truly based on a firm foundation, a common understanding of the issues and policy concerns that people had and utilize mechanisms and capabilities that ensured that all the various parties could communicate not only internally within the GNSO but more broadly with other members of the community. Because those policies and that policy development process really involves all members of the ICANN community.

So the focus of the improvements effort to date has been on five main areas: You know, first off handling the structural aspects of things and getting the GNSO council structured to act as no longer truly a legislative body, which it had evolved to over the years, but to move to it's next evolutionary step which is to be much more of a manager, strategic coordinator of policy development activities that are much more drilled down to members of the community participating in developing the policy rather than just the members of the GNSO council doing that.

And so that was a significant achievement back at the Seoul meeting last year where the new GNSO council was seated and various new operating procedures were introduced.

But there are still four major areas as you see from this slide that still require substantial implementation for - fortunately we've made a lot of progress. But those are, if you look at the upper left-hand quadrant adopting a Working Group model of policy development where truly Working Groups comprised of all members of the GNSO community and those outside the immediate GNSO community have provide their expertise, their input, their perspective on issues that are important to the community.

The upper right-hand section which probably should be actually enhancing constituencies with a small "c" as some of these discussions have developed over the last couple of years. But really making sure that the various groups within the GNSO community who gather together and truly form themselves really have an opportunity to develop and work on a level playing field with an understanding that if you're in one group or another there are common operating principles, common ways of doing things.

Not dictating how each member of the GNSO community operates but having some general parameters, guidelines, benchmarks so that members of the community in one group can be assured that the operations of other sections of the community are done in an open, fair, transparent manner.

A critical aspect, the lower right-hand quadrant, is revising the policy development process. As I noted earlier making something that is consistent based on thoroughly understood principles that has the appropriate structure and framework that allows a level of consistency, transparency and comfort that all members of the community can follow, can look at, can see where the various discussions are going.

And then the bottom left quadrant there, improving communications with ICANN structures. Again underscoring the extreme importance of the ability to communicate. And that's not only within the GNSO through the various Working Groups and Work Teams making sure that they have the appropriate tools to work but also looking at the GNSO Web site, making sure that that exists. Making sure that the line in a very comprehensive and clear structure and framework.

And also ensuring that there are the appropriate communications links and mechanisms between the various groups - the GNSO council and the board, the GNSO and the large community and individual members of the GNSO with some of their colleagues and compatriots.

So when you look at where we are right now in terms of the GNSO council the rather complicated slide that I've just flipped up there shows a general structure of the GNSO moving forward.

Moving from the past focus on six separate constituencies - moving that up a level and really looking at four distinct stakeholder groups which are divided into two houses of contrasted parties and non-contrasted parties.

This slide has its own, you know, two hour presentation that I won't go into detail but that I'm happy to answer questions on on specific aspect of it either later in this presentation or even off line if you guys want to reach me at [robert.hoggarth@icann.org](mailto:robert.hoggarth@icann.org).

In terms of the latest news of where we are I've got two slides here just to give you some general perspective where we are on specific aspects of the GNSO implementation as it applies to those five main areas that I threw up earlier.

And those are that right now we have the stakeholder charters in place. As I mentioned we've got a structure now that focuses on these four major stakeholder groups. We've got the registry and the registrar stakeholder groups, then you have the commercial stakeholder group and the non-commercial stakeholder group.

And last July when the board approved the various charters of the stakeholder groups paving the way for the new council to be seated in the Seoul meeting the board approved only temporary or transitional charters for the non-contracted parties for the CSG and the NCSG.

And both those groups, the leadership in those communities are currently working on permanent charters that we hope will be submitted and approved by the board in the Cartagena meeting timeframe. That will provide some stable charters for those groups.

It's important to underscore that any organizational charter within the ICANN community is subject to the community revising it or changing it. But the significant thing that the board is looking for from the CSG and the NCSG is that they evolve from those transitional charters to their more stable, permanent, long-term charters.

There's also been some tremendous progress by the Work Teams particularly in the policy development arena on developing the new policy development process and developing the Working Group model for policy development.

The work product of both those teams are going to be discussed at the Brussels meeting and both those Work Teams has circulated to the community the latest work product, the best and brightest that they have developed up until now so there can be community discussions in Brussels about that.

And then of course as I mentioned when the GNSO council was seated, the new GNSO council in Seoul, there was an initial set of GNSO council operating procedures that continued to be refined and the Work Team responsible for those

efforts has presented a number of additional recommendations on things like voting (extensions), statements of interest that the GNSO council is going to be reviewing in the Brussels timeframe.

Additionally there's been substantial progress by a Work Team that is focused on constituency and stakeholder group operations. Their job as I mentioned earlier has been to establish some recommendations on membership and operational practices within the various constituencies and stakeholders.

And they've spent a tremendous amount of time really thinking hard about what some of those general parameters might be, what some of those general guidelines might be. And they just recently submitted their recommendations to the GNSOs operations steering committee. And depending upon the timing I think there will be certainly some discussions taking place in Brussels on that topic.

And then finally as I noted that there are efforts with respect to updating the GNSO council procedures. And then of course looking at the Brussels timeframe, the GNSO council looking at its new job of really acting as a coordinator and strategic manager of policy development.

They're going to be conducting their first work prioritization exercise in Brussels which would be their first real dynamic and substantive discussion about prioritizing the GNSO council's work.

So that'll be taking place in Brussels. We expect fully that the work will continue in the various stakeholder groups to develop their charters. And there continue to be various groups that are stepping forward in different context who are looking to form their own specific constituencies or interest groups. And we expect that those discussions will continue at the board level, at the community level and even within some of the various stakeholder groups as well.

So my final slide is just to once again encourage folks to continue to look at opportunities - either join and existing stakeholder group or constituency. On the NCSG side there's also the concept of interest groups. So there's a lot of activity and a lot of opportunities for people who are new to the community particularly if you all are having discussions with them.



There are still opportunities to work on the various Work Teams and so contacting Glen de Saint Géry, the GNSO secretary is a way to get involved in that.

And please, you know, check out the public comment page for some of these various Work Team recommendations. That's going to be an important area where we want to see a lot of community comment and review. There's been a lot of very tremendous bottom up work taking place there and it's going to be very important to get broader community input on that.

So I'm going to stop there. Marika I'll turn it over to you for some of the more substantive policy issues. And I'll stick around for Q&A at the end. Thanks a lot.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Rob. So we turn now to the Intra-Register Transfer Policy PDP. And as most of you are probably aware that the Intra-Register Transfer Policy known as IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004. The objective of the policy is to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation process of that policy it was decided to carry out a review of the policy to see whether it was actually working as intended, whether there were any issues that would need further clarification or improvement.

And as a result of this review a list of issues was identified that were then grouped together into five different policy development processes also known as PDPs that were titled (A2E) and are currently being addressed in a consecutive manner. A PDP Working Group has been considering the issues that are part of the so-called group B, hence the name the IRTP Part B PDP Working Group - (a whole mouth full).

So this group has been reviewing a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain name registration that has been inappropriately transferred either as a result of a hijacking or a conflict between the registrant and admin contact. And it has been reviewing whether a separate process or provisions should be introduced to address such instances. Furthermore the group has been discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

So this policy development process was initiated in June 2009 and based on the Working Group discussions, review of stakeholder group and constituency statements that were submitted and the first public comment period the Working Group has now published its initial report.

An initial report presents for each of the charter questions that the group was addressed to look into one or more preliminary conclusions and recommendations on which the Working Group is now looking for community input.

One recommendation for example relates to a proposed expedited transfer reversal policy that aims to address the question of urgent return in case of domain name hijacking.

Other recommendations look at a possible PDP on requiring (unintelligible) and there's also proposed new language for denial reason seven that's included in the current policy.

The Working Group will be organizing a public information and consultation session at the ICANN meeting in Brussels on Wednesday the 23rd of May from 4:00 to 5:30 local time during which the Working Group will present its report and solicit community feedback.

The Working Group will open a public comment period after the Brussels meeting on the 5th of July for a period of 20 days as required by the ICANN bylaws. And following that the Working Group will review the comments received and continue it's deliberations in an aim to deliver a final report and agree on - reach consensus on the different recommendations.

So even though this Working Group is well on their way new members are always welcome although you might want to hold out for one of the upcoming IRT, PDPs that will address issues such as - related to to dispute policy enhancements, a penalty for IRTP violations and operational rule enhancements. And in addition you'll find on this slide some links to background documents as the initial report and further info on the session in Brussels.

So moving on to a second GNSO policy development process that's underway which deals with post-expiration domain name recovery. So this is an issue that was brought to the GNSO by the At-Large Advisory Committee which raised a number of questions in relation to the predictability and transparency of existing expiration and renewal policies and practices.

In addition to those issues the Working Group has also been 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?

So this Working Group has also just published its initial report. This report contains amongst others the results of a registrar survey in which renewal and expiration practices of the top ten registrars - gTLD registrars were reviewed.

The survey found that there is a lot of variation amongst registrars in relation to renewal and expiration related practices. So part of the Working Group discussions have focused on this question whether this variation is desirable or not or in which cases it might be appropriate and in which cases predictability might be the preferred option.

The report also includes a summary of the Working Group deliberations, information provided by ICANN compliance staff on the number of complaints received in relation to these kind of issues and orders that have been carried out in relation to the existing Expired Domain Deletion Policy or EDDP.

And as on most of the issues relating to the charter questions there have been very different opinions and in order to deal with that the Working Group decided to carry out a survey amongst it's own membership in order to try to assess possible options for further consideration.

So the initial report also contains the results of this survey. And in some cases you can see there is a very clear picture of the possible approach forward that might get consensus from the Working Group. But there are other instances where you'll see that options are very divided.

Part of the reason of putting out this initial report is that the Working Group hopes that the community will provide its input on these different questions as part of the public comment period that will be initiated following the ICANN meeting in Brussels, or the session that will be held in Brussels, so the group can take that into account when continuing its deliberations in the second phase.

As you'll see here the session - the post-expiration domain name recovery session will take place in Brussels on Thursday the 24th of June from 9:30 to 11:00 local time. And again on this slide you'll find some further information on where to find additional information including a link to the initial report.

So next up is the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group. So the issue that was an issue brought to the GNSO Council was 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 role of ICANN was questioned, what role should ICANN have in addressing registration abuse and what issues if any actually fall within the scope of GNSO policy development?

So in response to those questions the GNSO Council tasked a pre-PDP Working Group -- so please know this is not a Policy Development Process Working Group as are the previous two groups -- which was tasked to gather further information on issues such as what is the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse as distinguishing those two is very important in the context of which issues can you develop consensus policies and which issues you cannot.

What is the effectiveness existing abuse policies? And would there be any benefit of having more uniform provisions in registry and/or registrar agreements in relation to abuse? As you can imagine these were not simple questions to answer. And the Working Group quite extensive deliberations and made use of a number of subteams to conduct some of the leg work to get to conclusions on these different items.

So in February of this year the Working Group published an initial report and conducted a public comment forum. And following review and analysis of these

comments the Working Group updated the report accordingly and published its final report on the 29th of May and submitted it to the GNSO council for its consideration.

So the report itself consists of around 125 pages so it's quite a substantial document. The report details the deliberations and findings of the Working Group on the different issues and provides a detailed overview and description. But much of the information serves as actual background to the focal point of the report which are the recommendations that are now being put forward for the GNSO Council to consider.

The recommendations included relate to issues such as cyber squatting, there is a recommendation there to initiate a PDP to review the Uniform Dispute Resolution Process also known as UDRP, a recommendation relating to WHOIS access, there is a recommendation to request for other information from ICANN compliance on this issue.

There's a recommendation for development of best practices in relation to malicious use of domain names, further monitoring and research is recommended in relation to what the group has titled a Cross TLD Registration Scam, possible enforcement action is recommended in relation to fake renewal notices.

On some of the issues such as uniformity of contracts there is actually a split recommendations where some in the Working Group recommend the initiation of a PDP on the minimum baseline for registration abuse provisions and others actually disagree with the initiation of a PDP.

In addition there are some recommendations that relate to more uniformity and structured approach in relation to reporting and development of best practices.

And at this point in time the Working Group does not recommend in any further action in relation to issues such as front running, domain kiting and deceptive names.

So I said this report has now been submitted to the GNSO council and it is for the council to consider which recommendations it will adopt and what further action it will take on these different recommendations.

There is a presentation (unintelligible) to the GNSO council on Sunday the 20 of June starting at quarter past 10 local time. So for those that are interested to get a more detailed overview and discussion of the report are welcome to attend. You also find here a link to the final report.

And that's it I think for my issues and I'll hand it over to Margie. And I also remain available until the end of the call for further questions or you can put them in the chat and I'm happy to try and answer them.

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika. This is Margie and I'm going to talk to you two issues that I am actively supporting. The first on relates to vertical integration between registrars and registries.

In the GNSO council they've started a policy development process, a PDP to analyze whether there should be rules or restrictions regarding whether a registrar can own a registry or a registry can own a registrar. And if so whether there would be additional rules that would apply to that.

This PDP process got underway this year and is on an expedited track. The reason for this is that as many of you know the new gTLD program is currently underway and a lot of the issues that the PDP Working Group is dealing with directly affects the new gTLD program.

As the new program is being launched there's the expectation there there will be new models of distribution proposed for the new gTLDs such that there may be situations where a registry might want to own a registrar or vice versa and these issues have never been formally analyzed by the GNSO council.

There is no prior policy recommendation with respect to this issue. The current practice really arises out of the contractual relationship between ICANN and the various registries. And this issue is important to the community because it affects not just the new gTLD program that is currently being launched but it also affects the existing gTLDs.

And so the question before the Working Group is whether there should be uniform rules, what the rules should be. And this work as you can imagine has gotten a lot of

attention in the community. The Working Group consists of about 60 or 70 participants from all over the world, many stakeholders and is very actively involved in pursuing this issue.

Recently there's been a lot of activity with respect to vertical integration and this has affected the pace of the work of the Working Group. The Working Group is trying to reach conclusions on some of these issues quickly so that there can be a consensus position developed before the launch of the first round of applications for the new gTLD program.

In the Nairobi meeting many of you know that the ICANN board adopted a resolution regarding the vertical integration issue essentially stating that ICANN will require strict separation between registrars and registries and that there can be no co-ownership.

This resolution has been put into implementation in the proposals that are proposed in the applicant guidebook that was just posted recently before the Brussels meeting.

And so the short-term goal of this Working Group really is to see if they can come up with a consensus quickly before the final applicant guidebook is published. Because then they can affect the model that goes forward when the new gTLD program is launched.

The Working Group will also work on long-term rules and the policy development for new gTLDs and existing gTLDs after the initial round. But the initial amount of work is really focused on the first round of applications.

And if you're interested in this issue we have a lot of activity going on in the Brussels meeting. There will be an informational session on Wednesday, June 23 and there you will be able to hear from the members of the Working Group to tell you the progress they've made on whether a consensus position has been reached.

If you're interested in the implementation that's been proposed in the draft applicant guidebook we encourage you to comment in the draft applicant guidebook public forum which is currently open until July 21.

And then as the PDP Working Group continues its work and develops its preliminary report and initial report you should participate as well in providing comments in the public comment period's when those reports are published.

The next issue we have is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement which is referred to as the RAA. The background on this issue is that as many of you know the RAA is rarely updated and was recently updated last in 2009.

And as part of the adoption of the 2009 form of RAA the GNSO council formed a Working Group with the at large community to see if there could be additional amendments explored and additional improvements to the registrar accreditation agreements through the delivery of something that was called a registrant rights and obligations charter.

And the idea being that registrants sometimes do not have familiarity with the registrar accreditation agreement and would like to have a simple place to be able to identify all rights and obligations that arise through the registrar accreditation agreement.

So this drafting team worked for approximately a year and they worked on several aspects. They recently published their report. One of the recommendations in the report is a form of a registrar rights and obligations charter. And this document outlines the terms within the RAA that deal with rights and obligations that relate to a registration.

There's also a section of the report that deals with topics with additional amendments to the RAA. And this topic has been - has received a lot of interest in the community. The drafting team received recommendations for amendments from various stakeholders such as the law enforcement community, the intellectual property constituency and others.

And there are recommendations within the report that deal with whether ICANN can achieve better compliance through additional tools that could be incorporated in the RAA. There's consideration for protection for registrants and there's suggestions for more security requirements to enhance the security and stability of the Internet.



So if you look at the report you'll see the form of the registrant rights and responsibilities charter that is proposed in - from the Working Group. There's also a list of high priority amendment topics that the drafting team suggests to be further analyzed in order to produce a new form of RAA.

And there's also a section of the report that deals with suggestions on procedures for taking these amendment topics and producing a new form of RAA.

If you're interested in this topic we invite you to participate in the public forum or the comment forum on the initial report. It's open until July 9 and I've provided you a link on the slide. And also there will be a special session on Monday, June 21 in Brussels where members of the law enforcement community and members of the drafting team will talk to you about some of the amendment suggestions and how they might help enhance the community's ability to react to instances of cyber crime and malicious conduct involving the DNF.

And with that I will turn to Liz Gasster who will talk to you about WHOIS studies.

Liz Gasster:

Good day everyone, Liz here. As you know the GNSO council has been looking at WHOIS studies for quite some time now. This is because WHOIS policy as you know has been debated for many years and there is concern about WHOIS accuracy, there is concern about whether WHOIS provides sufficient privacy for individuals, there is concern about some of the technical limitations of WHOIS.

And so this has really stimulated the council's desire to have fact-based studies to help move policy discussions along. So in early 2009 the council identified five broad WHOIS study areas that reflect these policy areas of concern and asked staff to determine the cost and feasibility for each. And then following our obtaining of that information the council and staff would then decide which studies should be conducted.

So staff has basically taken up these five broad WHOIS study areas to do this investigation. And the rest of my report today just updates you on where those studies - investigation of initiating those studies stands. Keep in mind that no studies have been initiated to date.

So the first area that the council asked us to look into is WHOIS misuse, the possibility that public WHOIS significantly increases harmful acts and also to study the affects of anti-harvesting measures and how effective they are in reducing access to WHOIS for harmful purposes.

So there are really two studies involved here. One is a experimental study that would measure a variety of acts aimed at WHOIS published versus unpublished test addresses that we would create. And the other is more of a survey that would survey both registrants, registrars and research law enforcement organizations about past acts.

And we have done an analysis of this. The analysis was produced on the 23rd of March. We determined that it would cost about \$150,000 to do this study and that the study would be useful for counting and categorizing harmful acts attributed to WHOIS and would probably be useful to show that data was probably not obtained from other sources. But it also may have some limitations in terms of being able to assess whether the misuse is significant or not.

And this is described further in an analysis paper that's available online and the resources are available at the end of my presentation. And you may want to look in more detail at that analysis for details on staff's view of that misuse study.

The second area looks at identification of registrants. How do registrants identify themselves in WHOIS? And to what extent are domains registered by businesses or used for commercial purposes that are not clearly identified as such in WHOIS? And also the extent to which they might be related to the use of proxy and privacy services. So perhaps the identity is obscured or suggest the registry is a non-commercial entity.

So again staff did a feasibility analysis of - and cost analysis of this study with the help of an RFP approach where I think we got five responses back for this study and estimated that it too would cost about \$150,000. And we think this study would be useful in providing insight on why some registrants are not clearly identified and the frequency of use of proxy and privacy services by businesses. Once again there is this 23rd of March report that goes into more detail in terms of our analysis on this study.

There are two studies related to proxy and privacy services. We started out actually lumping these together. One that we're calling a privacy and proxy abuse study and one that we're calling a privacy and proxy reveal study that I'll get to in just a minute.

We have separated them now for purposes of soliciting responses to RFPs, because they're really quite distinct in terms of the approach that would be used by potential researchers to execute these studies.

But the policy and privacy abuse study would really focus on the relationship between the use of proxies and abuse and study a broad sample of the domains associated with many types of acts and compare the overall frequency of use of proxy and privacy registrations with the frequency of proxy and privacy registrations related to abuse.

We did post an RFP on the 18th of May to solicit costs and feasibility from interested, independent researchers. The due date for responses to that RFP is the 20th of July . And if you'd like to see the details of the terms of reference for that RFP they're posted on ICANN's Web site and there's a link again in the back of my presentation.

I mentioned that there's a separate privacy and proxy services reveal study. This is intended to look at how proxy and privacy service respond to information requests.

We are working on the RFP for this study. In some ways this is probably the most challenging study to design. And so we are estimating that an RFP would be released on this study in the July timeframe, possibly a little later but we are actively working on the development of the RFP for that now.

There was also a study that had been proposed that the council asked staff to look into that would involve a technical analysis of how various client side software displays non-ASCII registration information. This study is on hold pending the work of the (SSAC) GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group.

The IRD Working Group will be sharing some preliminary ideas in Brussels the Thursday am local time slot. And I'm sorry to mention that I just lost Internet connectivity so if someone could just switch - on the presenter list could switch to my

next slide please. I live in a remote area and my Internet connection is sometimes spotty. So I apologize that I will need someone else to advance the slide on my team.

And while that person is hopefully advancing the slide I'll talk about the fifth area of the study which is the WHOIS service requirements request that was requested by the GNSO council actually in May of 2009. It's quite a different type of study in that it was intended to be a inventory of possible service requirements based on current service requirements and previous policy discussions.

The staff generated a first draft of this presentation on the 26th of March - and again I apologize for my technical problems remotely. We produced that report on the 26th of March and solicited views from the SOs and ACs which was requested of us in the original motion that following release of a draft report we consult with the SOs and ACs to get their input.

Thankfully my Internet is resorted now so I'll hopefully be able to manage the deck from here. I'd like to give you a quick example of what that - the list of what the compilation includes. You'll see a list of items on the slide there which I won't read, just the first one perhaps, mechanism to find authoritative WHOIS servers, structured queries. These are just examples of the types of requirements or potential new requirements that this compilation includes.

So we did get feedback from - some input from the community in particular from the registry constituency, from the ALAC and from a group of technical experts and then some individual input as well.

And we have produced what we're calling a draft final report on the 31st of May. We didn't want to actually finalize it until after the discussion that we're having in Brussels in case there were additional inputs that people wanted to provide. So we will be generating an actual final report following Brussels.

And then in terms of next steps I do want to mention that the council in - GNSO council in April approved a motion that was forwarded to ICANN requesting funding in the fiscal year 2011 budget framework of \$400,000 for WHOIS studies. At the moment the current draft budget does include that funding -- the budget as of the 17th of May. So that is in the budget for board approval in June.

The council is discussing now which studies to do and the RFP's as I mentioned on remaining studies are underway. And the service requirements work the council will also be discussing that report. And of course discussions continue also in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group as well.

For more information on the pending RFP's, the previous RFP's, all of staff's analysis and copies of the report the link is there. And again I'm happy to answer any question, comments at the end of this presentation. Thank you. And I'd like to turn it over now to Bart Boswinkel.

Bart Boswinkel: Good afternoon. This is Bart Boswinkel. We'll now go into quite some - another area. This is activities related to the ccTLD community and what's happening in the ccNSO. I just want to draw your attention to the two main policy related activities that can't be undertaken by the ccTLD community. That's IDN - the introduction of IDN ccTLDs and the delectation, redelegation.

As my colleagues of the - said the GNSO - support the GNSO have been telling you about the improvements of the GNSO I want to take you briefly to what is happening on roles and responsibilities and improvement of the ccNSO itself. This is an internally different process. And I want to touch briefly on other activities of the ccNSO - internationalized domain names or the internationalized domain names country code policy development process.

Their - IDN ccPDP has in fact two purposes: One is the introduction - or to recommend to the ICANN board a policy for the introduction that is the selection delegation of IDN ccTLDs. And the second component of that policy development is to change the structure of the ccNSO to include IDN ccTLD managers. I will briefly touch upon these two subjects.

The first one, the overall policy. In order to understand this and to relate this to the fast track you should keep in the back of your mind that the fast track is just a temporary solution. And fortunately four IDN ccTLDs under the fast track have already been delegated by the board and as I understand some are most are still in the process and I've sent in the applications. But this is a temporary solution. The IDN ccPDP is to develop an overall policy for the introduction of IDN ccTLDs.

So what has happened recently after the Nairobi meeting the - we received comments and we compiled a comparison of these comments and the chair's interim report. And based on these comments there is a very critical point under debate by the Working Group which will be discussed probably at the Brussels meeting as well. And it focuses on the question whether or not to include Latin scripted IDN ccTLD strings.

So - because there are two reasons, or there are a couple of reasons why people - or members of the Working Group think they should be included. It is first for discrimination purposes. If you would have non-Latin script IDN ccTLDs it is - it's not clear why Latin script IDN ccTLDs should be excluded. And a second reason was - is the - to maintain the distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

Until recently the idea was that under the new GTLD process a country name would support all the government could be applied for. If you look at the new draft guidebook this has been excluded under certain circumstances. So that is - these were the two reasons why this is debated.

If you look at what is happening right now there is a proposal to include Latin script IDN TLD strings or ccTLD strings based on the assumption that the string should contain at least one non-ASCII character. And this definition or this movement is based on the definitions in the IDNA-bis protocols. The Working Group hopes to propose a next draft report by the time - by next week before the Brussels meeting.

One of the open issues which hasn't been addressed yet is the whole issue of variant management. So if you have non-ASCII characters in an IDN table some characters might be - look confusingly similar and there needs to be some rules in place how to deal with them.

The issue of variant management has not been resolved in the technical community. And it is the view of the Working Group that the - a policy should not be recommended or not even proposed at this stage while the technical solutions have not been completely defined at this stage.

So with regard to the structure of the ccNSO again one needs to keep in mind the ccNSO was established in 2003 At that time there were only - IDN ccTLDs were not

considered and one of the fundamental design rules is - of the ccNSO is one ccTLD per country/territory.

Now with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs this will change. In some cases you will have just one ccTLD per territory because they will not apply for an IDN ccTLDs and on the other extreme you will have maybe 22 ccTLDs or including IDN ccTLDs per country. For instance this is potentially the case for India. And so the ccNSO as it is based on one vote per territory needs to be restructured in order to take into account these - the changed environment.

Another reason is if you look at who can be member or who can become member of the ccNSO the definition is too limited. So it is - yeah, that needs to be updated as well to include IDN ccTLDs.

The discussion of IDN ccTLDs again will be one of the major focal points of the ccNSO meeting. In this case there will be a workshop on Monday afternoon and you are more than welcome to participate at those discussions.

A second point for - which draws major attention of the ccTLD community is the delegation, redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs. Now delegation, redelegation, retirement of ccTLDs is fundamental through them -- the policies. And - because unlike gTLDs in principle there is no contractual arrangement.

There are some exceptions. In principle ccTLDs can enter into a voluntary arrangement and these voluntary arrangement do not deal with redelegation issues or changing of manager or even the retirement of a ccTLD. So this is purely policy driven or mainly policy driven.

Now the work of this Working Group commenced almost a year ago and in the last couple of months they really made some progress. One of the difficulties they needed to overcome and this is in the first progress report leading up to the Nairobi meeting is the policies are not clearly documented. There is no authoritative source at least not identified by the Working Group on the different policies for delegation, redelegation and retirement and so the Working Group had to look into other sources.

What has been done by the working group is they've devised a methodology to look into these different sources for delegation, redelegation and retirement. There are three documents which are very relevant. One is the (RFC 1591) which is a document going back to 1994.

The second one is ICP-1 which is an Internet - or an ICANN document which - goes back to '99 and this third document is the so-called (GAP) principals on the delegation, redelegation. The first version was produced in 2000 and the second version was produced in 2005. And looking at these documents it is unclear which one is authoritative and even depending who you talk to it's changing over time.

So the Working Group had to decide on another - or included these documents and looked at and compared them. And they looked at the board resolutions and some of the (IANA) reports relating to delegation, redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs and identified a whole set of issues.

In order to classify these issues they developed a methodology and based on that methodology they've identified what they called 16 interesting or possibly interesting issues. Why is it interesting? Because based on those issues they will get back to the council to possibly recommend a PDP on delegation and redelegation.

In the - say leading up to the Brussels meeting the second progress report with a full description of the methodology will be produced and ready for discussion at the Brussels meeting. And at the same time a full analysis document will be published for public comment. This document is over 100 pages so the Working Group doesn't expect the normal window of a month for public comments. So the public comment period will remain open until mid-September.

How do you get involved in the whole discussion about delegation, redelegation if you're interested? First of all of course participate in the public comment period -- this will be announced, and participate in the public sessions at the Brussels meeting. The ccNSO meeting will dedicate 1-1/2 hour slot on Tuesday afternoon to discuss this item.



And there is some background materials and the progress report - the second progress report and the public comment report will be published either by the end of this week, early next week.

The third topic which is not so much dealing with policy development is more about the internal workings of the ccNSO and is to illustrate the different activities of the ccNSO.

The ccNSO itself as I just said is established in - was established in 2003 and it consists of ccNSO members and council. And what is again - what was one of the major features is that non-members in particular ccTLD managers participate in the meetings as well. So currently the ccNSO has 105 - 106 members and other non-ccTLD managers - or non-members but ccTLD managers participate as well.

At the time the ccNSO was established there were some internal rules but they never were designed and these processes were never established to deal with the number of members we have right now and with the number of activities. And probably as within the GNSO and the at large and other advisory committees you can see an increasing work load and an increasing complexity of issues. And again the ccNSO in one way or the other has to deal with this as well.

And so what has been done until now to cope with this, there was a council meeting in Nairobi where some of the issues and topics were identified that needed to be discussed more in depth with council members and members and non-members of the ccNSO. And particularly the - how to deal with the increasing work load and the duration of some of the projects.

To distinguish - one needs to distinguish here between say the ccTLD focused projects and the more cross constituency projects like IDN ccTLDs or the introduction of IDN ccTLDs, the selection of one character IDN TLDs, variant management, et cetera, et cetera.

And from another perspective there is clearly a need to increase the number of active participants. Although the ccNSO has 106 members it's only a small group of those 106 members which for different reason participate actively in the ccNSO and it's Working Group's.

So what will happen next, the council will have again a follow up workshop which is closed at the Brussels meeting. And there will be a members meeting on Wednesday afternoon to include the members and their views in improving the quality of the ccNSO.

How can you participate in these sessions? And probably the ccNSO members would like to learn from the experience people have in the GNSO and the GNSO improvement process. You can participate at the open session on Wednesday morning, 27th of June. And there is a summary of the council - as background material there is the summary of the council workshop in Nairobi available on the slides.

And other ccNSO Working Groups, other ccNSO activities. Maybe most of you know that the purpose of the ccNSO is not just to develop and propose policies to the ICANN board. It has a far broader (remedies) to share or to offer a platform for information sharing with ccTLDs among each other and to liaise between the difference - to liaise with the different SOs and ACs and to inform the other SOs and ACs about ccTLD issues. And vice versa that the ccTLD community is aware of issues in the other SOs, ACs as well.

The ccNSO organizes it's activities in Working Groups and so I just want to take you through some of these Working Groups and what their focus point is. And most of them will meet during the Brussels meeting.

So there is - this is a standing Working Group, the Technical Working Group. Its purpose is to facilitate the sharing of operational technical information among the ccTLD community members and those who are engaged in the ccTLD community. The Technical Working Group organizes these meetings on Monday. And some of you may have participated in one of those meetings.

A second working group which is what is called the Instant Response Planning Working Group. This one was established after the Conficker incident and as a result of the need for the ccTLDs to have a trusted channel of communication among each other.

And over time this Working Group will coordinate the input from the ccTLD committee to the - on the DNS-CERT initiatives as well because there is in their view a close - or in the view of the ccTLD community a close relation between, say, having a coordinated channel to respond on incidents and the DNS-CERT initiative.

A third one which is the (ADHOC) - a third example is the (ADHOC) Wildcard Study Group. This was established at the request of the board to look - and at the ccNSO council. Hopefully this Working Group will produce its final report at the Brussels meeting and then will be closed.

The purpose of this Working Group was to - first of all to share the asset and ICANN staff reports among the ccTLD community and to summarize it. But secondly is to solicit the views of the ccTLDs who are engaged in wildcarding. And they organized the presentation at Nairobi and they will include some of the use cases for wildcarding in the final report and note that some of the ccTLDs were using wildcarding after entering into a dialogue will have - stop using wildcards.

Other Working Groups. The ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group. This Working Group will organize a session as well at the Brussels meeting. This session will be focused on the - on soliciting the views of the ccTLD community on what they consider to be the strategic issues from a global perspective.

So focused I'd say what the ccNSO could do and what the - what ICANN could do. This session was already organized a year ago at the Sidney meeting and the SOP Working Group - since it's important that the ccTLD community remains to be involved in the strategic planning processes of ICANN and of the ccNSO as well.

Finally one of the ICANN - one of the topics that will be discussed as well at the Brussels meeting is the independent review report by the reviewers of the independent review of the ccNSO itself. Again this will be on Wednesday.

That's all for me. And now I hand it over to Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Bart and hello everybody. Time to focus on the last end of the ICANN name, notably numbers by which we mean IP addresses and autonomous

system numbers. And they certainly need policies as well for allocation of blocks of such.

And that's the area of the ASO - Address Supporting Organization which is a rather particular organization because it relies heavily on other organizations outside ICANN in the limited sense and those are the RIRs - Regional Internet Registries.

Regional Internet Registries typically receive huge address blocks from the IANA function of ICANN. In the case of IPV-4 it's so-called slash 8 - 16 million addresses in one go which they then in turn distribute in smaller chunks to the ISPs. And one ISP near you will receive one and hand it out in smaller pieces to the end customers like you. So that's the supply chain, if you like.

And there are five such Regional Internet Registries. AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC is (unintelligible) for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North American and the Caribbean, LACNIC for Latin America and the larger part of the Caribbean and finally RIPE for Europe and the Middle East.

Now these are the important pillars of the IASO. They also cooperate in a particular organization, the NRO - the Number Resource Organization. And here comes the ingenious structure of the IASO because the IASO is actually a memorandum of understanding that is set up between ICANN and the NRO and the RIRs and it - and those, the NRO with the role of fulfilling the ASO function. Easy isn't it?

Now when it comes to policy one major task of the ASO is to handle global policy proposals. Now that sounds very grand but it has a very particular meaning here. A global policy is a very rare occurrence indeed because the Regional Internet Registries they develop a lot of regional addressing policies for their distribution to the ISPs, local Internet registries, national Internet registries or what they may be called.

And only very few policies affect IANAs allocation to the RIRs and only those are called global policies. So there may be policies that are exactly identical across all the RIRs but they are not called global policies, they are called globally coordinated policies.

So if I've confused you sufficiently with that let's go straight to what's on the table within the Address Supporting Organization right now. There are two global policy proposals in the pipeline, one for Autonomous System Numbers, ASMs and the other for recovered IPV-4 address space.

ASMs to start with. Well what is that? It's what the ISPs are using for bunk traffic - called the motorway traffic in the IP addressing world. So shorter numbers than the IP addresses it used to be but they are getting fewer and more scarce. So there is a transition from 16 byte such numbers to 32 byte such numbers already under way.

And there is a policy for it but due to some complexities with the legal systems that needed updating, well there's been a proposal to defer the full transition to (such two) bytes with one year. And well that was sort of a very small change but important change and current status is that all the RIRs have agreed on the text and formally adopted it.

Which means that the next step is that the proposal is reviewed by the NRO and the ASO Address Council verifying that all the procedures have been followed. And then it's forwarded quite simply to the ICANN board for ratification within a determined number of days and then subsequent implementation by IANA.

So that one has - is very much on the home stretch. It's a wholly different situation for the recovered IPV-4 policy proposal which actually is intended to address the situation post-exhaustion of IPV-4 addresses. You may know that we have only got in the IANA stock 16 slash 8 blocks and they will last for around about two years. And then it's a matter of how could IANA handle address blocks that was returned to them.

And the current status of that proposal is that it is in a deadlock. Two different proposal texts have emerged but they differ. And they have been adopted in different RIRs but they differ on whether one aspect should be mandatory or not.

So the main issue on that one today is whether the two versions can be consolidated to a joint global policy proposal or not. Which it seems right now the discussions underway is rather leaning towards relaunching a new policy proposal excluding the

particular regional element that became a sticking point. So you maybe see a revival of this one but that's really what's on the table right now.

So if you're really interested in addressing policies well, there is just one advice is can give and that is to participate in the bottom up policy development in your RIR in that particular region you happen to be. Because they all conduct open meetings regularly, multiple times per year where the policy proposals are discussed. And they all have open mailing lists for such matters as well.

And if you come to the Brussels meetings you should be aware that the ASO Address Council will meet in Brussels at a meeting venue on Tuesday the 22nd. So that's an opportunity to see them in the flesh - the tenors and sopranos of this particular choir.

And with that I conclude from my side and I hand it over to Scott Pinzon.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you Olof. Good day to everyone. Just a few quick notes on how you can remain informed now that you heard the latest on all these issues and then we'll get to your questions.

I think most of you may be familiar that once a month we put out the policy update which gives the latest on virtually every Working Group that is operating in the ICANN world. It's available in several languages so be sure to check that out if you'd like to know month to month what's happening.

Fewer of you might be aware that we now have a Podcast. This is designed primarily for people who are new to the ICANN community and cannot parse all these acronyms and all this jargon. In that case you can listen to ICANN Start and what we do in each one of those is take one issue and answer very basic questions about it so you can get oriented and then understand the ongoing conversation.

There is a new episode every month and each episode is also transcribed. So whether you prefer to listen while you're on the go or read it so you can take in the information faster we serve you both ways. The URL is presented there, you can also find it in many of the iTunes stores across the world by entering the Podcast section and searching on ICANN Start.

We just wanted to mention that this was brought to you by policy staff and we come from all around the world. You see a lot of the U.S. represented in the slide but there's a person from Geneva in there and - whoops I've lost a slide somewhere but representing you from all continents basically.

Finally we're very sincerely interested in making these presentations useful to you. And this time we have managed to use some of Connects rather humble polling features and we're going to post a survey as this Webinar ends and we'd really like to have you fill it out.

The responses are anonymous but the results will help us to shape future Webinars to be better. Since we are going to do this before every international meeting we would like to continuously improve it so it's useful for you. So if you can please stick around and fill out the poll.

And at this point we will open the floor to any questions. You can ask your question by clicking on the raised hand icon in the lower-left screen or you can enter it in the chat box. Thank you. I think I can see some of you are filling out the survey, we appreciate it.

One question has arisen. Can the community get other languages for the policy update? And Portuguese is particularly requested. I can look into that for you (Cheryl). At this point as we end the fiscal year at ICANN the budget is extremely tight but there is a desire to eventually be able to work most of the policy items in 11 UN languages.

So it is on the agenda to try to move that into some of these other languages. Unfortunately I cannot tell you a specific time when it will happen. But your request is noted and the more you can get the at large people to request languages, the more we can build the case to the budget people that it's necessary. So please feel free to have them write policy-staff at [icann.org](mailto:icann.org) and make language requests.

Are there any further questions? One of the questions that's come up is how do you submit the survey? That puzzled me too but it's set up so that as soon as you check options it submits itself. So you won't see a submit button. But once you click a response it will take it.

Marika Konings: Scott this is Marika can I maybe answer another question that appeared in the chat? Steve DelBianco was asking if staff provides a similar briefing to the ccNSO.

I just want to note that this invitation to this Webinar has been sent to all the different communities within ICANN. So also to the ccNSO community. So this is open to everyone to join. And I think you should look at the list on the left-hand side we do have representatives from different parts of the community.

So - and later tonight we'll run another session to make sure that we as well can cover a broad range of time zones to make sure everyone has an opportunity to listen to this presentation. And I said before a recording will be made available so even those that cannot attend the session will be able to listen to it afterwards and look at the slides after this session.

Liz Gasster: And this is Liz for anyone who responded mostly understandable and clear if there's anything we can do to make things very understandable and clear - if we are speaking too quickly or any other suggestions to make things more clear we'd welcome them. Thanks.

Scott Pinzon: This is Scott again. We will allow a few more minutes for completing the survey. We have one question outstanding. Let's see - no, Marika answered that. So...

Liz Gasster: I may have (unintelligible) in the (unintelligible).

Scott Pinzon: All right. (Sebastian) the floor is yours.

(Sebastian): Yes. I guess I am mute. Oh, you can hear me.

Scott Pinzon: Yes.

(Sebastian): Okay. Thank you. Just to use the (tool) allow to us but I want to come back to the question of internationalization and translation. I think we need as a community to think about which element we need to have in translation and which element we need to have in interpretation.

And I think that this type of Webinar here what - who gives another view of what is happening within ICANN it's one of the most important one to be interpreted in



various language. Because it's will allow - as it's clear, it's summary it will allow more people to be aware of what's happening within ICANN and I think it could be a very good way to go further.

And I don't want you to tell me about the budget. We can find a way for budget decrease some area and increase in some area and this one is very important.  
Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you (Sebastian). Definitely a point well received. Before we go I want to let everyone know that this presentation will be given again 4-1/2 hours from now whatever your local time is. If you know someone that you wished had heard it you can refer them to it. Or if you'd like to hear it again you're certainly welcome to. It'll be the same Connect URL.

All right. Hearing no further questions, I see no other hands raised so we're going to formally end the meeting at this time. Thank you u very much for your participation and we look forward to encountering you on the other lists and around in the ICANN community.

Thank you very much. Have a good day or good evening.

Man: Thank you.

END