Pre-London Policy Update Webinar
12 June 2014
First session: 10:00 UTC

David Olive: Thank you. I would like to welcome everyone to our Policy Update Webinar today, June 12. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development Support at ICANN.

And as many of you know on the call we, from the policy development staff, hold our webinars before all ICANN meetings to provide a preview of some of the work both policy development, advisory and other related activities.

At of course the ICANN meetings you are very busy and we are also supporting that. In Singapore we were supporting some 140 sessions from the various supporting organizations and advisory committees which gives you an indication of the activities you're involved with and so we're happy to present this webinar to you today.

Just some brief housekeeping matters, you will be able to ask questions in the chat and that way you can present them and we'll try to answer them in turn. And at the end of the Webinar we'll also open the line so you can have questions and answers as well so that's two opportunities for you to do that.

Today our focus of course is on the activities at ICANN 50 in London. There of course will be many sessions but here are a few to highlight talking about and discussing the ICANN accountability process as well as the transition from the NTIA stewardship of IANA functions. There will be a high level

governmental meeting along with the GAC on Monday, a big summit called ATLAS 2 for the At Large group, and the commonwealth DNS program will be there as well.

On Monday, as always, we have our welcome ceremony. Tuesday is an important day when all the stakeholders and constituencies are meeting together as well as exchanging ideas and questions with the Board of Directors. The gala is of course on Wednesday. And we'll have a public forum and Board meeting in Thursday of the ICANN week.

Let me briefly go into some details of policy development at ICANN and quickly policy recommendations are formed and refined by the ICANN community through your work using the supporting organizations and influence by of course the advisory committees all comprised of volunteers from many countries and territories in our bottom up open and transparent process.

Each of the supporting organizations has their own specific process to conduct a policy development or policy advisory and these are of course outlined in our ICANN bylaws. We're very happy that we will be highlighting some of these on our teleconference today.

I also like to show this infographic which talks about some of our policy development aspects within the larger work of ICANN but also some of the coordination functions, the contractual compliance functions and the operations functions that are also part of ICANN's activities.

The goal of this webinar is of course to update you on current work that will be happening in London and encourage your participation either if you're going to be there in person or through the remote participation and of course that's also available and we encourage you to do it that way if you cannot physically be with us in London.

We'll review the issues. We'll also talk about some upcoming initiatives and opportunities for you to provide your comments and input. We'll answer some questions. And of course the webinar will be hashtagged as presented here.

Topics covered in this particular session we'll be looking at first the Generic Name Supporting Organization and some of the main issues that they have been - and are discussing at the ICANN meeting and in between sessions on their teleconferences are listed here in the program.

We'll also be having update from the Country Code Supporting Organization and some of their topics of discussion. Also at ICANN 50 our Address Supporting Organization will be meeting and some of their activities as well as the Root Server Systems Advisory Committee will also be holding sessions including a public session on Monday for people to learn more about their activities.

Other advisory committees are meeting; obviously the Security and Stability Advisory Committee including some of their recent studies will be presented at the ICANN meeting. We talked about the Government Advisory Committee including the high level governmental ministerial meeting and we'll hear more about that.

And finally the big activity of the At Large group will be their summit and we'll have a bit of background for you on that as well. I now turn it over to my colleague, Marika Konings, to talk about GNSO policy issues. Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, David. Hello everyone. Thank you for joining us today. And as David said, my name is Marika Konings and I'm based in the ICANN office in Brussels. I'm the Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO, or Generic Name Supporting Organization, which is also being referred to.

So we'll first be focusing on some of the topics that are currently under discussion in the GNSO. As we only have limited time on the Webinar today we've decided to focus our contribution on those items where there is either a milestone imminent, an opportunity to provide input or a call for volunteers that is open or will open shortly; noting that we currently have over 15 projects active and underway.

At the end of our overview we'll also provide a brief update on those activities where there's no imminent milestone but for which you can expect an update or a milestone in the near future so will look at that at the end of our slide deck.

But first I'll hand it over to my colleague, Lars Hoffman, who will be talking to about the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Marika. And hello everybody. My name is Lars Hoffman and among one or two other things I support the IRTP Part D Working Group. The IRTP or Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, is a consensus policy that dates back to 2004. It provides a straight forward mechanism to transfer domain names from one registrar to another. And the policy is currently under review and has been for a while. And this Part D is supposed to be the final round of revisions.

Although few perceive the IRTP as the GNSO most exciting policy inter-registrar transfers are in fact still the number one area of consumer complaints received for ICANN compliance underlining that despite (unintelligible) it is clearly a very important consensus policy if not very exciting.

Oh did I go one too far? Yes, sorry. The IRTP Part D Working Group is chartered to address six specific questions. These address a variety of issues such as reporting requirements for registrars, the accessibility of the transfer dispute resolution policy, or TDRP, the question over the continued need for

forms of authorization, FOAs, for short, as part of the transfer procedure, and also penalty structures in case of noncompliant registrars.

The working group published its initial report in March this year and it's been out for public comment and in fact the reply period closed last April, just a few weeks ago. And the working group received four rather detailed comments.

Although most of those comments were largely supportive of the working group's I believe 13 draft recommendations, two issues, namely the proposal to (abandon) registries at the first level dispute providers, under the TDRP, and the proposal to maintain FOAs, were both subject to conflicting public comments.

And so the working group has been meeting during the past few weeks trying to incorporate all comments received and it's in the process of reviewing these two issues that I just mentioned in particular.

The working group is of course meeting in London where its members will discuss any outstanding issues and finalize their recommendations. The final report is expected to be submitted to the GNSO Council, I'm sorry, shortly after the London meeting and providing that the Council adopts the group's work a Board report will be published which then will be again subject to public comment before it's considered by the ICANN Board.

And you can find more information through these links that will lead you to the group's wiki page, to the initial report. And if you're in London please join us on Monday at 1:30 pm, a very convenient time, in the Thames Suite room for the IRTP Part D face to face working group meeting. It might be the last face to face IRTP meeting at an ICANN meeting so make sure you're there.

Right, that's all for me. Thank you very much for indulging me and I believe over to you, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Lars. Hello, everybody, and welcome to our webinar. I'm Mary Wong and I'm originally from Singapore although now I'm based in the United States working from home. I am a Senior Policy Director at ICANN. And like Marika and Lars I primarily support the GNSO or Generic Name Supporting Organization.

It's my privilege to take you through a few of the other efforts underway in the GNSO that, for reasons Marika's mentioned, we thought might be of particular interest to you especially for the London meeting.

And one of these is a new cross community working group, or CWG, and this particular one has been tasked to develop a framework of operating principles for future CWGs or cross community working groups.

Why is this important? A number of you who have been involved in ICANN for a while will probably agree that there is a recognized need that there should be a uniform framework of rules and principles that will enable the different supporting organizations, or SOs, and advisory committees, or ACs, to collaborate effectively across ICANN at least on issues of common interest.

One issue obviously here though is that each SO and AC has its own remit and scope and each may also have operating procedures and rules that are vastly different from another.

That's not to say that there hasn't been CWGs, or cross community working groups, in the past and there has been a number, and a number have been very successful. Nonetheless though, in 2012 the GNSO took the initiative to draft an initial set of principles that it could use for discussion with other SOs and ACs to try to develop this sort of uniform framework.

It asked for feedback and suggestions and a very detailed set of feedback was provided by the ccNSO last year in 2013. The ccNSO and GNSO continue discussions. And a couple months ago in March, they agreed that

there ought to be a cross community working group comprised not just of members of the ccNSO or the GNSO but hopefully also other SOs and ACs that would take forward the initial work that was started by the GNSO.

And on this slide you see the objective - the final objective of that working group. The CWG has been formed and has started to meet and there are participants from different SOs and ACs, however, participation, like most working groups, in fact all working groups, continue to be open so if you are interested there are a number of ways you can follow and participate that I'll highlight.

The goal here is that final framework that this group will work on should be produced for community discussion and public comment within the next few months.

Here are some further information. And as I said, to get involved you could do a number of things. First of course you can review the work space where a lot of the documents that I don't have time to go through in this Webinar, have been posted including a staff briefing paper that gives you some of the background, the reasons for this working group, the initial GNSO principles and the ccNSO feedback.

There is going to be a face to face meeting in London led by this particular CWG so please do come and join in the conversation because whichever SO or AC you may be part of or even just as a member of the ICANN community this is a fairly important objective for everyone. And we're looking forward to your feedback.

So that was the cross community working group. We now turn to a GNSO initiated policy development process led by a working group for Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation.

The background of this is that, as many of you know, there is a form of contract between all registrars called the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the newest one of which, the 2013 RAA, was approved by the ICANN Board last June.

The background for this new RAA is that a number of topics for the negotiations with the Registrar Stakeholder Group included certain high priority topics that were identified previously by the ICANN community.

At the end of these negotiations, upon the approval of the 2013 RAA, it was clear that one issue remained outstanding from the negotiations; meaning, it was not formally or finally addressed in the new RAA. And this was in relation to the use and the accreditation of privacy and proxy services for the Whois system.

We are not going to go into the details of the Whois system today but essentially that is the globally accessible generic top level domain registration data directory that you can check to see who registered a particular Website, how to contact them and so forth.

And one of the registration services that a number of providers offer is the ability to hide some or all of your contact details either through a proxy, meaning a different entity, or at least by masking some of your own details through a privacy service.

What ICANN had committed to do, another piece of background, is to create an accreditation program for these providers, the ones that offer either privacy services or proxy services or both.

We said that this was an issue outstanding from the RAA negotiations but it should be noted that in the 2013 RAA there is a temporary specification that concerns this particular type of service. It's temporary because it runs only

until January 1, 2017 or the start of ICANN's formal accreditation program, whichever is earlier.

So as part of the effort then to get finalization on this issue of accreditation and use of privacy and proxy services, the Board requested the GNSO to start a PDP. And this was done in October 2013 and hence we have a GNSO working group on the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers and the various policy issues that surround the creation of such a program.

There is a charter for the working group that in the background information we'll list on the next slide you can consult. Basically there are a number of questions in the charter that the GNSO Council has asked the working group to address.

They cover seven categories and we've listed a few of them in this slide. And the working group has begun systematically going through each of these questions with the goal to produce an initial report for public comment early next year.

I mentioned the 2013 RAA, here on this slide, you see a link where you can see that as well as the temporary specification I referred to. There is a work space for the working group where you can see the charter and the progress of the work and of course the working group, like many others, has also planned a face to face session at the London meeting on the Wednesday this time.

And they have planned this to be something here for community feedback so if you are available please do attend the session either face to face or remotely.

We move on now to another PDP, or policy development process, that has some background in a process that is reaching a conclusion and that has

kick-started another follow up process. This is the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs.

In this particular case IGO means international government organizations. And these would be organizations such as the United Nations or the World Trade Organization that are formed by and between governments.

INGO, in this context, stands for international nongovernmental organizations, and therein lies the distinction between IGOs and INGOs. Note that this policy development process, or PDP, refers to protection of the identifiers. This means the names or the acronyms of one or both of these types of organizations in all gTLDs meaning not just the new gTLDs launched under ICANN's new gTLD program that's ongoing now but also the so-called legacy gTLDs such as dotCom.

This particular policy development process that I'm speaking of was initiated by the GNSO in October 2012. And this purpose was to evaluate whether there was a need to protect IGO and INGO identifiers, meaning names or acronyms, and when we speak of INGOs, here we note that it includes the International Red Cross movement and the International Olympic Committee. Some of you may have followed some of these discussions either with respect to these specific organizations or more generally the PDP that was started.

And I mentioned that this PDP covered all gTLDs. Do note that this covered both top level, that means to the right of the dot, as well as the second level, meaning the left of the dot.

Further background to this PDP, alongside the initiation by the GNSO the Government Advisory Committee, or the GAC, in part because this concerned international government organizations, had issued advice on the subject in the form of the formal communiqué that they issue at the end of each ICANN meeting.

And there was several issued in the course of the last couple of years on the need to protect IGOs and some INGOs. As a result, alongside this PDP again, there are now certain interim or temporary protections that have been put in place by the direction of the ICANN Board while the GNSO develops the policy recommendations to this PDP that I'm talking about. And this is fairly relevant background for reasons that you'll see.

What happened was that a year after the PDP was kicked off, that means late last year in November 2013, the working group completed its work, sent its consensus recommendations, which numbered 25, to the GNSO Council that adopted them unanimously.

The recommendations were then, as per ICANN bylaws, sent to the ICANN Board for their consideration. Earlier this year, the ICANN Board acknowledged receipt of those recommendations and tasked its New gTLD Program Committee to develop a proposal that would take into account the GAC advice that I had mentioned had been sent on this topic as well as the GNSO's consensus recommendations.

The short form reasons for this, and there's a lot more detail that's in the materials, the short form reason is that there are some differences between the GNSO's consensus recommendations and the GAC advice.

There was a proposal developed by the NGPC that was sent to the GAC around the time of the Singapore meeting. Following the Singapore meeting the ICANN Board passed a resolution to adopt some of the GNSO recommendations at this time. And those recommendations that were adopted were the ones that were not inconsistent with the GAC advice.

So next steps become quite important in this instance for that reason. The GNSO's consensus recommendations basically did not recommend

protecting acronyms, meaning the shorthand abbreviations, for IGOs or INGOs.

The recommendations that were adopted therefore did not extend to acronym protection at least on a permanent basis. And therefore in relation to acronyms, particularly in relation to IGOs, the Board has not adopted the GNSO's recommendations on this and will be facilitating dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO in an attempt to resolve remaining differences.

Four of those recommendations that were adopted, however, an implementation review team is being formed and this will consider those interim or temporary protection that I had mentioned the Board had put in place initially. And you can look forward to the outcome of that work in the next few months.

With respect then to the remaining differences between the GAC and the GNSO, and here's what takes us to the next thing that I'll speak to you about, there may - I should not say "may" because these slides were prepared before the last GNSO Council meeting - there is going to be another policy development process, or PDP, emanating from this particular one on one specific issues and that is to refine the sorts of protections that are currently available for IGOs and INGOs on a curative basis.

And I'll mention what that means as soon as we go to the next topic. Here you see some of the further information.

And so the next topic then is curative rights protections for IGOs and INGOs, international governmental organizations and international nongovernmental organizations. And it's important to note that this particular effort stems from the work of the PDP that was done that I just spoke of that examined the issue of all protections, not just curative, for these types of organizations at the top and the second level in all gTLDs.

This particular effort focuses, as I may have mentioned, on one type of protection and this would focus also on that sort of protection at the second level.

By curative rights essentially we mean some of the mechanisms that you may already be familiar with such as the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, or the UDRP, that has been existence since 1999. It is one of the earliest ICANN consensus policies.

It's since been joined by something called the Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure, or the URS. The URS is based on the UDRP but it was created specifically for the New gTLD Program whereas the UDRP applies to both legacy gTLDs as well as new gTLDs under the program.

There's a number of other differences between them that's not relevant for this particular time. The reason why this is an issue for IGOs and INGOs is listed on this slide.

I've mentioned that they're curative in the sense that they are efforts to resolve disputes at the second level between a complainant and in this case it would be say an INGO or an IGO and a third party registrant that may have registered a second level domain name that is very similar to or perhaps even identical to the IGO's name or acronym and it's curative because it takes place after that third party registrant has registered that particular domain name.

And this can be contrasted with so-called preventative protections because preventative protections actually come in before there is that sort of third party registration. For example, a reserve name would be considered a form of preventative protection because no one would be allowed to register that name if it's reserved.

I want to emphasize here that this particular new effort focuses on IGOs and INGOs, focuses on curative rights protection measures, the two listed on the slide, for the reasons that unlike say trademark owners for whom these protections were initially designed, IGOs and INGOs don't fit very well into the UDRP or the URS system.

In order for the GNSO to conduct a PDP there needs to first be an issue report partly to scope out the issue and partly to allow the community to provide feedback on whether there should be a PDP and what should that PDP look like if so. Some of the other efforts that we've mentioned in this webinar did have an issue report preceding it for this particular reason.

The preliminary issue report in this case was published for public comment in March and the final issue report was sent to the GNSO Council for their vote on whether to initiate a PDP. And you may have noticed that I changed the title of this part of the presentation a little bit because at its meeting last week on the 5th of June, the GNSO Council did decide that it would initiate a PDP on this very, very specific topic and it would be a PDP on curative rights for those IGOs and INGOs that have been designated as having the identifiers protected by that earlier process that I mentioned a little bit earlier.

This slide shows you what a possible PDP might cover and the reason why this is relevant is that the GNSO Council will be talking in London about the scope of that PDP for the working group to be convened. And it is mentioned elsewhere in this Webinar that working groups in the GNSO operate under a charter from the chartering organization and in this case the GNSO Council. So this slide shows what the issue report recommends be the scope of that particular PDP that has just been approved.

For further information, you can look at the final issue report that lists and describes some of the bullet points or expands on them that I listed in the previous slide. It is not on this slide, but there is also now a Web page on the

GNSO Web site that contains this issue report and other links such as to the most recent GNSO Council recommendation.

So on that note, thank you for sticking with me through these various projects. I'm going to hand it back to our team leader, Marika. Marika all yours.

Marika Konings: Thanks Mary. Thanks very much for this detailed overview and we will now look briefly at some of the other GNSO projects for which as I mentioned before there is no immediate milestone, but which are nevertheless still important topics for which you can expect updates or discussions taking place in London.

So first of all, there is the Policy Development Process or PDP on translation and transliteration and this working group is looking at whether gTLD directory contact information should be translated and/or transliterated. And if it would decide that that would be a welcome, it should also discuss how that actually should happen and who should bear the costs for that.

And so the working group is aiming to deliver its initial report for public comment by October of this year and has planned a face-to-face meeting in London, which is open to anyone interested during which they will continue their deliberations on this topic.

The data and metrics for the Policymaking Working Group is a non-policy development process effort, which is looking at standard methodologies of reporting and metrics that would assist fact based policy development and decision making as well as assessing once a policy has been implemented and whether that it did what it was intended to do and if not, how that can be adjusted.

And the working group is currently in the process of reviewing previous GNSO efforts in relation to data metrics that were used and they are

expected to continue this conversation during its face-to-face meeting in London, which will take place on Thursday morning and again is also open for anyone interested in this topic.

Similarly, the Policy Implementation Working Group is currently reviewing past GNSO efforts with the aim to assist in developing lessons learned that can be applied to its recommendations that are intended to address a number of questions related to policy implementation in a GNSO context.

And the working group aims to deliver its initial report for public comment by the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles in October of this year and they have also scheduled a face to face meeting in London to continue their deliberations and provide a status update to the GNSO community and answer any questions that there may be.

And although not a project initiated by the GNSO itself, but which follows a requirement under the ICANN bylaws, I also wanted to briefly mention the work that has commenced in preparation of the GNSO review, which is expected to officially kick off on the 1st of July of this year.

The GNSO Working Party has been formed, which is currently acting as a liaison between the board's Structural Improvements Committee, or SIC, which is responsible for managing the review as well as the independent examiner. One has been appointed to conduct an independent exam as a part of the review process.

The Working Party will also have a meeting in London to further continue its preparatory work, which amongst others includes the preparation of questions for a 360 review that is planned to be conducted as a part of this process, and you will find here further information on this.

As has already been noted, there is time for questions at the end of this session, but please feel free - any question you may have on the topics we've

presented or anything related to the GNSO. To post those in the chat and we will do our best to answer those in the meantime. And with that, I will hand it over to my colleague Bart Boswinkel.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Marika, I hope you understand because again as we are a very (distributed) group of people, I am talking to you from the Netherlands. So I will take you through some of the topics and materials for the ccNSO meeting in London and I will focus on these topics, the framework of the Implementation Working Group and its progress.

A little bit on the IANA Stewardship transition process and ICANN's accountability process, and again, one of those new things the Cross Community Working Group on the use of names, countries, and territories, which was launched at the Singapore meeting and is - will meet in London. And I will highlight some other sessions.

First on the framework of the Implementation Working Group. I have included this for two reasons in fact. First of all, of course to show progress as this is one of the major projects of the ccNSO, but also to highlight some of the differences between the different supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The ccNSO has until now only run two policy development processes and although this is a very heavy handed process itself, the framework of implementation working group process, it is not a new - it doesn't develop new policy, so it is not a policy development process. It has - it is the interpretation of the existing policy which basic document is (ROC5091) which dates back to 1994 as you can see. And therefore with the changes in our environment, in our work, in our world, it is - it was ready to be revisited from say - by the policy group or by the policy supporting organization.

The working group has - and this is one of those examples Mary mentioned. This is one of those earlier cross community working groups and the reason

why you can see that whatever comes out of the framework of the Implementation Working Group as recommendations needs to be supported by both the ccNSO and the Governmental Advisory Committee in order to be recommended to the ICANN Board.

So this is just a little bit of background and to highlight some of the differences in the supporting organizations and advisory committees. If you look at the framework of the Implementation Working Group from a substantive point of view, they are addressing some of the concerns that evolve over time regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. I will not go into details of these different topics. If you have any questions, please raise them, but I just want to highlight now where the framework of interpretation is in its work.

The working group has reached full consensus on its interpretations of the current policies and is now working on its recommendations to the community and finally to the ICANN board in the interpretation of (ROC5091) and other documents.

The working group had hoped to conclude its work prior to the London meeting, but is still discussing some of the recommendations so there will just be a presentation at the London meeting of its recommendations and work to date. But the full report and therefore all of the recommendations will be submitted to the ccNSO and to the Governmental Advisory Committee prior to the next ICANN meeting, so that's the Los Angeles meeting.

The second topic I want to touch upon briefly is the IANA Stewardship transition and ICANN's accountability process. It is probably very high in everybody's agenda, but I just want to highlight some of the ccNSO aspects and the meetings that the ccNSO has organized around these two things.

Now first of all, the ccNSO Council did submit a statement at the Singapore meeting and also submitted a comment on the IANA Stewardship transition.

The main concerns the ccNSO raised or the council raised were the scope of the process and secondly the formation of what was called at the time the steering committee, which is - and the major point being that the ccTLD community includes members of the ccNSO and nonmembers of the ccNSO.

And it is very important to have a place that the non-ccNSO members have a place at the table as well to make it as broad as possible as was required by the NTIA. And if you look at the latest announcement on the IANA Stewardship transition process, you will see there is room in the Coordination Committee as it is called now for non-ccNSO members and the group has been expanded to four ccTLDs in general.

So that's what we got for the comments made to date from the ccNSO. In London, there will be two major sessions doing the ccNSO meeting days, which are Tuesday and Wednesday. There will be an interview panel on perspectives on ICANN's accountability. The goal is to inform the cc community and broader community around the different aspects of and perspectives from different groups and ICANN's responsibility, and that session is on Tuesday from 12:00 to 1:00 and everybody is invited as for all of the meetings of the ccNSO.

And a second discussion will be on accountability on the IANA Stewardship transition on Wednesday afternoon at 2:00 and that is a panel discussion again and it will focus again on scope of the process of the process, the IANA Stewardship transition process and on engaging ccTLD managers. And as could be expected, it is also a topic for discussion with the GNSO Council, with the board, and with the Governmental Advisory Committee.

So now a little bit on one of the Cross Community Working groups that was initiated by the ccNSO and invited - and is now a joint group with the GNSO, that's the Cross Community Working Group on the use of names and countries - the names of countries and territories as TLDs.

This is the result from the study group initiated by the ccNSO, which came to the recommendation that a cross community working group should be established to further review the typology as developed by the study group and how the representations of country and territory names are currently dealt with under the different ICANN policies. And if feasible - and first, that's the feasibility. If feasible, develop a harmonized framework for using country and territory names.

In the background is country and territory names I used and we presented in various manners. The study group developed a typology and depending on say the category of country and territory names you use, there are different issues with the different policies and practices to date. So in order to improve the predictability and usability this working group will start and hopefully develop a framework. It will have its first face to face meeting in London where it will start developing its work plan and the way they want to approach it.

Other activities of the ccNSO in London - first of all Tech Day. Tech Day has become by now more or less a standard meeting at the ICANN meetings. It is organized by a group initiated by the ccNSO but is broader. It is focusing on technical and operational issues facing top level domain operators in general, so not just ccNSO or ccTLD managers and therefore it is open to everybody with interest in technical and operational issues.

This time, part of the program is a round table on name servers with both cc and non-cc operators and others to share their views on how to run name servers, et cetera. So again, just for those who are interested in technical and operation issues, you are more than welcome to attend the Tech Day on Monday.

Other ccNSO meetings - as I said, the ccNSO meetings are on Tuesday and Wednesday. There will be a security session, there will be a panel discussion on Wednesday morning with ccTLD and ICANN accredited registrars. And

the focus of that panel discussion is what needs to be done in order to - yeah to standardize on the one hand and on the other hand recognize the differences between the ccTLD managers and it's a bit of a dilemma as you can see, and then there is the ccTLDs (new session).

As I said again, these meetings are open to everybody and the ccTLD or the ccNSO meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday have more of a business managerial focus for those who are interested. That was my short update on what is happening. You can find further information on the ccNSO Events & Meetings at the different Web sites and the agenda overview.

I just want to add one more thing. Yesterday the ccNSO secretariat posted its first forecast previewing the London meeting and you can find that one on the ccNSO Web site.

I now want to hand it over to my colleague and dear friend Carlos who will talk to you about the ASO. Thank you.

Carlos Reyes: Thank you Bart and hello everyone. My name is Carlos Reyes and I work with Barbara Roseman in supporting the ASO.

Just a quick overview of the ASO Address Council. The ASO Address Council is comprised of 15 members, 3 from each region, with staggered terms. One person is elected each year. Two members are selected by the regional policy forum of each RIR and one member is appointed by the executive board of each region.

This year marks a significant milestone for the ASO as it celebrates its 15th Anniversary after its creation in 1999 per an (OOU) with ICANN. The ASO will be participating actively at ICANN50. They will be meeting formally and as well many members of the (Interim Member) Council will be in attendance and they will have the usual meeting with the board and will also be providing

a briefing to the ICANN community on the 25th of June with updates from each RIR.

In terms of policy activities, there are currently no global policies in development or under consideration. However, the ASO AC recently did provide advice on the global policies for post-exhaustion IPv4 allocation mechanisms.

At the request of ICANN's IANA departments, the ASO advised ICANN to immediately allocate the - sorry, to immediately allocate the addresses that have - that were triggered after (ALAC)'s inventory fell below 8.3 million addresses on the 20th of May. ICANN's IANA department immediately allocated each RIR - about 2 million addresses using about half of the recovered pool.

And then on the 23rd of April, the ASO also discussed their 16-bit autonomous system member availability. However, the ASO AC determined that no change in the policy was necessary, but the - it should consult to regions on the impact of the run out.

And with that, I conclude my brief update on the ASO and I will turn it over to Steve Sheng.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Carlos and hello everyone. My name is Steve Sheng. I am the Team Leader for the OSSEC and SSAC support. I will provide you with a quick update on the status of the OSSEC restructure efforts and draw your attention to two events.

The OSSEC continues to make progress on its restructure efforts, mainly in three areas. First, the Executive Committee established a more frequent sequence of teleconferences, currently twice a month to culminate its activities. Also, the OSSEC offers a procedure that defines the working models of the OSSEC and is undergoing another round of edits and is

nearing completion. Last but not least, a membership committee was established last November to evaluate potential members of the OSSEC.

A cornerstone of the restructured OSSEC is the formation of a caucus where interested and qualified members of the Internet community in addition to (root) server operators can participate and work on items advising the ICANN community on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet (root) server system. And with that backdrop, the OSSEC Executive Committee has written and approved a document on the working definition, membership requirements, and application process for the OSSEC caucus.

There is currently an open call for membership that is circulated across the technical community. If you are interested in joining the OSSEC caucus, we invite you to apply online for the first round of application and shortly after the ICANN London meeting.

For ICANN50, the OSSEC will hold a public session on Monday from 1:30 to 3:00 pm in the Main Hall. The first part of the meeting will be a public OSSEC meeting. The second part will be an informational session for the OSSEC caucus. There are also meetings scheduled throughout the week for OSSEC to work on several matters of interest.

With that, I will now hand it over to my colleague, Julie Hedlund. She will provide you with a brief overview of recent SSAC activities and also concludes the presentation with a quick overview of a recent SSAC advisory on name collision, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Steve. This is Julie Hedlund and just to let you know of some recent activities in the SSAC. Just yesterday, the SSAC posted a comment on the JAS Phase One Report and the SSAC will be talking to the community about that report and providing more information at the ICANN meeting in London. The SSAC also has several work parties that are

currently developing products. We have a work party on the IANA Stewardship transition, one on identifier abuse metrics, public suffix lists, and we also have ongoing outreach to law enforcement representatives, and the SSAC is developing a program for a workshop at the 2014 Internet Governance Forum that will be held in Istanbul. And there you see the link to the SSAC Report.

In London, the SSAC will have several events. There is a Beginner's Guide on DNSSAC what will be held on Monday, June 23, and that will be at 5:00 pm. There will be a DNSSAC on Wednesday the 25th of June and that will begin at 8:30 local time, and the SSAC will have its usual public meeting on Thursday, the 26th of June, at 8:00 am. And during that meeting, it will talk about its recent activities and also the recently published report, and that is Report SSAC 66, and I am going to go ahead and turn things over to Steve who will tell you more about that. Thank you.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Julie. The SSAC 66 comments on the JAS Phase One Report mitigating the risk of DNS (main space collisions). Very quickly, name collision refers to a name that is defined and used in one mains space may also appear in another. So one common example where the conflict arises is names used in the public (main space) as defined by ICANN may be in conflict with names defining (private main space) where it is used in enterprises.

So in when such a scenario happens, users and applications intending to use maybe (one name space) may actually use it in another (name space), so this will cause a series of unexpected events.

The circumstances that lead to the collision could be accidental or malicious. ICANN has been very serious in mitigating the risk of the name collision and it has commissioned the - a report by the JAS Global advisors on this, so the SSAC review, the report, and provided comments. The SSAC made eight

recommendations. The first three are - the first four are you know operational and the last three are strategic.

So the first one is SSAC recommended to ICANN to consider expanding the range of situations that will trigger an emergency response. In the JAS Report, the trigger will be the clear and present danger to human life and the SSAC recommends ICANN to expand the situation to for example national security key commerce process. Those are detailed in the report.

The second recommendation in the JAS report is recommending a single controlled interruption period for 120 days. That is later revised to 90 days. What the SSAC is recommending is instead of a single controlled interruption introduce rolling interruptions. So you have, you know, interruptions broken by periods of normal operations.

And the third recommendation is for ICANN to perform an evaluation of potential notification approach prior to implementing any notification approach. So in addition to the 127/a notification approach as identified by the JAS report, there are other approaches. For example the (unintelligible). So the SSAC recommend ICANN perform a thorough evaluation on that.

The next two recommendations is concerns with IPU6 usage. So the SSAC recommends notification approach that are common dates IPU6 only hosts. In addition to IPU4 only or dual stack host. The background of this recommendation is to, for example, longer shelf life where, you know, as the Internet moves gradually more adoption of IPU6 it's important to have that notification for that part of the host, and finally is to provide to clarity to registries on the rules and method of allocation of blocked names after the conclusion of the past period.

So those are kind of the highlight of the recommendations, and the last two I will not mention here. They are available in the SSAC report where Julie shared the link as well. The SSAC will present this report in the ICANN

London meeting. We invite you to participate and provide feedback. With that, this concludes the RSAC and SSAC presentation. I will now hand over to my colleague Olof and he will share you more about the GAC activities. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Thank you so much and hello to all. My name is Olof Nordling and I'm supporting the governmental advisory committee, abbreviated as GAC, which is quite a growing committee, counting 135 governments as members and 30 IGOs, intergovernmental organizations, as of service. And that's already not correct. It should be 137 governments as of right now.

They will meet London and they always meet face to face at ICANN meetings, and those meetings are very, very important. That's where the main decisions are taken by the GAC, although they conduct intercessional work remotely in working groups and in conference calls. And the mission of the GAC is, as you may know, to provide advice to the ICANN board on public policy matters or public policy aspects on any matter.

So what are they up to in London? Well as of recently, actually over the last few years, much effort has been made regarding advice concerning the new gTLD program. And there are still a few matters that needs ironing out. Mary mentioned the IGO protection. There are also some explanations expected by the GAC, how safeguards will be implemented and practiced. So there are quite a few to address in that regard, but the expectation is that those - the GAC will be able to conclude on these.

There are of course many other topics to discuss and high profile topics like every entity within ICANN discussing the INS stewardship transition, as well as the ICANN accountability. Also (Mark) mentioned the framework of interpretation working group, well outcomes or near outcomes, which brings me to discuss in particular with the ccNSO, and the GAC is always interested in Whois-related matters. So that will be on the agenda as well.

A fairly recent development is a joint GAC/GNSO consultation group that's been active, very active I must say, for the last half year, that will present its findings to date and also some proposals to improve the early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO policy work to avoid the last minute surprises coming from the GAC in what the GNSO is up to.

Also the ATRT2 recommendations which were submitted by the HRT2 at the end of the last year and due for - by the board in London will most certainly be discussed and planned also for implementation. There is one particular recommendation that addresses the GAC-related matters and it's one recommendation but it consists of 19 sub-recommendations, so there's a lot to do. This will be addressed by the board GAC recommendations implementation working group as well as two of the working groups within the GAC on the working matters and on government IGO engagement strategy.

There are also some I would say more extra work sessions and of course first and foremost there will be a second high level governmental meeting ever. The first one was in Toronto, and that will happen in the GAC room on Monday in London and it promises to be well attended. One hundred governments have announced their attendance and some 30 ministers to date. So it will be - well space will be short supply, let's put it like that. And it will be an open meeting, so if you can manage to squeeze in, please try.

In addition to that there will be two sessions dedicated to inform the community about two aspects. This is also following on HRT2 recommendations of making the GAC activities more open, more transparent and try to explain better what the GAC is up to. There is a working group on future gTLD routes.

So they are proactive as well, and they have a subgroup on geographic names. And the chair of that subgroup will hold a session about findings and lessons learned from the dealing with geographic names during the first

round as the first little information to the community and in preparation of course for future and new gTLD rounds.

There will also be an open forum where GAC members and the chair will explain how the GAC actually works and what preparations are done at the home front by the GAC members. Those two sessions will occur the first one on geo names on Wednesday morning at nine and the GAC open forum will start at 8:30 on Thursday.

Well they do have a full agenda starting on Saturday and running until Thursday around 10:00 am, and most of the sessions, with the exclusion of the communicated drafting sessions, are open. So please come to the palace suite and join the show, and you can enjoy it actually in all six UN languages (unintelligible). We have all the big interpretation facilities for that. And with that I conclude from the GAC side and hand over the floor to Heidi Ulrich who will tell you more about what ALAC is doing. So Heidi, please take it away.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you, Olof, very much. Hi, everyone. My name is Heidi Ulrich and I am the senior director for At Large which consists of the At Large advisory committee, the ALAC, and the At Large community, consisting of the regional At Large organizations and At Large structure.

This body represents the interest of the Internet end users, and today I'm going to be talking to you very briefly about the policy advice development activities that they have been carrying out since the Singapore meeting but most of my time will be spent talking a little bit about the At Large summit, the second At Large summit, the ATLAS 2, which will be taking place in London.

So very briefly on the policy activities between Singapore and London, the ALAC submitted 14 policy advice statements and correspondences between the Singapore meeting in mid June, including a record of ten in a four-week period. And the ALAC is developing three statements at the moment in response to public comments, consisting of the fiscal year '15 operating plan

and budget public comment, the enhancing ICANN accountability public comment, and the ICANN draft five-year strategic plan.

Statement highlights that the ALAC would like to highlight are the two summits that they submitted related to the transition of the stewardship of the (unintelligible). Both of these comments stress the need for the perspective of the end user to be included. And the ALAC also submitted four statements related to the strategy panels. The ALAC stated their overall support for these but suggested key additions.

One of these additions was that crowd sourcing for obtaining broad-based input may be seen as an alternative to existing methods of these conclusive issues. However new techniques should not be seen as replacing the valuable policy process use of collaboration and background. And all ALAC policy statements are available on the At Large correspondence web page at the address noted on the slide, and there's also a summary of the ALAC statements in the monthly policy update. So we encourage you to take a look at that.

Now I've mentioned the rest of my presentation will be on the ATLAS, and firstly I'd like to talk a little bit about what it is. And 150 globally diverse At Large structures, or ALSs, representatives will be convening Monday to discuss ICANN issues from the Internet end user perspective. And this is only the second time in the history of At Large and ICANN that all 150 or all ALSs will be able to meet face to face.

And the first time the summit took place was in Mexico City in March 2009, and this was a fundamental event for the At Large. It became a foundation stone to the involvement of many of the ALSs in ICANN, and this time we're almost double the size of ALSs. It will be quite a big event.

And the theme of the ATLAS 2 it the global Internet, the user perspective. And this theme is going to be discussed in various ways within five thematic

groups, and these are - these groups are going to have four parallel breakout sessions on Saturday the 21st of June and Sunday the 22nd of June. And these groups and their output will form the basis for the ATLAS 2 discussion. Leadership teams have been created for each of these groups and they'll be taking those groups all the way through the session. And their output will form the core of the ATLAS 2 declaration which I'll talk a little bit about later.

So I'd like to take some time to go through these groups since they are the basis for the ATLAS 2 activities. And the first is the future of multi-stakeholder group. This group starts with the promise that the future of the multi-stakeholder as a form of (unintelligible). However multi-stakeholder is not monolithic and must recognize the roles played by different stakeholders on a variety of issues. And while there are threats to the multi-stakeholders, the recent (met mengal) meeting provided one of the first examples of the multi-stakeholder model decision making modality. And questions that this group will be exploring include what are the current deficiencies in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and what can ICANN learn from the (met mengal), its processes and recommendations.

The second thematic group is the globalization of ICANN, and this group will address the elements that are required for ICANN to be truly global, and this includes ICANN providing a framework in which all global stakeholders are able to interact on an equal footing without barriers to participation. And questions to be discussed within this group address issues of inclusion and diversity and equal stakeholder - and equal global multi-stakeholder model, ICANN's constitutional and legal mechanisms, accountability mechanisms and operational matters.

The third thematic group is the global interest of user perspective, and the focus of this group is on the key element of trust as a key Internet design principle. And this group will discuss how the trust of users can be fully to developed. Questions to be addressed include whether end users will

continue to enjoy the global Internet, especially given the strength in Internet access, et cetera, between developed and developing countries.

Thematic group four is ICANN transparency accountability, and this group will focus on questions raised by the APRT2 final report, mainly recommendation nine which reflects community feedback on existing appeal mechanisms, as well as recommendation 9.2 which addresses the accountability at the decision-making process and reform of the appeal mechanism. Questions will focus on how to strengthen the accountability and transparency of ICANN.

Thematic group five is the At Large community engagement in ICANN, and this group will focus on the challenges of how the At Large community can effectively engage with the various ACs and SOs. Questions that this group will address include those on increasing engagement in breaking down the silos between these various groups, as well as on what types of capacity-building activities are needed.

So in sum, the ATLAS 2 is a very rare opportunity for ICANN's global end user community to meet, learn, accept, mentor and influence policy. So next I'd like to talk a little bit about the outstanding preparation work that has gone into the ATLAS.

The ATLAS 2 has been organized in a bottom up fashion by the At Large community and has been a fully At Large community process. The organization structure consists of an ATLAS 2 organizing committee, co-chaired by (Eduardo Diaz) and Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, as well as nine ATLAS 2 working groups. And to date, these groups have had a total 50 preparatory calls as well as countless hours of volunteer time to prepare the meeting schedule, agendas, background material and et cetera. So it is truly a community effort here.

Preparatory activities prior to ATLAS included a series of eight ATLAS 2 capacity-building webinars for the At Large structures, and these included

community and staff experts presenting on topics such as the future of Internet governance, policy development, policy issues, security and stability and the ALAC rules of procedure. Five ATLAS 2 newsletters, to date four have been developed in English, French and Spanish by the ATLAS 2 communications working group, and there is going to be one more prior to the ATLAS. And then during the summit itself there'll be daily newsletters containing the key activities of the day.

Also an At Large 2 website, developed by the ATLAS 2 communications working group was launched earlier this week, and this website contains information on both the content and logistics relating to the ATLAS 2. And so I very much encourage you to take a look at that site which is on the slide. Also a very exciting At Large social media strategy has been developed and implemented for ATLAS 2 using Facebook and Twitter and there'll be a very active social media presence during the summit. In fact it's already started and using the hashtag ATLAS2, which you can see on the logo and the information on the slide as well.

There's also a welcome video prepared and distributed to all At Large 2 participants. And also in preparation for the ATLAS 2, many of the At Large structures filmed interviews on Skype discussing their activities, and these are available on YouTube. And I'll put the link to that up during - after my presentation.

And finally thanks to both the ATLAS 2 sponsorship working group and the generosity of three sponsors, there's been $40,000 in additional funding provided to the ATLAS 2 which will allow for a sponsored lunch, dinner and an ATLAS 2 fair and networking event. And that last one will be open to all.

And finally the activity during the summit, there'll be many activities, and just to start with there will be five (unintelligible) sessions. These will be taking place on Saturday, Sunday and Thursday morning and there'll be five thematic groups holding four breakout sessions on Saturday and Sunday as I

discussed earlier. Also each of the five (RALOs), original At Large organizations will hold a face-to-face general assembly to discuss policy and process issues of key importance of the region. These will be taking place Tuesday and Wednesday and are open, an At Large fair as I mentioned earlier.

This is going to be a fantastic network opportunity for all 150-plus At Large structures. This will held on Tuesday the 24th at 19:30 and 21:30, and our keynote speakers include addresses by Nnenna Nwakanma, who's African regional coordinator of the Worldwide Web Foundation, as well Wolfgang Kleinwachter, ICANN board director. There will also be an At Large quiz, music and cross-panel, so you're very much welcome to attend that event.

The ATLAS 2 participants will meet with the board and the AC and SO chairs as well participate in At Large and other ICANN meetings. So they will also be going out to the various meetings that are being held during the ICANN 50th meeting. Also an ATLAS 2 mentoring program developed by the ATLAS 2 mentoring working group will hold - will allow a large number of ALS representatives who are new to ICANN meetings to learn directly from At Large leaders, and that has been set up and it will be holding orientation on Saturday.

Also finally an At Large 2 declaration which will be the primary output of the ATLAS 2 will be presented to the board on Thursday the 26th. It is expected to form the basis of the post-ATLAS 2 development of the At Large community. This concludes the At Large ATLAS update, and I'd like to hand the floor over to David Olive who will be taking questions and answers. David?

David Olive: Thank you very much, Heidi and members of the policy team, for sharing information with our community members here on the call today. I will now go to questions and answers and we're going to have a slightly different procedure, a little more formal. If you would like to ask a question, please

press Star 1 on your phone and you'll be asked to record your name and then the operator will put you in a queue, and then we'll take the questions in that queue. For those of course who may not be on the dial in, you can of course ask questions in the chat.

And just for your information again, please note in the chat the slides, recordings and transcripts will be posted shortly at the end of this webinar so you can review them at your leisure, and the website is there for your information. So we'll now move to questions. Operator, can you please start that process? And for those again, Star 1 to ask a question to be put in the queue.

Coordinator: Yes. At this time no one has questions yet but once again to ask a question, please press Star 1 and record your name when prompted. One moment please while we wait.

David Olive: As you are formulating your questions we did in the new registration form that you filled out to be part of this webinar, we have a place for submitting questions. You might not be able to get answers to all those questions but we did provide some information for you because some of our other colleagues are the subject-matter experts of the new gTLD application program or the legal experts, and so we wanted to point out that there will be several sessions at ICANN 49 that will be addressing many of those questions that you raised and we also have here some answers as well as where to find out more information about that. Again to press Star 1 to join the queue and we ask you to do that and we're happy to answer your questions.

Coordinator: At this time we don't have questions yet, but once again that is Star 1 to ask a question and please record your name clearly when prompted. One moment please.

David Olive: Okay let me just quickly go on to as you're looking at forming questions how to stay updated, and we recommend the quickest way is to subscribe to the

policy monthly. This comes out and also in our UN languages. We have over 7,000 subscribers to this list and so we're trying to promote even more subscribers to help us get that number even higher to stay updated in English and in the languages indicated here on the slide.

Of course you can also follow us on Twitter at the following handles you see here or contacting us through the policy-staff@icann.org for the other further questions. For those of you who may be attending in person in London, this gives you the list of our 23 subject matter and secretariat experts who assist the work of the advisory groups and the supporting organizations and you in the policy development and policy advisory work at ICANN. As you can see, we're spread around the world and I address that activities from the regional hub in Istanbul, Turkey where I am current.

Coordinator: There are no questions at this time over the phone.

David Olive: Okay. With that after a busy ICANN meeting and we expect that to be so in London, we always have a follow-up wrap-up session and this was one such session where we were celebrating Istanbul as a regional hub for the members of our policy team. So at times we get together and are able to do that. But more importantly we thank you for your participation in this webinar briefing you on the policy activities expected to be taking place at ICANN 50 in London.

And with that it is very good that we will have another session later today to reach out to people in different time zones, particularly in the Asia Pacific and we thank you for your participation in this time zone presentation. And if there are no other questions...

Coordinator: No questions at this time.

David Olive: Thank you. We'd like to wish all the participants a good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be. On behalf of the policy

team, we thank you for your energy, participation and involvement in ICANN's activities. Thank you so much.

Coordinator: Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect.

END