

Pre Singapore Policy Update Webinar

29 January 2015 19:00 UTC

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

David Olive: Okay, let's begin. This session will be recorded. Welcome to the ICANN 52 Policy Update webinar. We thank you for joining us. I am David Olive, ICANN Vice President for Policy Development Support and I'm happy to speak with you on this webinar from our regional headquarter hub in Istanbul, Turkey.

As you know the Policy Development Support staff provides this briefing for the community in preparations for our ICANN meetings. In this case ICANN 52 in Singapore. And so you'll be hearing from most of the staff based in various parts of the globe, like you are I'm sure.

So with that I want to, again, welcome you and note that if you will be asking questions you can put them into the chat or we'll have time at the end of the session to take questions as well. And to that extent we will have a full program for you and a lot of information to convey to

you, but the slides, the presentations, the recording and the transcripts will be made available so that you can review them at your leisure in preparation for ICANN 52.

Let me first go through some of the highlights of the ICANN 52 meeting. In particular Monday of course we have our welcoming ceremony and the supporting organizations and advisory committee have their session - high interest topics. Tuesday is an important constituency and community day where the stakeholders and the constituent groups meet, exchange ideas - also have a meeting with the Board of Directors to convey their views and ask questions. It's a very lively and exciting day for the stakeholders at the ICANN meeting.

Wednesday many of the counsels meet. We see the joint board meeting between the ICANN board and the governmental advisory committee. The other supporting organizations are meeting as well. And we have the special (abrallo) showcase that you'll hear more about on this presentation.

And, finally, on Thursday we have the ICANN public forum, community recognition and board meeting on the end of that day. This particular meeting in Singapore has a focus on, obviously, the (IANA) stewardship transition and the ICANN accountability prophecy. And here are a few meetings that are taking place of the working groups and public briefing sessions on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday for those who are interested and, of course, all these sessions will be able to be participating in remotely or if you're in person, obviously, in the rooms that you'll find in the program.

ICANN's policy development activities relating to the technical coordination functions are formed and refined by the ICANN community through its three supporting organizations listed here and influence by the board advisory committees, also listed here on the slide.

All policy activities are comprised of volunteers, people on this call and others, in a bottom up multi-stakeholder and open and transparent process. ICANN stakeholders includes companies that offer domain names to the public, registrars, companies that operate top-level domain registries, internet service providers, intellectual property interests, business users, non-commercial users such as academics and non-governmental organizations and non-profits and individual users and governments.

Volunteer policy development activities start at the working group level and form around the policy issues, policy advisory or other related ICANN issues. And many of these working groups are open to everyone in the ICANN community. At the moment we have about 70 active working groups across the supporting organizations and advisory groups focusing on various ICANN policy and related issues. It shows how busy you are as our community.

Of course public comments are sought at every stage of the policy development process to let you and other interested community members provide their views and to insure that policy recommendations reflect the concerns and perspectives of the broader community. And so we encourage and thank you for that input. And during this period there about 14 public comment processes open for input by you and our community.

Let me turn to the goal of this webinar, which is to provide you with a current view of the policy - the development issues being looked at or advisory issues being looked at by our community as we embark on our meeting in Singapore - to review these issues, provide opportunities for you to provide input, answer any questions you may have and, of course, please look at our webinar hash tag on your screen.

Thank you again for taking the time to be with us and I'll turn it over to my policy team members to brief you on some of the highlights. Marika, I cast it to you.

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

I will first focus on a number of initiatives that are undertaken jointly by the different ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. The first one of which is the cross community-working group to develop an Internet Assigned Numbers Authority or IANA. (Unintelligible) transition proposal on naming related functions.

As many of you are undoubtedly aware the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, or NTIA, announced on the 14th of March of last year that it intends to transition key Internet domain functions to global multi-stakeholder communities.

As part of that announcement the NTIA asked ICANN to convene a multi-stakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the US government's stewardship role with regard to the IANA functions and the related (unintelligible) zone managements. As the IANA functions cover different areas, many numbers, protocols, parameters and names.

And as a result also involve different effected communities. And the idea is was that each of those directly affected communities would take the lead in developing a transition proposal that relates directly to their area of interest. And in doing so taking into account that the four principles that NTIA has put forward as a requirement for the final transition proposal.

So this cross community working group which has been jointly formed by the Generic Name Supporting Organization, or the GNSO, the Country Code Supporting Organization, the CCNSO, and the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the SSAC and the At Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC is basically the response of the Naming Community to this request to develop a transition proposal that specifically focuses on the IANA functions that relate to the domain name system. After weeks of intensive deliberation, which included a face-to-face meeting in (unintelligible), the CWG published its draft transition proposal for public comment on the 1st of December.

So following the closing of the public comment forum the CWG has been very busy reviewing the input received, which included at an intensive work weekend on the 10th and 11th of January, which consisted of eight hours of CWG meetings.

As a result of the diversity of comments received the CWG has needed more time than originally anticipated to analyze and consider these comments, which included a number of alternative proposals and ideas that have been put forward. Furthermore the linkage between the cross community-working group on an (unintelligible) ICANN accountability has become more apparent, which has resulted in enhanced communication and coordination between these two groups.

Regardless the CWG is keeping up the pace, which has resulted, for example, in I think 12 hours of conference calls alone just this week. As some of the key aspects the CWG is currently working on is obtaining legal advice on relevant aspects of the proposal (unintelligible) the conversations for the CCWG accountability on the linkage between the two efforts and, of course, for the work on developing the transition proposal. The CWG is trying to publish a discussion document prior to the ICANN meeting in Singapore to allow the community to provide further input on some of the key issues the CWG is dealing with.

For those of you that are interested to learn more about this topic there are a number of meeting scheduled in Singapore as you can see on this slide, but I also wanted to flag here that in order to brief the community on this document, which is expected to be released on Monday, the CWG has also scheduled two webinars that will take place next week on Tuesday the 3rd of February. And I can post the link to those webinars in the chat window in a second.

Then moving on - and I'm just looking to the side of my colleague Bart Boswinkel, but I don't think he's here yet so I'll cover this one as well.

So the next one we want to talk about is the CCWG on enhancing ICANN accountability.

So as I was talking about before during discussions around it IANA stewardship transitions a process the community also raised a broader topic of the impact of the change on ICANN accountability given its historical contractual relationship with the United States and the NCIAA. The concerns raised during these discussions around the transition process indicated that the existing ICANN accountability mechanisms do not yet meet stakeholder's expectations.

Statements made by various stakeholders suggest that current accountability mechanisms need to be reviewed and if need be improved, amended, replaced or supplemented with new mechanisms. For example, some of the recommendations that have been made by the accountability and transparency review team and in light of the changing historic contractual relationship with the US government.

Considering that the NCIAA has stressed that it is expecting a community consensus regarding this transition a failure to meet stakeholder expectations with regards to accountability and may create a situation where NCIAA may not accept the IANA transition proposal as meeting its conditions. Thus reviewing ICANN accountability mechanisms was considered to be a crucial part of the transition process and overall conversations.

So the CCWG is expected to organize its output into work streams consistent with its charter. The - Work Stream 1 is focused on mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the time frame of the IANA stewardship transition.

And, secondly, there's Work Stream 2, which is focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA stewardship transition.

The CCWG held a face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt in Germany earlier this month on the 19th and 20th of January. It was attended by more than 50 members and participants with an additional 50% of observers joined the meeting remotely. The meeting led to significant progress including initial agreement on a problem statement, a list of stress test and requirements for Work Stream 1 and these basic themes were identified in a mind map, which will form the road map for the next phase of its work.

As expected next steps the CCWG accountability will continue to progress in all the work perhaps has identified during the Frankfurt meeting. The results of planning a number of sessions in Singapore, including a community engagement session and two working sessions, which will include remote participation and here you see some of the current status and next step as mentioned.

So that's two working sessions in Singapore and an engagement session and further information on this initiative can be found on its Wiki Space. And with that I think I'm handing it over to Olof.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much Marika and my name is Olof Nordling and I'm supporting the Governmental Advisory Committee, or the GAC. Just to say that there are a few additional joint activities to mention and let's start with the GAC GNSO consultation group on GAC early engagement and policy development activities - a long name, but as

the title says the purpose of the activities is to improve communications between the GAC and the GNSO with the view to get earlier engagement in GNSO policy development processes to avoid that - the misunderstandings later on.

And this group has been active since a little bit over a year and already led to some changes. For example, perhaps first and foremost the appointment of the GNSO liaison to the GAC in the form of Mason Cole, which you may know many of you, but that's not all of it.

They have a number of recommendations which they will present during a GAC GNSO session on Sunday the 8th of February between 3:00 and 4:30 PM for discussion and hopefully decision on how to advance and also the consultation group will hold its own (unintelligible) meeting on Monday between 12:30 and 2:00 PM in a meeting room called Indiana, but it's still in Singapore. And with that I'll leave the floor to Mary Wong to tell you about other activities. Mary, take it away.

Mary Wong: Thank you Olof. Hello everybody, this is Mary Wong from ICANN staff and 18 minutes ago we started this call in Turkey, virtually speaking, moved to Europe and I'm happy to say I'm speaking to you from Singapore where we hope to welcome everyone in person or virtually to the ICANN meeting here in just over a week's time. So my first topic with you today is on one of the other cross community working groups that members of our team are supporting and this is the CWG for the framework of principles for future CWGs, which is sometimes affectionately known as CWG Squared as you see in the arrow there.

This was a group that was chartered by the CCNSO and the GNSO just under a year ago because a growing number in the community across very SOs and ACs started to agree that there are many more issues that are of cross cutting interest across the various sectors of the ICANN community and as we've seen from the newer CWGs, some of which Marika spoke about just a few minutes ago, there is therefore an increasing reliance on the use of CWGs to accomplish the work.

However, what we don't currently have is a single uniform framework that contains guidance for how these groups should work and when we talk about how they should work we're really talking as this CWG found in its initial studies about a typical lifecycle that goes in something like five phases.

Starting from the chartering and the formation through to the operations and the deliberations and decision making of the group. Down to what happens to its deliverables, what is the role of the ICANN board and, of course, how do we insure follow-up upon termination of the work.

So the working group is looking at these five phases and its most recent activities is the development of a checklist of sorts - or a template for the first two phases of this lifecycle and the hope is that in Singapore - and you see here on this slide that the meeting that they will be holding of the community is on Wednesday morning in the (More) room.

That you will be able to be there or representatives from your group, whichever group that might be across the ICANN community will be able to provide it with some good feedback with the aim being the next

milestone, ICANN 53, where hopefully the full initial checklist will be ready for community feedback and, of course, the ultimate hope is that this will feed into all the future work that this community will be doing regardless of whatever cross cutting issue it chooses to utilize. This framework and this methodology for.

So on that note I'm going to hand it over to - is it Lars?

Lars Hoffman: It is. Hi everybody, it's Lars and (unintelligible) will conclude this section on the cross community working groups with a quick overview of the work of the CWG on country and territory names as top-level domains. This community-working group was tasked to draft harmonized framework for the use of country and territory names as top-level domains as the title strongly suggests and to recommend next steps to both the GNSO and the CCNSO.

The group has been active for about six months and it is currently preparing a (unintelligible) options paper to layout some of the possible roots toward such a framework and that should be presented and discussed for the first time to the invited group in Singapore.

The group is also submitted in December a letter to the GAC whose sub-working group on the protection of geographic names that deals with a somewhat over that (unintelligible) issue. The group will meet face-to-face in Singapore as I just referred to, I believe on Monday at 12:15 and it can - it's looking to conclude its work hopefully by ICANN 54 this autumn in Dublin. And with that I'll pass it back to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Lars. It took a bit of time to get off mute. So next we'll look at some of the other projects that the GNSO is currently

looking at in addition to the one that is ongoing on the stewardships transition and enhancing accountability activities as was just spoken about. Let me just go to the next slide.

However, as we only have limited time available today we're only going to highlight some of these activities, noting that there are nearly 50 GNSO related meetings schedule for the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. So, first, we'll focus on translation and transfiguration of contact information and for that I will hand it over to my colleague Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Marika and this is Julie Hedlund and welcome everyone. I'll cover this very briefly. I support this group along with my colleague Lars Hoffman and a significant note is that in December of 2014 the PDP working group released an initial report. That report addresses the charter questions.

There are two questions, whether it's desirable to translate or transliterate or, as the working group calls it, transform contact information into a single common language and the second question is who should decide who should bear the burden of transforming contact information to a single language? That initial report is out for public comment, which ends on February the 1st at 23:59 UTC.

And following that the working group will consider the comments that are received, actually they are doing so already and they will continue to do so in Singapore. And we are foreseeing a report - a final report coming out in May.

The key arguments addressed in the initial report are arguments supporting mandatory transformation and arguments opposing

mandatory transformation. Just to summarize, mandatory transformation could result in a more transparent accessible and more easily searchable database could facilitate communication, avoid a possible abuse and might make it easier to cross reference holders of domain names.

On the other side of the argument opposing mandatory transformation are some concerns about accuracy, particularly relating to translation or transliteration of common nouns and concerns about the expense of transforming contact information as well as the usability of the transformed data.

Now the preliminary recommendations in the initial report are that there was no support for mandatory transformation. The working group recommends that it's not desirable to transform contact information and make that mandatory.

They do suggest that registration directory services databases should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-Latin script contact information that data fields should be tagged in (unintelligible) or Latin-script to allow easy identification that the registered name holder should enter their contact information in the language or script used by the registrar and that the registrar would - and registry would assure that the data fields are consistent and do some verification.

Here are some links for some additional information where you can reach - see the initial report, the public comments and a recent webinar that was held on the initial report. And at this point I want to thank you very much and I will turn things over to my colleague, Mary Wong, who

will talk to you about privacy and proxy services accreditation issues - policy development process.

Mary Wong: Thank you Julie. Hello everybody, it's Mary Wong again. And as Julie has just said I will be speaking to you about the - one of the other PDPs that the GNSO is currently conducting. And given the mouthful of this title, Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues, this is normally and usually abbreviated to PPSAI.

This is a group that was chartered by the GNSO council. You see here on the timeline a little less than a year and a half ago and I should say here that the timing of the work of this group has, to a large extent, been affected by an external factor. If you look at the quote on this slide about what this group was chartered to do it is to develop policy recommendations regarding certain issues that were highlighted during the negotiations for the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, or RAA. As most, not all folks, know the RAA was successfully negotiated and those were concluded and is actually now operational.

Following that and following the approval of that agreement by the board the remaining issues that had been highlighted during that process and that had not been addressed as part of that process were noted to be issues relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy services and the board has asked the GNSO therefore to follow-up by doing this PDP. The external factor that I spoke about is that this is a program that ICANN already committed to doing and in fact in the current 2013 RAA there is a temporary or interim specification that deals with some of the issues surrounding privacy and proxy services.

This interim specification expires - or is due to expire - on January the 1st 2017 or upon ICANN's implementation of its accreditation program, whichever is earlier. And so this is in large part the external factor that is driving the work, the pace and the timeline of this particular working group.

The thing to look out for and to look forward to in the Singapore meeting next month is that since its formation and charting the group has been meeting very regularly and has come up with a set of preliminary agreement emendations that it would like to present to the community in Singapore.

Some of these will be issues that if you've attended previous sessions with the group you would have sketched with them their history of the discussion of some of these issues and ultimately following the Singapore meeting, again, here I refer you to that timeline on this slide, the group hopes to complete all its initial deliberations and so be in a good position to publish its initial report for public comment shortly after the Singapore meeting.

As David noted in his introduction and as Julie has illustrated with the translation - transliteration working group, public comment is an integral part of the PDP and it is in reviewing the public comments it has received to its initial reports that all our working groups are able to refine and prepare the final report, which is what is sent to the GNSO counsel for its review and hopefully adoption, which then moves to the board level for their review and adoption. So as I noted the group has come to some preliminary agreement on a number of key concepts.

These are - some of them are listed in this slide. They follow the categories that the working group developed based on the two-dozen or so charter questions that the council asked it to consider as part of an accreditation program.

And some of the highlights here - you notice that the group agreed early on that there should be no distinction in principle between a privacy or a proxy service. And while most people on the call will know what those are I should note here that they aren't identical services. What they do in relation to the who is system, which allows anyone to access a free and publically available database to look at who is behind the registration of any domain name in the generic TLD system.

These services allow to a different extent the masking of some or of that kind of identify of contact details. The group has decided that by treating these services alike there are also some minimum mandatory requirements. In the large part this is to also insure that there are safeguards for registrant who may need the kind of protection afforded by these services. That certain mandatory provisions have to be included and published in the customer agreement regardless of which type of service is being used. And on ICANN's part the list of all the accredited providers that goes through this program successfully has to be made publically available.

As with some of the requirements in the 2013 RAA, the group has also discussed and come to preliminary agreement on things like a provider being able - or having to provide a designated contact point as well as developing a list of the sort of requirements relating to the type of illegal activity that has to be reported. And the last two bullet points here that I want to highlight is particularly interesting because the

questions of relay and reveal have been very difficult questions for the ICANN community, including the GNSO, for quite a long period of time. And while previous efforts have touched on how to deal with them they haven't gone as far as this particular group.

And so you see here some of the key preliminary recommendations, including the mandatory forward or relay of certain types of electronic communications as well as where review is concerned and this relates really to a request that a provider would receive from the third party to either this third party, the customer's identity or details or to publish publically in full who is the customer's identity and contact details. And so you can imagine some of the complexities that go into trying to insure accessibility on the one hand protection on the other, but some of the baseline mandatory requirements discussed in detail listed here on this slide that the group has agreed to and for that we are very happy with the progress.

That said, there are also some issues for which the working group has not yet reached consensus and so the Singapore session will be very helpful to the group as it starts to bring its initial report together. A couple of the things that I wanted to highlight about these particular issues are here on this slide. And that includes whether or not a domain name that is registered and is used for online financial transactions, that is associated with commercial activities should be committed to use a privacy or proxy service.

What do you do when there is a request by a third party for a provider to relay certain requests to its customer and that is done, but there is a persistent delivery failure? What should be the process of escalation? What should be the obligations on the provider? And in relation to

reveal, as I've highlighted, has two aspects - disclosure or publication. That there are different kinds of third parties that make that kind of request, including law enforcement.

So there are some difficult questions that the group is currently struggling with as regards to these particular issues and we're looking forward to the Singapore discussions to get some community assistance in preparing, as I noted, their initial report.

So here are some additional links and information, including the meeting that the group will be holding in Singapore on the Wednesday and on behalf of the group I look forward to seeing you and welcoming a participation, physically or remotely, as well as, of course, to you and your communities input on the initial report when it's published after Singapore. On that note I'm going to hand over to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you Mary. So next we'll be talking about policy and implementation. So there has been an increased focus over the last couple of years of - on how to deal with policy implementation related questions. Such as, what happens if a policy issue is identified during the implementation phase? Who decides whether something is policy or implementation?

And do we actually have sufficiently clear processes in place to deal with these kinds of questions. So as a result of those conversations the GNSO council formed a working group to focus on a number of questions that specifically relate to policy and implementation in the context of the GNSO. So this working group has now published its initial recommendations report for public comments.

In short, the working group is putting forward the following preliminary recommendations for our community consideration. And so first of all in response to one of its charter questions, which asks for recommendations concerning a set of principles I would underpin any GNSO policy implementation related discussions. The working group is recommending adhering to a set of principles that it has outlined in section four of the initial recommendations report and those principles are to be used when policy or implementation related issues arrive in the implementation phase. The principles are divided into principles that cover both policy and implementation. Those are primarily applied to policy and those are applied primarily to implementation.

Furthermore, in addition to the only formal process GNSO currently has, which is a policy development process, or PDP, the working group is also proposing three new standardize processes for GNSO deliberation. Namely the GNSO Input Process, or GIP, which is to be used for those instances for which the GNSO council intends to provide non-binding advice, which it expected to typically concern topics that are not GLD specific and for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date. And non-binding advice (unintelligible) needed (unintelligible) has no binding force on the party it is provided to.

So, for example, this process could be used to provide input on the ICANN strategic plan or recommendations from an accountability and transparency review team. It is the expectation that such input would then be treated in a similar manner as public comments are currently (unintelligible) by the entity which the input is provided.

Secondly, there is the GNSO Guidance Process, or GGP, which is to be used in those instances for which the GNSO council intends to provide binding guidance to the ICANN board, but which is not expected to result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties. And binding guidance in this context means (unintelligible) has a binding force on the ICANN board to consider the guidance and which then can only be rejected by a vote of more than two-thirds of the board if the board determines that such guidance is not in the best interest of the ICANN team (unintelligible) ICANN.

It is expected that this would typically involve clarification of or advice on existing GTLE policy recommendations. This could, for example, be in response to a specific request on the ICANN board, but it could also be at the initiative (unintelligible) council to an issue that it has identified. For example, such a process could have been used if it would have been in existence at the time in relation to the request from the ICANN board to provide input on the (unintelligible) brand registry agreement or also known as specification 13.

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

(Unintelligible) criteria are proposed to be to relate - to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified in scopes either after the adoption opportunities or policy recommendation by the ICANN board or the implementation of such an adoption recommendation. Or,

two, to provide new or additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that has been substantially scoped previously. Such that extensive personal background information already exists.

For example, if initial report for a possible PDP was not initiated at an earlier stage or part of a previous PDP that was not completed or developed through other projects such as the GDP. Further details on each of these post-processes can be found in initial recommendations report.

As a result of its deliberations on the three implantation related charter questions the working group recommends that the policy development process manual be modified to require the creation of an implementation review team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN board, but at the same time allow the GSO council the flexibility to not create an IRT in exceptional circumstances. For example, if another IRT is already in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations and the working group also recommends the adoption of the implementation review team principles as outlined in annex H of the preliminary - of the initial recommendations report and that should be followed as part of the creation as well as the operation of implementation review teams.

So to provide your input on the initial recommendations report you can do so by the traditional public comment form, to which you see the link here on the screen, but in addition the working group has also developed a survey that can be used as an alternative way to provide input. And, again the link is up here on the screen. In addition the working group is also hosting a session at the ICANN meeting in Singapore to be able to provide further details on its recommendations

as well as any - answer any questions that there may be. So this session is scheduled for Wednesday afternoon from 3:30 to 5:00 local time.

So before handing it over to my next colleague I briefly wanted to touch upon a number of other GNSO projects that you might be interested in. So, first of all, there's the IGO, INGO access security or bribes protection mechanism policy development process working group. This effort is looking into whether to amend existing (unintelligible) resolution processes or create potentially new processes to address specific concerns of IGO and IGNOs. This working group is actually planning an all day face-to-face meeting right after the ICANN meeting in Singapore, which is intended to assist in meeting its target date of July-August of this year to publish an initial report for public comment.

The (unintelligible) transfer policy part-d policy development process recommendations will be up for ICANN board consideration at the ICANN meeting in Singapore and provided these are adopted the GNSO council will form an implementation review team which is to work with ICANN staff to insure that implementation happens - conform the intent of the policy recommendations.

Last but not least two other issues - other initiatives that are not meeting in Singapore, but which intend to have reports out for public comment later this year are the data and metrics policy making working group. And (unintelligible) will be subsequent procedures discussion group.

So if you're interested to learn more details about either of those initiatives or any of the other projects that the GNSO is working on I

would like to encourage you to visit this page. That puts all GNSO related information. That should aid your preparation for the next ICANN meeting at your fingertips. Of course, if you have any immediate questions please feel free to ask them at the end of our webinar or type them in the chat and we'll do our best to answer them. And with that I'll be handing it over to Bart Boswinkel to tell you about the country code names supporting organization.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Marika. Welcome to a brief update of what is happening in the CCNSO. I will touch upon a few topics. First of all, the framework of interpretation. Those of you who have attended previous webinars know this is a long ongoing project within the CCNSO together with the GAC. A little bit on what is happening within the CCNSO with regard to the IANA stewardship and accountability processes and some miscellaneous topics.

So framework of interpretation. What is - will happen in Singapore? As some of you will know the CCNSO council adopted its - the final report of the framework of interpretation working group at the Los Angeles meeting, but this was an interim adoption awaiting support or endorsement from the Governmental Advisory Committee, which is one of the other chartering organizations of the framework of interpretation group.

So what - in Singapore the GAC - or the framework of interpretation working group will seek support on a framework of interpretation and the recommendations related to it from the governmental advisory committee.

The final report was submitted to the GAC before the LA meeting together with - at the same time it was submitted to the CCNSO and in spite of all the CCNSO-GAC agenda. For those who are not so familiar with the FOI the FOI will provide the Framework of Interpretation will provide color and depth to the current policy relating to delegation and re-delegation of CCTLDs. So to be clear it is not a new policy.

It is just an interpretation of the existing basic policy document, which is ROC 50-91. What is out of scope of this working group is the IANA functions contract and the applicable law of countries and relating to the CCTLDs, which remains paramount. So especially in the context of the IANA stewardship transition process and the accountability process the framework of interpretation is relevant as well and, as you may have heard and may have seen, it came up in the discussions around these two - in these two processes and was highlighted by the CCTLD participant and members of these working groups.

So, as I said, the focus is on delegation and re-delegation of CCTLDs and the topics are consent of the current CCTLD managers, the interpretation and the definition of what used to known as the local internet community, which his now called - or which is now renamed and going back to ROC 51-91 to significantly interested parties and (unintelligible) and transfer of a CCTLD also, and formally known as unconsented re-delegations. So a second topic I want touch upon briefly is what is happening in the CCNSO regarding the IANAs (unintelligible) chip and accountability processes.

Now, first of all, as with the other communities under the ICANN umbrella for the CC community it is of the highest priority. Both for members of the CCNSO and for non-members of the CCNSO and this

is also reflected in the participation of the CCTLD community in, for example, the cross community working group on the - say - the cross community's stewardship working group. There will be two major sessions at the CCNSO - and I'll go more in detail - a little bit more in detail into these sessions itself, but say the format of these sessions will be, first of all, explaining the process and final discussion with the community and amongst CCTLD members and participants to select the view of the CCTLD's presence.

One - I would say I want to highlight - one aspect of what the CCNSO is doing as well is they have created a CCNSO coordination committee under the chairmanship of the CCNSO (Byron Holland) in order to coordinate the CCTLD efforts with respect to these processes or members of the CWG and the CCWG exo-ficio members of this coordination committee and they meet twice every two weeks.

So with regard to the other sessions the CCNSO meeting - or with regard to the sessions themselves, first of all, the CCNSO council will discuss the decision making process it wants to enter into regarding the proposal of the CWG and the recommendations coming out of the CCWG and probably present their findings to the community itself and it is one of the topics they want to discuss at the joint meetings with the GNSO. And at a large the CCTLD community discussions themselves will focus on the current state of affairs regarding the CWG stewardship. That will be on Tuesday afternoon 9 February and preemptive elements of the CWG accountability will be discussed on Wednesday afternoon prior to the CCNSO council meeting.

Some other topics that will be discussed by the CCNSO and that's the outcome of say - the working groups and other work of the CCNSO.

First of all, there will be, as I said the annual council workshop, in this case it will again - and this is reoccurring topic of these workshops, is the rolls and responsibilities of the councilors and a particular one is the outreach and engagement of the CTLD community, in general, in the work of the CCNSO and in particular on the intertube main processes - so the stewardship and the accountability process.

During the meeting on Tuesday there will be a presentation of the incident response working group. This working group is focused on creating a secure email list to inform and alert the CCTLDs of security incidence that may affect the CCTLD registries. This has been an ongoing process.

As usually there will be a discussion of the CCNSO strategic and operational planning working group and their findings and input of the five year - in this case the five year operational planning process and there that day, which is a Monday, which is open to all with an interest in operational and technical topics and the program group of that day has been expanded to include representatives from other communities as well to make it as interesting as possible for those - not only from the CCTLD, but for the broader community.

And, finally, it will be the usual sections at the CCNSO meeting - say, new CCTLD or CCTLD related topics like changes of policies of CCTLD marketing activities and an update from the regional organizations. More information on the CCNSO meeting can be found at the CCNSO dedicated meeting page. You can see the URL. For those interested in the work of the CCNSO Strategic and Operational Plan you can see the URL of this particular working group and those of you with an interest in the (unintelligible) final report it is posted and

can be found on the framework of interoperation working group webpage and the URL is included as well. And that ends my brief update of what is happening at the CCNSO and now I'd like to hand over to my colleague (Barbara Roseman).

(Barbara Roseman): Thank you Bart. I'll be addressing the (unintelligible) - I'll be updating on the address supporting organization and regional internet registry. Over the course of the last period the RARs have had meetings in all regions. Over 50 policy proposals were made in total. 19 concluded with consensus in being implemented by the respective RAR. Additionally (unintelligible) introduced a new who is implementation.

(Unintelligible) and (unintelligible) worked to manage their remaining IPD for resources and support IPD 6 deployment. (Apeanick) improved their processes through some member supported actions and (Aaron) prepared for IPD 4 depletion in their area and to improve their member resources policy manual. The (Wright) entity introduced a new management interface for their resource certification, which deals with RPKI and reduced workload and facilitated transferees for their members.

Regarding the work on the IPG. (Chris) and the - (Chris) is the consolidated RAR IANA stewardship proposal team that the RARs produce to create their proposals. They had a mailing list developed and they submitted their final response to the ICG on 15 January. All of the different regions participated in this by having teams that joined in on the final (crisp) project. And I'd like to hand this over to Steve now - Steve Sheng for the root server system advisory committee update. Oh, I'm sorry - (Carlos) will be presenting it right now.

(Carlos Reyes): Thanks (Barbara). This is (Carlos Reyes) and I will be presenting on the root server system advisory committee. As an overview of the RSSAC is comprised of 12 voting appointed root server operator representatives. Three regional management partners, which include (unintelligible), NTIAA and IANA. Three liaisons and the current co-chairs for this year are (Lars Yohanlemon) from Net-Nav in Sweden. The I-Root root server operator and (Tripte Sinhoff) from the University of Maryland the D-Root operator.

Currently the RSSAC is meeting monthly via teleconference and, of course in person at ICANN public meetings. Since its restructure the RSSAC has formed the caucus of root server systems and DNS experts. There are currently 53 members. Recently they launched a new work party to focus on root zone TPLs and two work parties completed their work since ICANN 51 in Los Angeles, which has led to the finalization and approval of RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002, two advisory documents.

RSSAC 001 is titled Recommendations on Service Expectations of Root Servers. And as of right now it has not been published, but it will be published in tandem with an RFC from the Internet Architecture Board. Essentially RSSAC 001 describes the best practice service to be provided by root servers and defines the operational expectations that users might reasonably anticipate. In total there are 18 expectations articulated in a variety of different areas, including infrastructure or service capacity, operational security among others.

Onto RSSAC 002 - RSSAC 002 was published and it identifies and recommends and an initial set of parameters establishing a baseline in

identifying trends for root server - for the root service system. These parameters include the size of the overall root zone, member queries and response type and size distribution among others. The RSSAC is recommending in its advisory, but the measurements be collected in a central location and stored in the common format for ongoing analysis.

And the implementation of these measurements will form an early warning system that will assist in detecting and mitigating any effects associated with the growth in the DNS root zone as well as help identify any changes that might challenge the normal performance of the root service system. So, as you can see, the RSSAC system has definitely reengaged in the ICANN community and with that I will hand it over to Steve Sheng for an update from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Carlos. Since ICANN 51 the security and stability advisory committee issued SSAC 69 the last of a three part series advice are in a stewardship transition. In SSAC 69 the SSAC describes the ways in which NTIA currently contributes to the security, stability and resiliency of the IANA function activities and they present questions and issues for the community to address in order to preserve the SSR of IANA function through and beyond transition and it makes (unintelligible) recommendations to each of the questions.

The first set of recommendations is regarding root zone management. First, the SSAC recommends any proposal to replace NTIAs final authorization of root zone changes with an alternative be at least reliable, resilient and efficient as the current process. In drafting this recommendation the SSAC understands noting that the stability and

efficiency of the existing structure process (unintelligible) for their root zone management.

The second recommendation is effective arrangements should be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the root zone management process - post transition including inter-organization coordination if in the post transition root zone management process involve more than one root zone management partners. Today the arrangement - there are two arrangements. One is the IANA functions contract between NTIA and ICANN as the IANA function operator and then the cooperative agreement between NTIA and (unintelligible) as their root zone maintainer. So as NTIA is transitioned out of its current role the effective arrangements should be made.

And the last recommendation here is NTIA should clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the root zone maintainer after transition. This is related to the second recommendation.

The next set of recommendations is to the operational communities - the names, the numbers and the protocol parameters that are developing proposals. The first one is to determine whether or not the requirement and deliverables you find in the IANA functions contract should be retained and, if so, which ones? Whether additional controls are needed and how - by whom they should be administered. This one has already been addressed by the cross community working group IANA stewardship transition.

The second recommendation is determined whether or not existing mechanisms outside the IANA functions contract are sufficiently robust

to hold the IANA functions operator accountable. And, if so, if they're not what additional accountability measures will be needed?

The next recommendation is for these communities is to review and, if necessary, enhance its policy development process to insure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA functions operator are clear and implementable so that the IANA functions operator are not left to interpret the policies being given. So it's clear and implementable.

Investigate and clarify the process for handling the possibility of governmental sanctions and restrictions. This related to the protocol obtaining the (OFAC) licenses following this stewardship transition. And, last but not least it's consider the extent to which the importance of transparency and freedom in proper influence in the performance of the IANA functions might require additional mechanisms for other safeguards.

The SSAC - this is a brief overview of the advisory - the SSAC will provide detailed updates to the community at ICANN Singapore meeting. So that's a quick update. Next, I'll hand over to my colleague Olof to provide an update on GAC. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much (Steve) and hello all, you're back with me, Olof, again from a Brussels suburb for a few words about the Governmental Advisory Committee or the GAC, which is an advisory committee within ICANN that currently has 148 governments as members. And also 32 (IDOs) into governmental organizations as observers. And our mission is to provide advice for the ICANN board on public policy matters or on public policy aspects on any matter.

So what are they up to in Singapore? Well, regarding policy related activities, well, there are quite a few of those. And first and foremost like many others I would perhaps say all others it's the IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability. And it should be noted that the GAC is one of the chartering organizations for the cross community working group for names within the stewardship transition and also the cross constancy working group on accountability. So it's quite important and we'll (unintelligible) consider retirement in Singapore by the GAC.

Also, Bart mentioned a framework of interpretation for CCTLDs. And that's also high on the agenda. The CCNSO is waiting for an endorsement by the GAC and the GAC has not (unintelligible) which were sorted out hopefully by - with the session together with the CCNSO.

Human rights and international laws were clearly a public policy matter and it will be discussed how this can be reflected in ICANN's activities. There are also remaining issues with the new detailed (unintelligible) program. Would you believe it?

Protection of (unintelligible) red cross and red profession - national names is such a one - certainly quite a long standing. The implementation - the detailed implementation of what GAC has provided as advice regarding safeguards is also subject for discussion within the GAC and most certainly also with the board. Also, country names on the second level where the board is awaiting advice from the GAC and the GAC has promised to deliver that, which we all are certainly looking forward to.

So there ought to be a session for the community, that's on Wednesday starting at 10:30 in the GAC room on geographic names. And that's for future rounds. There's GAC working groups previously a sub-working group that appears to draft and this has been published for community input and the community has provided a lot of the input and this will be discussed and advanced during this Wednesday session.

And, of course, many of these matters will be dealt with in meetings with other parties within the ICANN structure like the GNSO, CCNSO (unintelligible) meeting the (unintelligible) and most certainly the board, which is probably the most visited and most attended GAC meeting of them all.

This is not all, there are process matters to address. The accountability (unintelligible) review team they produced quite a lot of recommendations - particularly pertaining to the GAC and those are being addressed by a number of working groups within the GAC and also external involving the board and also what I mentioned earlier the GNSO-GAC concentration group for early engagement that was much prompted by the HR team to recommendations.

A little modification - some modifications are needed to - for the GAC operating principles that we would discuss. And there will also be a few updates from the ICANN compliance team and also a briefing on the DNS market.

So understandably enough the GAC is pretty busy starting at mid-day on Saturday and closing at mid-day on Thursday in Singapore. And it just serves to be noted that all sessions are open with one exception.

There's the communicate drafting session on Wednesday afternoon. So you're most welcome to join the GAC meeting room, which is named (unintelligible) and where you can enjoy the proceedings in any of the six UN languages. We have interpretation for those and also Portuguese. So with that I conclude on the GAC and back across the Atlantic to my colleague Heidi Ulrich to talk - to tell you a little about the GAC - or ALAC, sorry. So take it away Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you Olof, hello. Everyone, my name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Senior Director for At Large. I'm based in the Los Angeles ICANN office. Today I'm joined by two of my teammates (Arielle Lang), At Large Policy Coordinator who is based in the Washington DC office and (Sylvia Evanco), Manager At Large Regional Affairs who is based in Lima, Peru. We are delighted to give you a brief update on the activities of the 15 member At Large Advisory Committee - or the ALAC - chaired by Alan Greenberg and the At Large community consisting of the five regional At Large organizations and currently 182 At Large structures. I will first go over a little bit of the hot topics and (Arielle) will continue in more detail on that.

In Singapore the ALACs will be implementing a new strategy for their activities at public meetings. The strategy focuses their discussions on two or three hot topics in order to allow sufficient time for discussion on these topics. In Singapore the two main hot topics will be the following, the first is the NTIA IANA functions dealership transition. Weekly calls of the At Large ad hoc working group on the transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function, or transition working group for short, have been held since August 2013 and these frequent meetings have allowed the ALAC position to be developed through a bottom-up process.

The ALAC favors an inside ICANN solution rather than creating a contract (unintelligible). And this hot topic will be discussed ALAC meetings on Sunday and Tuesday in Singapore and also the transition working group will be meeting on Tuesday the 10th of February between 17:30 and 19:00 in the VIP room.

The second hot topic is ICANN accountability and transparency. The ALAC position is to insure strong accountability and multi-stakeholder involvement in all ICANN decisions. This hot topic will be discussed during the ALAC meetings on Sunday and Tuesdays. I would now like to hand the floor over to (Arrielle) who will provide an update on ALAC policy advice development activities and provide more detail about the ALAC's work on hot topics as well as their ongoing issue of the public interest commitments, or the PICs. (Arrielle)?

(Arrielle Liam): Thank you Heidi. My name is (Arrielle Liam), At Large Policy Coordinator since the end of ICANN 51 Alan Greenburg, a former ALAC liaison to the GNSO has become the ALAC chair who oversees policy advise development activities on the ALAC. Over the past four months the ALAC have managed five policy advice statements. Two statements are concerning public interest commitments. During the topic forum, at ICANN 51 the ALAC called for a freeze on the most sensitive category 1 TLDs as defined by the GAC to appropriate public interest safeguards are put in place.

To (unintelligible) this position the ALAC submitted a follow-up statement in November last year. Gaining momentum the ALACs advise has rallied support from the business constituency, the GAC and other sources. Last week the ALAC matched with members from

the board knew GPLD process committee and engaged in the productive discussion on the TDD consensus policy and ICANN compliance follow-up measures related to the public interest commitment.

ALAC's concern will be further discussed at the upcoming NGTC meeting. In response to the public comment request the IANA naming related functions to ask transition proposal. The ALAC submitted a (unintelligible) statement (unintelligible) an internal ICANN proposal. The ALAC believes that ICANN reliably perform the IANA services and should continue to do so unless it is incapable or unwilling to carry out these functions. Being sure that this happens additional accountability measures need to be put in place.

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

Further, more at large members have been actively contributing in the enhancing ICANN accountability cross community working group. (Unintelligible) an ALAC member has been working as the co-chair. Over to you Heidi.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much (Arielle). We'd now like to turn to ALAC At Large and later on (unintelligible) activities in Singapore. In Singapore ALAC will be holding 22 formal meetings. The ALAC will be meeting with the ICANN board of directors on Tuesday the 10 of February between 8:30 and 9:30 in the (unintelligible) meeting room. ALAC topics to be

discussed include their hot topics, NTIAA, IANA functions, stewardship position and ICANN accountability and transparency issues as well as progress and implementation of the recommendations from the second At Large Summit.

Meetings will be held within CCNSO, GAC as well as the non-com and SSACK leadership. Also, senior ICANN staff will be presenting updates on such topics as the GSE and government engagement, the fiscal year 16-budget process and information in management activities.

Six at large working groups will be meeting face to face to facilitate progress in both policy and process activities. These are the At Large metrics working group Sunday at 17:30 to 18:30. The ICANN Academy working group Monday 12:30 to 13:30, At Large Accessibility working group Tuesday 12:15 to 13:15, the At Large new GTLD working group Tuesday 16:30 to 17:30, the transition working group, again, Tuesday 17:30 to 19:00 and the at large technology task force Thursday 8:00 to 9:00.

Of note, following these successful iteration of HUBS during the ICANN meeting in Las Angeles during the meeting in Singapore at large structures will serve as hubs for remote participants on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday of the ICANN meeting. And nearly 20 At Large structures and (unintelligible) chapters have applied to service hubs. I will now hand the floor over to (Sylvia Avanco) who will update you on the activities of the five regional At Large organizations during ICANN 52 - (Sylvia)?

(Sylvia Avanco): Thank you Heidi. This is (Sylvia Avanco), Manager At Large Regional Records. I talk about the Sylvia activities in Singapore. After

(unintelligible) African joined me on the team ICANN accountability on Wednesday 11 from 14:00 to 15:30 PM. (Unintelligible) will hold this monthly meeting on Tuesday the 10 - 10:30 to 14:30 PM.

One of the highlights of this meeting would be the signature of the corporation agreement with (unintelligible) Asia. There will be a discussion of the progress and implantation of the AP (unintelligible) expired framework. And approximately 20 self-financed (unintelligible) will attend this meeting. (Unintelligible) will hold a dismantling meeting on Thursday the 12 from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM. Among other issues (Narala) would sign an (unintelligible) corporation with a North American registry (unintelligible).

Then the (unintelligible) will meet with the ALAC and the leadership team working session on Wednesday the 11th - time 7:00 AM to 8:15 AM. This meeting will discuss the strategy objectives for at large and (unintelligible) actions to implement those objectives. (Unintelligible) will meet on Wednesday 11 from 12:00 to 13:30 and this is a customer meeting with the five (unintelligible) where they will discuss several close (unintelligible) issues such as the at large 360 review. The new at large outreach document performance metrics (unintelligible) recommendations and relationships between the (unintelligible) and the RARS.

(Unintelligible) in the link provided. And now I would like to invite you to the AP (unintelligible) Singapore showcase 2015 celebrating diversity. Either (unintelligible) relevant is schedule for Wednesday 11 from 18:00 to 21:00 at the meeting room VIP and the Stanford ball room. This is a community celebration inviting all ICANN community to learn more about the achievements of (Ap Rilo). The beginning will

showcase how (AP Rilo) is engaging a diverse community of 36 (unintelligible) and the specific guidance in 21 countries. Approximately 20 (unintelligible) will attend this event and this will provide an opportunity to meet and greet them personally.

The speakers at the event include ICANN's President and CEO Fadi Chehade, ICANN's (unintelligible), Elector Alan Greenberg, AP (unintelligible) among other community members who loves to speak at the event. And join us for a very special music and dance (unintelligible) performance by students from the Malaysian School (unintelligible) science (unintelligible).

We will also have a Chinese calligraphy demonstration by brush and ink and even given that the entire meeting is taking place during the Chinese New Year festivities we will take this opportunity to celebrate the Chinese lunar new year as well. So please join us to celebrate (unintelligible) university and get achievements of the At Large Community. Thank you very much. Over to you, Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much (Sylvia). I would now like to open the floor for questions to the policy development support team. If it goes into the audio bridge please press star 1 and record your name clearly. If you're listening to the Adobe Connect room please type your questions on the chat pod and we'll reply to you out on the chat or verbally. Once again, if you'd like to ask a question from the audio bridge please press star 1 and record your name clearly. While we wait for some questions to come through I would like to address the questions that were submitted prior to the webinar, which we have answered on this slide that you can see on the screen.

The first question addressed the NTIA-IANA functions transition process and we have provided a link for more information about this topic as you can see on the screen. The second question addresses - asks for more information or an update about how is related policy discussions and working groups.

And the Governmental Advisory Committee, or the GAC, has recently asked the same question and in response I had staff prepare an overview, which can be found on the link that is provided on the screen. The third question new received was about how we can balance the remaining industry and is it possible to publically open the domain auction results. So for more information about this I'm referring you to the contractual compliance and the new GTLDs program auction website.

We don't appear to have any questions on the audio bridge so I'll move on to the next section, which is about how to stay updated with the policy development support team.

For the staff (unintelligible) you can contact us at policy-ask@icann.org. Alternatively you can also follow us on Twitter with following the Twitter handles that you can see on the slide on the screen. You can also subscribe to our monthly policy update by clicking on the URL provided on the screen, which is available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. If you are new to ICANN or the policy development process or would like to take part in working group work you can also join the GNSO new comer webinar sessions which are basically informal get togetherness which are chaired by community members where new comers may ask questions

about joining working groups and more experienced community members can also brush up on their basics.

The next schedule - sorry, the next session is scheduled for the 12th of March and you're all encouraged to join. The announcement will be sent out in February and with that I'd like to turn it over to David Olive to conclude the webinar.

David Olive: Thank you Benedetta and members of the policy team for providing this good information to our community members. I just wanted to point out that we are 27 members of this staff located in 9 countries, 5 time zones and speaking 12 languages. In fact, the speakers on tonight's webinar were in every geographic region where ICANN has a hub office or engagement office.

So we're here to serve you both close and far and we hope to see you in person in Singapore or, if not, via remote participation in the sessions that are of interest to you that we highlighted today in following the policy development activities at ICANN. So with that I'd like to thank you for your participation and wish you safe travels if you're on your way to Singapore and good evening, good afternoon or good morning wherever you may be. Thank you very much.

END