Pre-Prague Policy Update Webinar
14 June 2012
Second session: 19:00 UTC

David Olive: Welcome.to the ICANN Policy Update Webinar, my name is David Olive and I am Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN. We are pleased to provide our regular policy updates which we do prior to each ICANN meeting in order to provide interested parties with an update on policy development activities. We think it helps all of us to prepare and focus our efforts in Prague.

There was a lot of information contained I this presentation, the slides and recordings will be made available following this session so everyone will have an opportunity to review it and refer back to it if needed. A few housekeeping item, please note the policy notes in the center lower box, to reduce interference please mute your phones. There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of this session when the phones are un-muted.

In-between that of course if you have any question, please use the chat box and we will do our best to answer your questions in real time and so that would be another way to do that before the end of this session. The goals of our session today and we thank you for joining us, will be to provide an update on the current policy work, review the issues that will be discussed in the ICANN meeting in Prague, provide additional information opportunities

for input on those policy issues, have a special introduction to the At-Large policy issues.

Our at At-Large Director Heidi Ulrich will be doing that for us today and of course answer any questions that you may have on the topics and the programs that you see presented today and in Prague. In addition to the number of policy-related activities that we'll highlight today, there are other important sections taking place in Prague such as the update on the RAA negotiations, a session on ethics and conflicts of interest, ICANN and the Internet Governance Landscape, a new gTLD program update, the forum on VMs abuse and of course the newcomers track and finally the anniversary of ALAC which Heidi will tell us a little more about.

Of course events and further information and details can be reviewed on the Prague meeting schedule information is here. The focus on the presentation is on policy development at ICANN and as most of you will be aware, the following bodies are responsible for such policy developments. The Generic Names Supporting Organization, GNSO develops policy recommendations applicable to the generic top level domains. The Country Code Supporting Organization, ccNSO has the ability to develop policy recommendations applicable to the country code top levels.

And the Address Supporting Organization, ASO reviews and develops recommendations on Internet protocol address policy. In addition to the supporting organizations, they have a number of advisory committees listed here that also provide advice to the ICANN Board. In the interest of time so we can get to the substance of my colleagues and the inter-action going forward, the topics covered here for the GNSO are listed, also for the ccNSO, At-Large and the ASO. And more details will be provided in a moment.

I now turn the floor over to Liz Gasster, Senior Policy Counselor for the GNSO to talk about GNSO policy issues, Liz please.

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much David and good day everyone, my name is Liz Gasster and we have quite a long list of issues currently being discussed in the GNSO, so we selected a few highlights to review with you today. We do have about 25 projects and various working groups underway, so it's not feasible to cover all of them today. But just to give you some of the highlights, we'll be talking about the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, the locking of domain names subject to UDRP proceedings, take renewal notices update on activities related to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

I'll be talking a little bit about who is along with my colleague Steve Sheng and then we'll be touching also on consumer choice competition and trust metrics and cross community working groups and from (Jack)'s principles we've been working on. So these will be some selected highlights that we do plan to cover with you today and first I'll turn it over to Marika Konings to talk about the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. Thanks Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Liz, hello everyone thanks for joining us today. So first let me talk to you about the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy also known as the IRTP. This is a good GNSO consensus policy that was adopted back in 2004 and with the objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation of the policy was decided that it might be helpful to carry out a review to see whether the policy was working as intended or whether there were any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvements. It might be worth pointing out that this is

actually the number one of consumer complaints when it comes to issues that are raised with our ICANN compliance staff.

And as a result of the review that was carried out, a number of issues were identified that were then grouped together in five different policy development processes or also known as PDPs that were titled A to E, which are being addressed in a consecutive manner. So the Part B - the IRTP Part B PDP in this series is not nearly complete, all the recommendations have not been adopted by the ICANN Board and several of these actually came into effect two weeks ago on the first of June.

Including a requirement for registrars to provide a Transfer Emergency Action Contact or a TEAC which allows registrars to contact each other in case of an emergency such as hijacking. And it also includes requirement that the loosing registrar notify the registrant of the transfer out which before was an optional issue. And it provides clarification that an objection to returns for a monthly provider with the express and informed consent authorized transfer contact on an often basis and a phone number connecting the registrar.

The registrar must remove the lock within five calendar days. There are two other recommendations that were adopted more recently which relate to how to lock or unlock main names and another one relating to the clarification and sanitization of who is status matches relating to registrar lock. ICANN staff is currently working on the implementation and you can expect to hear more about those in the near future.

So in the meantime the IRTP Part C working group is making good progress and this working group is looking at three different charter questions. The first one relating to the issue of whether there should be a change of control or a change of registrar functions for gTLD registrations as is current it does not

exist. The second question relates to whether the form of authorization which is used to initiate a transfer should be time limited.

And a third issue this working group is looking at is whether there should be a requirement for registries to use IANA IDs for registrars instead of proprietary IDs. So in order to gather information on these questions, the working groups started off by conducting a data gathering survey. They also have the public common forum and they requested input from GNSO stakeholder groups constituencies as well as the size of their ICANN supporting organization and advisory committee.

So as a result of all that information gathered and a weekly conference calls, as the working group has now published it's initial report for public comments. As initial report includes four preliminary recommendations and the first one recommends the creation of a change of registrar's consensus policy which would outline the rules and requirements for conducting a change of registrar.

One of the requirements of that proposed policy would be for the registrar to notify the prior and new registrant of such change has been requested and the confirmation from both parties that such a change is desired. But at the same time there are a couple of outstanding issues, the working group is specifically looking for input on such as should this policy be accompanied by a restriction that would prevent a change of registrar immediately following a change of registrant for a certain period of time.

And whether the change of this registrant policy should be incorporated as a stand-alone policy or should it become part of the existing IRTP. And which changes to registrant information should qualify as the change of registrants, you know, in the Whois information. So these are some of the specific

questions that the working group is looking for input on as part of the public common forum.

And the second recommendation relates to a time limiting Forms of Authorization, also known as FOAs. As the current working group thinking is to put this time limit somewhere between 45 and 60 days, but it is also an initiative of the working group is looking for further input on to make a final determination of what would be the appropriate time limit. A third recommendation that is linked to the previous one relates to providing an up-out mechanism to the requirement of time limiting after way.

Should the registrar decide so, which for example might be desirable in cases where a domain and registration has been put up for auction which could span a longer time period than, you know, the 45 or 60 days that are currently on the discussion. So recommendation four would require all GTO the operators to publish the registrar of records, IANA ID and the (SIG) TLDs (awig) and noting that they should not prevent the industry to use proprietary IDs in the context of all - contacts of all the operations as long as the IANA ID is published as well.

So if you're interested to hear more about the initial report and the recommendations, you're more than welcome to attend the workshop that the working group is organizing in Prague on Wednesday from 9:00 to 11:00. I also strongly encourage you to submit you comments to the public comment forum which will be open until the 4th of July and followed by a recycle - reply cycle which is planned to close on the 25th of July. And on this site you'll find some more information or links to the initial report as well as the public common forum and the current inter-registrar (tents) or policy itself.

So the next topic I'll be talking about is the PDP, Policy Development Process relating to the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings or the UDRP domain lock working group as it's now being referred to as well. So this PDP follows from a recommendation of the IRTP Part B working group to address this issue as part of a possible review of the UDRP. And subsequently the issue report on the currency of the UDRP, this issue was also flagged as a problem.

So based on those two efforts, the council decides to initiate a PDP on the specific items. As, you know, accruing there is according to the UDRP no actual requirement of locker domain in the period between filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of proceedings. The UDRP does refer to status quo, but it actually doesn't define what it means in relation to the locking of a domain name.

So as part of the charter, the working group has been asked to consider a number of questions such as whether there should be an outline of the process for the locking of a domain name which should be followed by the registrar. Whether there should be a definition of what locked actually means, you know, meaning what kinds of changes that can and cannot be made once the domain name is locked subject to UDRP proceedings. And also whether there should be any additional safeguards to protect registrars during the process.

So following the adoption of the charter by the GNSO Council group - by the GNSO Council Working Group was formed and this working group started it's deliberations in April of this year. And as far as charter, one of the first tasks that the working group has been working on is actually a paying further input in order to have a clear understanding of the exact nature and scope of issues encountered with the locking of the domain and subject to UDRP proceedings.

And so two designs the working group has now developed two surveys, one intended for registrars and another one intended for UDRP providers in which a range of questions are asked in order to get further insight into the current practices in relation to the locking of the domain name subject to UDRP proceeding, but also the issues that are encountered by these two parties. So following the completion of the survey, the working group is planning to also open a public common forum to get broader input on these issues.

As well as the working group will reach out to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as other supporting organizations and advisory committees to get their view on these issues. So if you're interested to hear more about this topic, the working group is organizing an open working group meeting in Prague, this will take place on Thursday the 28th of June from 9:00 to 10:30.

And if you're interested to submit your views on this, I would recommend you keep an eye on ICANN homepage where you can find the link to open comment public forum so you can submit your submissions there once the public comment forum opens. And of course if you're a registrar or a UDRP provider, please participate in the survey that has been sent out earlier this week.

And if you want to know a bit more about the background on what the working group is working on, here's also a link to that workspace where you can find all the relevant information.

So the last topic I'll be talking about is stake renewal notices. Stake renewal notices are misleading notices that are sent to registrants from someone claiming to be or to represent the current registrars with the intention of

getting the domain transferred to this entity. This was an issue that was discussed as part of the deliberations of the registration of used policies working which recommended that the GNSO Council should consider initiating a policy development process on this topic.

But following some further discussions, the GNSO Council had on this issue they decided that, you know, it might be helpful to first obtain further information on this type of abuse and the scope to help inform the deliberations on whether or not a PDP would be the right approach to take.

So as a result of that the Council requested a drafting team to develop a request for information to the Registrar Stakeholder Group and based on the feedback received, report back accordingly to the Council. And this drafting team goes together and they'll develop the survey aligning a number of questions relating to fake renewal notices where you determine, you know, what the scope of the problem and the size of the issues encountered were.

And based on the feedback received, you can see here for example that, you know, on the issue responses were split between registrars where there, you know, some of them reviewed this as a serious problem that needed to be addressed while others provided the feedback, said it wasn't a big deal for them at all. So based on the feedback received, the drafting team produced a report to the Council which provides an addition to an overview of the results of the survey also a number of options the GNSO Council may want to consider to address this issue.

So these options include adding a section to the RAA that would address business practices that are not allowed by registrars and it suggested the Council could also consider adding it to one of the ongoing or future IRTP PDPs as objectives over fake renewal notices most of the time the transferring

of a domain to another registrar. Another suggestion was to add it to the upcoming PDP on the RAA which intends to address issues that were not resolved as part of the RAA negotiations.

The report also suggest to ask assistance from the ALAC to develop educational materials and promote awareness to these issues with registrars. And another suggestion is to raise the issue with the FCC who is active on this issue in previous instances - initiate a PDP on the specific issue are, you know, as a last option - do not proceed with any action at this point in time.

So following the submission of the report and the presentation to the GNSO Council, they actually decided to put it for public comments first and in order to obtain community input on the findings of the report as well as the recommendations for next steps. So as a result of that public comment forum, six contributions were received from various part of the ICANN community.

And the GNSO Council has now asked the drafting team to review those comments and to decide whether any changes should be made to the report based on those comments and report back to the GNSO Council and accordingly. And following that, the GNSO Council's expected to consider to proceed and what steps if any to take next. As (a bit) drafting team is expected to meet shortly to start its review on the comments received, so it's likely you'll see further news on this in the near future.

Here again you find some links to further information on these issues, there's a link to the report as well as the public forum where you can find the comments received and as well as a report of the public comments. And so with that, if you have any comments about - any questions or comments about these topics, please feel free to post them in the chat and I'll do my best to

respond to them accordingly, and with that I'll hand it over to my colleague Margie Milam.

Margie Milam: Thank you Marika and hello everyone, I'm going to provide you with an update on the RAA negotiations, this is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement that is a standard agreement that all registrars sign with ICANN to all them to register domain names on behalf of registrar. As many of you know, this has been a very active pause over the last several months to primary in Dakar when the ICANN Board opted a resolution asking for bi-lateral negotiations to begin.

And so since Dakar there has been an active series of negotiations that have tried to really address the issue and the amendment topics that were recommended by the GNSO Council and ALAC drafting team on the RAA as well as to address some law enforcement recommendations that were submitted by law enforcement representatives to deal with their ability to address cyber crime related to the (DNF).

An instance Dakar has been a member of updates as provided to the community through the community Wiki that has been posted and able to provide you with a link later on in this presentation. And since the Costa Rica meeting there's been updated recommendations received from the law enforcement community that may be of interest to you all, specifically with respect to who is validation issues and data retention issues. And so if you look at the Wiki, you'll actually see the submissions from the law enforcement representative that clarify their previous requests with respect to these topics.

The other aspects of the Board resolution at Dakar was that it asked for a issue report - a GNSO issue report to address the remaining issues. In other words the Board anticipated that not all of the topics that are suggested as amended

topics may end up as being incorporated into the negotiated RAA and as a result the Board wanted to kick off a policy process to have those additional items addressed through the GNSO Council's policy development processes.

And at the time the final issue report has been published and the GNSO Council's currently awaiting the negotiations to conclude in order to identify which of those amendment topics should be explored through the policy processes. So with respect to the current status of the negotiations the - there's been a series of documents posted on the ICANN Web site that really reflect the current state of the negotiations.

As you look through these documents, you will see that there's actually an entire RAA redline - redlined that has been posted and I just want to point out that this redline is really reflects ICANN's most recent app, but it is not a fully negotiated or approved document. So in other words, when you read this RAA draft, it has not been approved by the registered stakeholder group for example. Although there are many topics in there that have been explored with them and appear to have their approval, but the overall document itself is still subject to further negotiation.

When you look at the document you'll see there's a lot of significant areas that have been addressed in this draft specifically related to verification and validation of Whois information and registrar data. And that is something that is new and is likely to get a lot of community interest and discussion in the Prague meeting next week - for starting the next two weeks.

There's also enhanced data collection requirements that came from the law enforcement on registrants, this is not information that would be published in the Whois, but it's more that information such as for example financial information to be subpoenaed by law enforcement if they need to for law

enforcement purposes. There's also an enhanced reseller obligations because the reseller issue has been one that's raised a lot of concerns over the years and so there's clarification on reseller - reseller's are treated.

There's also this new concept of creating a privacy and proxy accreditation program and as you may know from the various reports that came out of the Whois review, there's a lot of issues related to specifically to privacy and - privacy, proxy and privacy services. And there's a suggestion that in case you need a privacy proxy accreditation program to try to create rules or rounds of the provision of both services.

There is also a huge point of content and that's been something that's been talked about in in-stock report and is something that would be instrumental for both law enforcement and for the general public to be able to submit a request related to illegal activity involving domain and abuse. And so that is something you'll see as you review the documents.

There's also a request for additional information related to registrars such as their location, the officers and directors, information related to affiliates - all of that is incorporated into an appendix that is posted for your information. And finally there's an enhanced language related to prohibition of cyber swatting and that is something that came from RAA drafting team recommendation.

And so as you come and think about the sessions that you would like to participate in Prague, I invite you to come to the session on the RAA negotiation because this session which is scheduled for the 25th of June is really meant to solicit information from the community that would inform the conclusion of the negotiations. And there's many key issues that will

addressed in that session, particularly ones related to Whois verification and when the appropriate time for having that.

And the suggestion from the (lock-up) community with that verification of Whois what happened before the registration is complete. And from the registrar perspective, they would prefer to see that after the registration is complete so that it doesn't interfere with registration offices. There's also a recommendation or requirement built into the draft that there would be phone verification requiring the return of the unique code and that is something that will be filled with the information in the section.

There's also questions about how often the verification should be updated and whether there would be annual re-verification of information. And that, you know, obviously would impact a lot of registrants and so that is something that we would like to receive input in the session.

And finally an important issue to the registrar community is the universal adoption of this new RAA, in other words once the new form is negotiated and gone through the process, the registrars are concerned that all registrars would need to be on the agreement at the same time or there would be a creation of a competitive disadvantage for those that have enhanced obligations versus those who are on the old agreement.

And so that is something that you we might explore in the session in Prague. And so that will wrap it up with respect to the GNSO activities. As I mentioned before, there is this issue report that was published related to the RAA negotiation topic. And as I indicated the GNSO Council would be in a position to initiate the policy development process once there have been the conclusion of the RAA and negotiations and a report of the amendment topics that weren't actually incorporated into the new form of agreement.

And we'll also be looking to abort instructions to try to get identification of the topics they would like to see covered in this TDP. And so finally on this slide I provided you with the information where you can get these reports and information related to the RAA negotiations as well as the Prague session information. And so with that I will hand it over to Liz who will provide you with an update on Whois.

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much Margie, this is Liz Gasster again and just very briefly a reminder that we do have four studies underway looking at Whois at the request of the GNSO Council. One that looks at misuse of public Whois data, one that speaks to identify how or to examine how registrants identify themselves, excuse me. One looking at proxy and privacy abuse of registrations and then final survey looking at the potential feasibility of conducting a proxy and privacy relay and reveal study.

There's also a upcoming survey that I'll talk briefly about related to a Whois service requirement report that was published in 2010 and I'll mention some other Whois activities as well. So again as many of you know, the GNSO Council decided in 2007 that Whois studies would be useful in order to provide a factual base for future policymaking. And after conducting rather lengthy process soliciting ideas about what studies could do and obtaining the cost of doing such studies and accessing their feasibility selected these four areas that are being pursued now.

The Whois review study that I mentioned already that is underway and new can expect initial results at approximately mid-2013. There's also this registrant identification study being conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago that is data gathering study that will identify and classify various

types of entities that register domains. This study was launched late last year and we are anticipating initial results late in 2012.

Next is the proxy and privacy abuse study that is looking at a broad sample of proxy and privacy registered domains that are associated with alleged harmful acts to do some analysis to understand how those are used. This study was just announced recently, it's going - it's being conducted by the National Physical Lab of the UK, they have begun their work and were expecting initial results in mid-2013.

And then lastly there was a proposal to conduct a Whois privacy and proxy study of relay and review requests. When we pursued this study, potential bidders were unsure of whether this would be feasible, especially related to obtaining a sufficient data sample and addressing some confidentiality issues, so the Council opted instead to conduct a survey to explore whether it was feasible and what factors might promote or impede timely resolution of proxy - I'm sorry, of relay and review of requests.

So this study was - survey was launched in September and actually initial results have been posted as of the 4th of June on the ICANN Web site and comments are being welcomed on this draft relay and review survey. Again assessing the feasibility of proceeding with a full study, so I encourage you if you're interested in that to look at the study that's posted and I encourage you to provide your comments on this draft report. There will not be sessions on Whois in Prague, this is really taking advantage of this webinar to give you and update on what is going on with these rather lengthy longitudinal studies.

So that concludes my summary of what's going on with the studies, but I did also want to make reference to a upcoming survey that is being prepared by a working group of the GNSO that's taking a look at Whois service

requirements and specifically a report that was published back in July of 2010 where the GNSO Council asked the policy staff to inventory technical requirements for Whois that would reflect not only known deficiencies in the current service but also take a look at technical requirements that may have been needed to support various policy initiatives that have been suggested or proposed in the task.

So the Council decided to convene a working group to try to estimate the level of agreement with each of these various proposed requirements that were included in this report of 2010. These are some examples of what the survey would include, they're there for your reference. And I think the idea as I mentioned is that to estimate the level of agreement with these kinds of elements and it's not intended to suggest policy - new policy for Whois, it's really intended to just make sure that when new protocols and new technical capabilities for Whois are being considered that all of the right agreements are being included in that assessment.

So a draft survey was posted just recently on the 30th of May for public comment and webinars were held on the first of June to explain what was intended by this survey and to solicit input from experts who are not only knowledgeable about technical aspects of Whois but also about survey design to help assess the quality of the survey to see if the survey is really asking the right questions given that it's directed as a somewhat technical audience.

So the next steps will be for - once that comment period ends for the (just) acceptance of the draft survey, the survey will actually be finalized for GNSO Council review and then conducted. And then the working group will analyze the results and publish a final report. So again that's not for discussion particularly in Prague, but we very much would - wanted to make you aware of the fact that we are looking for input on the draft survey.

And you'll see here more information, first about the Whois studies which also includes a link - if you click on that first link to the draft relay and review report that I mentioned. And then also information about the public comments that we're seeking on the technical service inventory survey that's going to be conducted shortly. So that concludes what I wanted to discuss about Whois and at this point I'd like to turn it over to my colleague Steve Sheng to talk more about Whois and the IRD working group, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Liz, good day everyone. The IRD stands for Internationalized Registration Data, it's a joint working group (tottered) by GNSO and ASAC to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing submissions and displaced specifications for Internationalized Registration Data. This is an important topic because it's supporting Internationalized Registration Data as seen as an important evolutionary step for the Whois servers.

So this will lead the registration data in Latin or US ASCII with the introduction of IDNs, you know, there's more and more demand for registrars to submit this information in their local languages and scripts. However today there's no senders exist for permission and display of this information and the current Whois implementation do not consistently support IRD. So those are the key issues that drives this work.

The current status of this work is the working group after two years of deliberation have published its final report and the ASAC has revised and approved the reports in April of this year. The GNSO Council is currently considering this report likely to take action in the next Council meeting in Prague or shortly afterwards. Briefly the IRD Working Group considered four issues, the first issue is it suitable to internationalize domain registration data?

That means to have these data in local languages and scripts and the answer to that is yes.

And second they work to see what data elements are suitable to be internationalized and they've done a systematic analysis of the data elements and going through them one by one to see which are suitable to be internationalized. The third issue they look at is the current Whois system capable of handling the query and the (save) of internationalized data and the answer to that is not. There are local conventions, it's jus that does not scale and to have interoperability problems. And finally they look at specifications that are feasible to deal with internationalized registration data.

With this issue they make four recommendations, the first recommendation is to recommend ICANN staff to develop in consultation with the community a data model that could accommodate internationalized registration data. The second recommendation is the GNSO Council and ASAC request a common issues report on translation and transliteration of contact information. This issue is extensively discussed in the working group, you know, having the localized information. And then the question is whether there's a need to translate and transliterate this information to English or to a Latin script.

And so should bear the burden to do that? The working group would recommend a PDP to address this issue. The third recommendation is speaking to the protocol deficiency and asking the ICANN staff to work with the community to identify a data access protocol that meets the needs of internationalization. And finally the working group asked ICANN to take appropriate steps that required gTLD registries and registrars and to a certain extent ccTLD registries to support defenders that agreed in the IRD report.

The next steps is once the GNSO and the ASAC approved the final version of the report, the report would be sent back - send it to the Board for (access). The GNSO Council may also wish to provide advice with regard to some of those recommendations that have policy implications. So that's a quick update on the IRD Working Group, next I'm going to pass it to my colleague Berry Cobb to give you an update on consumer matches, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Steve appreciate it and welcome everybody we appreciate the attendance. I'm going to give you a quick overview of the Consumer Metrics Working Group and basically how this got started late in 2010, the ICANN Board had requested from the SOs and ACs about seeking advice on the definition and proposed measure on consumer trust, consumer choice and competition.

These three key terms are defined in the Affirmation of Commitments and why this is important work currently is that one year following the first delegation of the new gTLDs, a future review team will be formed where they will finalize the proposed metrics that will help gauge the success of the new gTLD program.

Some of our recent developments back in 2011, the GNSO Council formed a working group to help try to define these terms and metrics and through all of our deliberations, we finally formed a final - or I'm sorry, a draft advice letter mid-February in which we opened up a public comment forum that lasted or closed around mid-May.

And presently the working group is reviewing all the public comments to state their final advice letter that will be later submitted to the GNSO Council. We're getting a little bit closer, we're actually about 75% complete of the comments and they are positive changes to the advice letter. So what are the

contents of the advice letter? Basically it's structured into three forms, first we'll define consumer trust, choice and competition as well as the proposed metrics for each one of those definitions.

I won't review through the definition here in detail today, but there are a few takeaways from the slide. The first is there is a particular order or reasoning for the order of these definitions and first and foremost consumer trust and consumer choice do typically overlap each other, however we're maintaining the distinction. But there's a key term here as to what a consumer is and thus the working group had to define what a consumer is and then thus apply that to those definitions.

The third one - ore really the fourth one which is competition, the takeaway here is just that the realm of the metrics around competition are only those for industry participants such as registry operators, registrars, etc. And lastly, given the review of the public comments, there are - will be modifications to these definitions as the working group produces it's final report.

Here - this slide is just a quick high-level overview of the types of metrics per definition and there are far too many to review here today. And I do invite the community that if you'd like details of them - specific metrics there's a link out to the public forum that contains the latest draft and you can get into the exact details of each of these metrics as well as possible challenges and (network) needing done and also including possible three-year target.

Just like with the definitions earlier some of the metrics are the - the definitions of these metrics are subject to change based on review of the public comments as well as a few additional ones are being included as well. So what are our next steps? Basically as I mentioned, the working group is trying to produce the final advice letter as to which that will be submitted to

the GNSO Council for their consideration. Which is stated here in June, it will probably look to be the beginning of July before the working group can formally submit the advice letter to the GNSO Council.

In terms of what this means for Prague, we do not have a public session this time, however representatives from the working group will be briefing the GNSO Council, basically just a quick status update. If you're interested in more information, you can go out to the public comment forum that I mentioned that has the latest work products, as well as you can go to the consumer metrics Wiki page that will show a lot of the current documents that are a work in progress and there's plenty of great information there.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Julie and she'll brief you on the Cross-Community Working Groups. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Berry and hello everyone, glad to be here to give you this brief update. The Cross-Community Working Groups are important because they address interest of common interest to the various supporting organizations and advisory committees. But there have been some concerns that they don't necessarily always operate and coordinate in their participations with the SOs and ACs. Because of that the Council thought to develop some principles for Cross-Community Working Groups to bring some predictability and clarity to their processes.

Just a note on some of the recent Cross-Community Working Groups had the SOAC new detail the Applicant Support Working Group, the Geographic Regions Review Working Group, Internationalized Registration Working Group that Steve Sheng my colleague mentioned just previously and the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group that Bart Boswinkel will mention a little later in this presentation. And some of the recent

developments are that the GNSO Council approved the drafting team to develop some draft principles.

The team provided those draft principles to the Council in January of this year and in March the Council approved those principles and then distributed them to the other supporting organizations and advisory committees for consideration. These draft principles just in a very high level address the scope of Cross-Community Working Groups, their purposes in relationship to the policy development processes and their operations formation, execution outcomes. The next steps are that the principles that may be incorporated in the GNSO guidelines for establishing working groups and the formation of new Cross-Community Working Groups.

ICANN is also holding a public session on the principles in Prague on Monday the 15th of June in the (Roma Room) and the goal of this session is to raise awareness of the principles, answer questions and discuss any issues or concerns. And of note, a development just in the last day or so is that the ccNSO has reviewed the principles and has responded to the GNSO Council Chair that they are suggesting a development of the Cross-Community Working Group to further hone the principles.

That there are some areas that they think may be missing and may need to be included in a revised set of principles. And for further information here is the link so that you can review the principles. And at this point then I would like to move along to my colleague Brian Peck who will talk to you about protection of Red Cross and IOC names, thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much Julie and welcome everyone to our policy update program, I appreciate your participation. I'm going to provide a brief update on the status of the discussion involving the (hospital) protection of Red Cross

and International Olympic Committee names. Basically what has happened since the Costa Rica meeting is the GNSO Council had established a drafting team to follow-up on the Board request for policy advice on providing top level protection for the IOC and Red Cross names after the initial first round.

The drafting team did come up with some recommendations to extend parameter protection to these two organization names at the (top) level and future rounds and also at the time devote those to place to provide these protections and the initial round which since of course has expired. The GNSO Council adopted those recommendations and forwarded them to the Board.

The Board's new gTLD Committee on April 10 declined to resolve the recommendations at the time, although recognizing the substance of the negotiation of the recommendations had concerns with Dakar's timing, given the late stage of the application process at that time and so declined to adopt those particular recommendations.

In addition, during the Costa Rica meeting the ICANN Board in response to request from a number of International Government Organizations or IGOs requested to both the GAC and the GNSO Council to provide policy advice on whether to protect the IGO names at both the top and second levels of the new gTLDs. The GNSO after delivering the request had decided that it's position at the time in response to the Board request would be more appropriate for the GAC to develop advice first and provide the Board, at which time if the Board were to still ask for advice for the GNSO Council, it would do so.

In addition in it's April meeting, the GNSO Council requested a industry report on special protections for all types of international organizations, including the Red Cross, the IOC and IGOs at both the top and second level

for all new gTLDs. The current status is as you all know, the initial application (run) has closed and of course yesterday the names were revealed.

The temporary moratorium on the availability of IOC or RC names at the top level do - still do the applica- excuse me, new detailers has expired and there are currently no second level protections for the IOC or RC names with the new gTLDs when they go designated on online next year. The GAC in addition has submitted a proposal last fall calling for permanent protection for both IOC and Red Cross names at both the top and second level. Last week the GNSO Council responded with a letter to the GAC providing an update on its drafting team's work in evaluating possible options or recommendations for providing protection of the Red Cross and IOC names at the second level.

In addition a preliminary shoot forward in response to the request for the GNSO Council was issued last week or published last week is now open for public comment. The basic staff recommendation from the issue report is for the GNSO Council to consider whether or not to initiate a PDP as an approach to develop any additional policy advice in response to the outstanding (boarder) requests in terms of both the IOC and Red Cross names and the IOG names.

This public comment forum is ongoing, will be ongoing during Prague, we encourage your participation, not only on the report itself but also on the issue on whether there should only be protection for international organizations that are not for profit and/or for unique protections under the national treaties and national laws in our multiple jurisdictions such as the IOC and Red Cross. Or whether all International Government Organizations should be considered for possible protections.

And that's a brief summary of the status of the issue related to the protection of IOC, IGO and Red Cross names, I'd now would like to turn it over to our colleague Bart Boswinkel to talk about policy issues related to the ccNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: Good evening or good day everybody, I'll just brief you on a few topics that - within the ccNSO, but before doing so I want to take you through and explain a bit about the ccNSO. Looking at the participants in the webinar, I've noted that a lot of people who are not familiar - probably not familiar with the ccNSO so I though it might be a good idea to explain a little bit of the ccNSO, its structure and how it organizes its work. The structure I will tell you a little bit more in a few minutes, but what is good to remember and to keep in the back of your mind is in fact the purpose of the ccNSO.

The - it is of course as SO for publish and development, but the policy (remit) for the ccNSO is very limited and it is clearly defined in the ICANN Bylaws. But it is from a cc perspective far more important platform to exchange information without other cc's and with other SO's and advisory committees. And finally, it represents ccNSO members in the ccTLD community in the larger ICANN arena, ICANN community. The ccNSO is mostly organizing its activities through working and study groups, so I'll give you two examples, one from a working group and one from a study group.

Looking at the structure, the ccNSO has members and these are all ccTLD managers - to date there are 132 members out of 256 ccTLDs. We have one application pending from (Bararand of BH) and since the Costa Rica meeting, 6 new members have joined the ccNSO. The, excuse me, the second part - and this is probably the most familiar part of the ccNSO - the ccNSO Council, again it has 18 counselors, 3 from the five ICAAN regions and 3 appointed by the NomCom. It has 4 observers from (redoc) ccTLD organizations, these are

not linked to ICAAN, but independent, and we have 2 liaisons, 1 from ALAC and one from the GNSO.

The role of the ccNSO Council is more administrative as defined in its - the ICANN Bylaws and the Rules of the ccNSO themselves and one of the major tasks is to maintain the work plan of the ccNSO, effectively they're organizing and insuring that activities get done. It also has a representational role - most notably are the joint meetings with the GAC and the GNSO and hopefully in the future with ALAC as well and the meetings with the Board.

Now going through some of the activities, one of the activities the ccNSO has organized is what is called the study group on the use of country names sTLDs. I would just brief you on to touch upon its purpose, current status and background. And the purpose and scope of the study group is to first of all is to provide an overview of all current and proposed policies for allocation, delegation of country names and territory names either as the gTLD, IDN ccTLD and ccTLD.

The second mega-task is to develop a type policy of the names, say examples of the IDN ccTLDs and (return dot) Holland or Norway and Greek and issues arising out of say the different types of country names and territory names and how they would, you know, fit in and how they would be treated under the different policies and see if there are some issues.

And if appropriate, finally decide if we would advice and of course of further action. The current status is the overview of potential policies is completed, the typology has been developed and to date and we hope by Prague UNESCO will conduct a survey among it's members. so countries to survey to test the typology as I see it will be launched shortly.

The study group has been working on identifying issues and this work will continue at the Prague meeting and hopefully it will be finished by then and then be post-Prague when the results from the survey come in, they will start working on the recommendations. A bit on the background of this study group, the use of country - or the use of country and territory names has been widely debated within ICANN for quite some time, both as part of the new gTLD process and as part of the IDN PDP.

It was very clear at a certain point that the IDN PDP is not suitable to deal with all different types of country names. For instance, Norway in English would not fit as - would not be eligible as an IDN ccTLD, so therefore the IDN PDP is not the suitable mechanism to study all the implications around and develop policy around the use of country names and therefore the study group was established. A second topic I want to discuss with you is the current status of the IDN policy development process.

This has - process has been initiated quote some time ago in parallel with the IDN Fast Track Process itself. But as most effort went into the Fast Track Process and the policy development process want to take into consideration the experience with the IDN Fast Track, it has say since 1 1/2 years has picked up the pace again and at this stage the overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD is almost completed.

Currently the working group dealing with this part of the IDN PDP is dealing with the confusingly similarity issues that arise out of the implementation plan, so learning from the experience of the Fast Track Process and hopefully at the Prague meeting the working group will be able to conclude its discussions. What it's also doing is updating the process, again taking into account the experience from the fast track process - and there will be a placeholder regarding IDN variant management.

A second part of the IDN ccPDP is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. Currently and according to the Bylaws, IDN ccTLDs cannot apply for membership, so as part of the overall policy, this topic needs to be addressed as well. The working group who's dealing with this topic is finalizing its recommendations, in particular and they still want to understand the implications of voting mechanisms for the ccNSO for the members.

Another main activity of the ccNSO is - again this is not policy-related, is for example the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, the ccNSO has established a Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group in 2008 and its main focus is on providing input and feedback to ICANN on its strategic and operational planning processes. Currently the SOP Working Group has submitted its final or its comments on ICANN's Staff Fiscal Year 2013 Operating Plan and Budget and the submission is available at this URL. But you have to keep in mind when - with the SOP, it is not representing the ccNSO nor individual ccTLDs, so it just speaks on its own behalf.

Finally, the ccNSO agenda for the Prague meeting, some highlights - there will be a fast panel discussion on ccTLDs and WCIT. The type of panel discussion will be how ccTLDs can influence the outcome of the WCIT process. This public or this panel discussion is open as all meetings of the ccTLDs are and it will be on Wednesday 27 of June and there will be an extensive IDN session again with an update from the working groups on - from the IDN PDP updates from the various issue projects, ICANN stop issue project and on universal acceptance of TLDs.

Again, this is an ICANN project and there will be two presentations from IDN ccTLD managers. And finally there will be a security session on Tuesday as well with the DSSA and the recommendations of the (SSRT) will be discussed

during this session. What I want to highlight as well and because there is no slide here on that is the work of the DSSA, the DSSA is making a considerable progress over the - since the Costa Rica Meeting and it will present its progress report to the community at the Prague meeting.

And the co-chairs all the DSSA will inform the respective SOs and ACs on the progress made and there will be a public open workshop on Thursday morning if you're interested in contributing to the work of the DSSA. The Prague agenda of the ccNSO can be found at this URL and the specific working group and council meeting schedule is on the ccNSO calendar. Now I want to hand it over to my dear colleague Heidi who will inform you on the ALAC policy issues, thank you very much.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you Bart, hello everyone this is Heidi Ulrich and this is the first time that ALAC activities have been included in this pre-meeting policy webinar. I'm delighted to give you a brief update on ALAC's policy and trust activities in advance of Prague's meeting. First I'd like to go ahead and talk about the policy issues being discussed within the ALAC, the ALAC produced 15 statements in response to open public comments between January and the end of May 2012.

In addition they've recently approved two more statements and are either voting on or developing five more at the moment. Of the statements submitted, ALAC would like to highlight two, the first is the ALAC statement on the ICANN Board Conflicts of Interest Review, the ALAC welcomed the creation of a board new gTLD program committee, however they believe cross-community commission including possibly outside corporate government experts be set up to examine ICANN's conflict of interest at all levels.

The second statement they'd like to highlight is the ALAC's statement on the Whois policy review team draft report. Currently the ALAC extended it's congratulations to the Whois review team for its exhaustive processing and the inclusion and transparency goals. The ALAC continued by recommending that Whois policies be regularized and privacy registrations be accommodated as long as the policy provider acts on the express actual authority of the registrar and that the policy provider accepts strict liability for the registrar on Whois behalf.

In addition to preparing statements, the ALAC and At-Large community members continue to work with members of ICAAN staff and the Board on applicant support issues. A sub-set of the JAS Group of At-Large and (UNESCO) members have been occasionally meeting with staff and select board members to work out the details of the applicant's (partner and) implementation. However perhaps as important as the actual work they are doing, this processing could be a good model for future collaborative efforts and different complex implementation issues can involve the community and not be done solely by staff.

For more information all of ALACs are available on the At-Large correspondence page at the address listed on the slide. Now I'd like to move on to ALAC process improvement issues. The first one that I'd like to discuss is ALAC process for considering and making objective to new gTLD applications which has now been operationalzed. And ICANN's new gTLD program the ALAC has given their responsibility to consider and possibly file objections to the new gTLD applications.

In March of this year the ALAC approved a process that involves a bottom up development of potential objections and approval of possible objections both by the regional At-Large organizations, followed by consideration and

approved by the ALAC. A 15 member new gTLD review group which was selected by the ALAC and the five (rayloads) is given place, they've had two meetings to be trained on process and will be meeting again in Prague to discuss further details now that the applications have been reviewed. This activity is the At-Large community's first operational role and the ALAC process is available on the page that I put on the slide.

The second program-related issue is the ALAC At-Large improvements project final report has been submitted to the SIC for review in Prague. As a bit of background to this, in June 2009 the final report of the ALAC review working group on ALAC improvements was published. And within that report they made certain which identified key areas of needed improvements of the At-Large, including the At-Large organization, it's effectiveness, participation in relation to other ICANN entities.

The ALAC and representative from the At-Large community have been working on the implementation of certain recommendations since August 2010 to (revolt) a number of globally diverse work team and more efficiently the At-Large improvements project task force. The final report outlines how they have either fully completed the 13 recommendations and actual items developed by the work teams or given the responsibility of monitoring activities that are ongoing by their nature to other At-Large groups.

And this task force also has identified a set of criteria to be considered in the next ALAC review. Upon review of the final report by the SIC which by the way was adopted or ratified unanimously by of ALAC recently and then moving on from the SIC to the Board, the first review of ALAC will be completed. And the final report is available on the At-Large community wiki at the URL listed on the slide.

And finally, this slide shows the At-Large community current organization, a community that is composed of globally distributed At-Large structures - now 144 arranged within five regional At-Large organizations or (rail loads) that feed directly to the 15-member At-Large Advisory Committee to the ALAC. Now the ALAC in its current form will be celebrating it's ten year anniversary during the Prague meeting on Monday the 25th of June between 1600 and 1900.

This ALAC anniversary event will include both a retrospective of the ALAC achievements as well as aims for the future. And you're all very warmly invited to participate in this event as well as the 20 other At-Large meetings being held in Prague. This concludes the ALAC update, I would now like to hand the floor over to may good colleague (Aloft Nordlink) (to talk) the ASO policy highlight.

(Aloft Nordlink):   Thank you very much Heidi and good evening to all from Brussels, now I'll spend a few minutes on numbers which in the ICANN context translates into IP address system on the (state) system number and those are in need of policy most certainly as well. And that's where the Address Supporting Organization or ASO comes into play. The ASO is probably the least well-known of the ICANN supporting organization (like I say), so a background is in order. I'll start with a few acronyms, Regional Internet Registry or RIR which is an important part of one could call the IP address foot chain.

They receive data blocks from ICANN to the IANA function and they distribute smaller blocks through the ISP in the regions which in turn hand over IP addresses for use you can connect to the Internet - pretty useful. There are five such regional entry registries - it's for Africa, Asia Pacific has eight in it, (Aaron) for North America, (Latnic) for Latin American Caribbean and (Y) for the European region and they all cooperate through an organization called

the NRO or Numbers Resource Organization. And now we can explain what the ASO actually is, it is an organization set up to an (MOU) which ICANN and the NRO and by inference also the RIRs.

And which this (MOU) appoints the task of fulfilling the ASO roles to the NRO and so the ASO can be seen as an alias for the NRO if you so wish. And one of the major tasks of the ASO is to handle global policy proposals, particular name and a rather grand name at that and it has very particular meaning. Because the (RAR) they develop many - very many regional addressing policies for the allocation to the ISP. But also very few ones that do affect the IANA handling of address block and only those are called global policies.

Now there is currently one global policy proposal that has been in the (fly) plan for quite some time and that's recently been approved. Addressing recovered IPT for address space in the situation (post-extortion) and as you are probably are well aware, last year the IANA of the IPv4 address block was exposed in the beginning of last year. So recycling of this scarce resource is really the name of the game here.

And it is important because the proposal enables IANA to both receive return IPv4 address from the (RARs) and also to pan it out allocated in smaller as a block then was previously possible because they were obliged to distribute the blocks of 60 million so-called (Flash A). And it's rather unlikely that such a block would be allocated or returned and allocated in the future. This was quite - took quite some time and this is actually the third proposal on this topic.

And what needs to happen is that such proposals must be first adopted by consensus and all regions and registries and then reviewed by the NRO

committee and then by the ASO address to the ICANN Board. And that is then happened with this particular proposal and it was ratified by the ICANN Board on the 6th of May and it's now under implementation by the IANA to enable the receipt and reallocation of (unintelligible). And so it took some time, this the current proposal and the two previous proposals didn't arrive at the full consensus needed in order to be put forward as a global policy proposal - o it's been a long time in the making but now it's done.

If you're interested in these matters, well the very best way to get acquainted with them and to make your voice heard is to join in the bottom half policy development processes in any of the (RARs), because they all conduct open meetings and where policy proposals are discussed and they are open mailing lists for such matters. So it's really an open door, you have the opportunity of a lifetime to get acquainted with it more in detail in Prague at the ASO AC workshop which takes place on Wednesday, 1:00 to 3:00 pm local time.

And with little commercial I would like to hand over to my colleague, (unintelligible) who will tell you more about organization and engagement and the (why of it).

(Phyllis):   Thank (Aloft), highlights I will cover within (our special) engagement area on new meeting structured and program, all three discussion sessions, public comments, the (TPC) consultation session and the newcomers activities at ICANN 424. You can find the full ICANN 424 schedule now at this notice on the slide, it was published on 4th of June, I can forward (unintelligible) closed by Thursday evening officially after the closing group session.

This is new, (some of the) Monday sessions are scheduled to increase interactive discussions on specific topics, David mentioned some of them at the beginning, each topic then sessions are organized based on common

feedback and we will have these on Monday throughout the day. The other main change is structural the public forum, at ICANN 424 the session - they'll have two major sessions, board reporting and open mic session. During board reporting ICANN boards will provide a briefing on what they have heard during the week and what their plans and concentrations of next steps about them will be. During open mic part of the session, there will be time for feedback on the board reporting, as well as the usual specific agenda topics.

These specific topics are again (crosses) within - from community leaders and I'm currently working on such a detailed agenda, I hope to have it published in a couple of days again, quite in advance for the community review before the session takes place on 28th of June. Outreach has been a highlight (to team) in the recent meetings, you may have been following that. A framework that is worked out by the ICANN staff was shared with the community at ICANN 43, now concerning this discussion, we will have another session. In this the aim is to find common teams to be able to work together better with the community in a more coordinated manner.

We will mainly focus on community building, increasing number of participants and level of engagement and discuss ways of working together to better coordinate the efforts using the limited shared resources of ICANN. You may remember the 1st of January 2012 at the beginning of this year, we launched a new public comment system. This system was implemented in accordance to the (ATR) recommendations and then collecting more specific (common keys) on the implementation details.

Now after five or six months now of using the system, it is observed that maybe the recommended structure does not seem to really serve to the intended goal as such. Reply periods do not seem to be used by most groups and the whole focus is still during the comment period. And the minimum 21

days (finding) maybe advance too short some of the groups. ICANN Board's Public Participation Committee, PPC oversees public command processes and they have a consultation session with the community on Thursday and this will be discussed there again. The other agenda point of this meeting will be on language services.

Now the newcomer activities are again taking place in Prague, lunch will serve from Saturday to Wednesday following the opening hours of the registration desk. It is staffed with ICANN staff and fellowship (all the time), so this is a very good example of ICANN staff working together with community, it's a joint effort. And this is now also turning into an ICANN information point for everyone, getting quite popular. So we try to have all sorts of fact sheets produced internally as well as those from community groups.

We will also use social media to get more focused for the newcomers during ICANN 424. And newcomers will be wearing green badges as usual, if you see one please talk to them and help welcoming them to the ICANN community. The other pillar of the newcomers program is the newcomers (Sunday track) they are getting really popular and we get not only the first timers but also old timers who would like to get a refresher as well. And newcomers (Sunday track) will start at 10:30 with a welcome session, including an introduction to ICANN the ICANN community and the they call the models.

Then we will continue with sessions on ICANN engagement tools, policy updates, investments, registries and registrars, in domain name system and we will conclude with contract compliance. If you know a new participant to ICANN you may want to advise them to attend these sessions and also to drop by the newcomer's lounge. Well it is not on my slide but I would like to

finally mention that we are again broadcasting the whole public sessions of the meeting, allowing remote participation to the meeting. We reached a record number of remote connections in Costa Rica and experience was reported to be very pleasant.

We hope to keep this high quality of service in Prague too, if you can't be in person at the meeting, please make use of these services and join us again. And thank you and I will not hand over to David I believe.

David Olive: Thank you very much (Phyllis) and I'd like to thank my fellow colleagues for their presentations. I will now have the phones un-muted so you can ask some questions if you have any additional questions either by raising your hand or through the chat room. And as we're doing this, the how best to stay updated I would recommend if you have not our policy update every month is a very good and concise way for learning more about the latest developments in policy development within the SOs and the ACs, it's also available in many languages.

And so we encourage you to subscribe and look to that. I will of course now go through the other areas, the other way of course would be to contact us with any questions you may have on this presentation. It will be posted and the transcription will be posted as we'll and we'll be able to provide that for your review and your leisure. In the meantime I open up for questions that people may have. (Brian Larsen) talks about it will be his first meeting in Prague and do they have any wifi meeting rooms, I think (Phyllis) will be answering that.

(Phyllis):   I'm sorry that on the chat room David, but yes there will be wifi throughout the whole meeting area and there's another question, there will be (switcher hi stack) for the meeting, yes there will be one. We provide ICANN port-to port

at the (hash track) if you follow ICANN account, everything will go there, will also be (hash track) for the newcomers.

David Olive: All right Brian, you're less than a newcomer, but those questions. If there are not anymore questions I would like to again thank all the participants for listening in, being part of this webinar as we prepare for the ICANN in Prague, we hope to see you there in persons or remotely and with that I would like to wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon or good morning from the Policy Team and from ICANN, thank you very much for your involvement here.

Woman: Thank you.

END