ICANN Policy Update
WEBINAR
08 June 2011 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Policy Update Webinar 08 June 2011 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://icann.adobeconnect.com/p62104460/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal

on page:

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

David Olive: ...there is a lot of information contained in this presentation. The slides and recordings will be made available following this session so that everyone has an opportunity to review the information when you can and at your leisure.

I have a few housekeeping activities to remind people of: One, to reduce interference we will mute the lines. Also please turn down the sound on your computers if you are in front of the computer. This as you know is an Adobe Connect room for the session so the slides can be viewed and questions posted. And the link to this was in the email you received with the meeting details.

While there will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the meeting during the session you can also submit your questions in the chat box at the bottom of the Adobe Connect. And the policy staff will do their best to answer your questions. And of course we will have a question period afterwards where you can either state your name or raise your hand in Adobe Connect and you'll be recognized.

Many of you are planning to attend the Singapore meeting or to participate remotely. And we're very happy that you are here today to learn more about what will be discussed in Singapore. For those who will be participating remotely there's special attention paid to enhanced remote participation and

further details of these remote services are available on the ICANN Web meeting site.

Of course the highlights in Singapore include a newcomer's track day on Sunday, further discussions and briefings on the new gTLD program, security and stability matters, abuse of the DNS forum and further information can be found on the Website for Singapore 41 on the meeting site. And there are the links there for you.

The focus of this presentation is on policy development at ICANN. And as most of you will be aware the following bodies are responsible for such policy development, the Generic Name 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 level domains. And the Addressing Supporting Organization, ASO, reviews and develops recommendations on Internet protocol address policy.

In addition to the supporting organizations at ICANN we also have a number of advisory committees that provide advice to the ICANN Board; and most notably the At Large Advisory Committee, the Security Stability Advisory Committee, the Root Server Advisory Committee and of course the Governmental Advisory Committee or the GAC.

The next two slides show the topics covered in this section. And we're going to begin with activities and policy development in the ccNSO. Bart Boswinkel will be talking to us about some of these activities. We will then turn to the GNSO for reports from Rob Hogarth, Marika Konings, Margie Milam and Liz Gasster on the items that are listed there. And we will end with a report from Olof Nordling on the Address Supporting Organization, the ASO. And of course questions throughout the chat or at the end we will also take questions.

I now turn you over to Bart who will start our discussion with issues at the ccNSO. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Good evening and - or good day. Welcome to my end of this policy update. I'm going to talk to you about - a bit about the framework of interpretation working group. The reason is this will be a very intense and long drawn activity for the ccNSO and for others involved including some of the - for the GAC as well.

A bit about other activities focusing on the Singapore meeting; a special one is the panel discussion of the ccNSO. Over the last three sessions the ccNSO have conducted panel discussions which - with a bit over - a more broader perspective than just the ccTLD community and then a little bit of the joint working groups in which the ccNSO or the ccTLD community is participating.

Okay on the framework of interpretation let me explain a bit of the background and why is it - why it is called the framework of interpretation and the framework of interpretation working group.

In - at the San Francisco meeting the ccNSO adopted - the ccNSO Council adopted a set of recommendations from what was the delegations, re-delegations and retirement working group. And one of the main recommendations was to establish what is called a framework of interpretation working group.

And the framework of interpretation refers to a interpretation of the main policy statements relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. And why this is important is delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs is almost of existential meaning for the ccTLD communities. And this is all conducted within the ICANN frame - under the ICANN umbrella.

So why is it important as a framework of interpretation itself? It is - it deals with policy related issues which were identified by the delegation and re-delegation working group which means it is on the brink of policy but the ccNSO has - fortunately the ability to use say more appropriate measures than a policy development process.

And I will explain shortly why in this case it is probably more important to do it initially and try to deal with the issues identified with a working group and then through a policy development process.

The community it is about interpretation of already existing policy so that's one of the reasons. At this stage the ccTLD community doesn't really want to change the policies it just wants a clearer understanding and a clearer guidance for all parties involved in order to create an environment where the decisions made regarding the delegation and re-delegations are consistent, predictable and all parties involved can be accountable and what the result is transparent.

One of the reasons why the ccNSO decided or whether the (RD) decided to recommend a working group structure instead of a policy development is that in especially dealing with delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs active participations of the GAC or GAC members is very, very important. As most of you will know ccTLDs are mostly located within a country and refer to a country and - or territory.

And there are some public policy aspects in some countries relating to the ccTLD as well; some countries have legislation in place. So it was very important to include and be inclusive for the GAC as much as possible. ALAC and the GNSO were invited to send liaisons and ICANN and experts are invited and in particular IANA staff.

Now at this stage the working group has already developed a work plan and it hopes to - that it will be finalized in Singapore. So that's a bit about the

framework of interpretation. And the expectation is this will take about - this working group will take about two years.

Some other major activities in the ccNSO environment is the ccNSO implementation of the ccNSO improvements; the ccNSO improvements are the result of the ccNSO review and the recommendations. Two major - one major one has already been implemented that's the recommendations to describe roles and responsibilities of chairs, vice chairs and councilors.

A second one that is developing a work plan and maintaining it of all policy and policy related activities will be discussed at the Singapore meeting. The finance and strategic operational planning activities of the ccNSO will continue as well.

There are two working groups dealing with this topic; they will meet in Singapore and they will give a presentation to the ccTLD community. And there will be again a extensive session on IDN ccTLD related work. This will include some presentations of IDN ccTLD operators who are already operational.

One of the items that has been quite successful for the ccTLD community is what is called a panel discussion. And in this sense the panel discussions are not really - it's more a debate. And the purpose of these panel discussions is not to come - reach a conclusion but it's to create awareness of a specific topic area and it's more for, yeah, to initiate thinking and - for the ccTLD communities and other interested parties.

These meetings are open as all ccNSO meetings are open. And this time - and that's why I've mentioned it to say the focus will be on the impact of new gTLDs on ccTLDs and vice versa. The topic areas that will be covered are the competition, marketing aspects of say regional new gTLDs or cultural new gTLDs vis-à-vis ccTLDs and regulatory and policies.

We'll have panelists from both new gTLD and ccTLDs and a current gTLD and possibly also from a user registrant perspective and from a government perspective. The session will be held on Wednesday the 22nd of June.

A little bit about the joint working groups that the ccNSO is participating; there are in fact three main ones currently. One is the DNS Security and Stability Analysis working group. The current status of that working group is they are discussion a work plan and they are trying to get, yeah, introduce each other.

It's a very, very large working group with participation from the ALAC, ccNSO, NRO, GNSO and the SSAC. So it's, yeah, it's interesting to watch how these different communities with all their backgrounds and different methods of working will get along. And that will be part of the discussions in Singapore. And the discussion will focus on the work plan.

The other one is - another one is the JIG working group, the Joint ccNSO GNSO IDN working group. It just produced its - the final report of the working group on the single character IDNs, will forward it to the Board and it awaits implementation by ICANN and ICANN staff.

At this stage the JIG has been requested to provide some more clarifications on some implementation questions so they're fully engaged. And the final one of the joint working groups, the ccNSO is participating is the study group on the use of country names as TLDs.

At this stage there is a, say, a rudimentary overview of policies and the next main task will be to create a topology of country and territory names and see how these different rules apply and what will be the outcome. In - at the Singapore meeting this working group will meet again. And one of its first tasks is still to appoint a chair.

So this was my brief overview of say the ccNSO and ccNSO related activities. And I now want to hand over to my dear colleague and friend, Rob Hogarth, to take you through the next presentation.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you very much, Bart. That was very comprehensive; much appreciated. During the next 45 minutes or so this next segment of the Webinar is going to address policy issues that are currently being addressed by the GNSO.

There is quite a wide variety of issues that the GNSO finds itself facing on any regular basis as David Olive explained earlier this supporting organization is one of the largest and most diverse segments of the ICANN community so they have their hands in many, many different issues and many of the policy issues impact their work.

The issues that we're going to discuss today are fairly widespread. We'll start off with an introduction that I'll provide addressing some of the latest updates for you about revisions and improvements to the structure and operations of the GNSO organization.

Then we'll touch individually on a variety of substantive issues in a little more detail. And as you see from this Slide 18 we've got quite a wide array of issues over the next 45 minutes to go over with you.

The first area, GNSO Structure and Process Improvements, really drive directly from the GNSO independent review and GNSO improvements process. And we use those terms somewhat interchangeably and have done so over the last three years or so.

The major focus of the GNSO review effort was to do three things; first to maximize participation in the organization, secondly to truly enhance - make more consistent and substantive the policy development process work and generally to improve communications throughout the GNSO between the

various members of the organization and between the GNSO and other organizations within ICANN - from other advisory committees and supporting organizations to the board of directors, the staff and others.

The five main areas that you see on the slide before you I've numbered in generally the order that they've been resolved. The critical foundational element of the structural improvements was to restructure the GNSO Council. That gets a checkmark because that was completed back in 2009 at the Seoul Korea meeting.

The second major area that's been generally resolved with still a little bit more work to do has been enhancing and maximizing the resources available for existing and potentially new GNSO constituencies. We've got a checkmark there because staff and the community have collaborated on a toolkit of administrative support services that are now being widely offered to various GNSO eligible organizations.

And because just recently the GNSO Council authorized staff to move forward with some implementation of outreach recommendations that will involve further collaboration within the community and among the staff.

Number three area, adopting a working group model, essentially identifies a new way of working formally within the GNSO. Over the past several years the GNSO has evolved to more of a working group model of policy development taking it away from the taskforce approach which was different not just in terms of terminology but essentially in terms of practice.

Where individual communities within the GNSO had a specific number of people that they could put as representatives on a taskforce, a very sort of structured approach where the new working group model of GNSO policy development really anticipated a wider cross section of community members widely participating in various policy development activities and allowing people to quite frankly float to the areas where they think they could have the

most impact either because of their particular business interests, their technical capabilities or their general expertise generally within the community.

So those are areas that are pretty much concluded now in terms of the lion's share of the work. That's also generally true of Item 4 on this slide, revising the policy development process. That's a tremendously important area that a number of community members have been working on over the past couple of years. And they are very close to concluding their work and undoubtedly by our next Webinar will either have a check or a three-quarter check mark for their activities.

The final area there, the purple area, Number 5, improving communications within the ICANN structures still is awaiting its checkmark. The major area there is redoing the ICANN Website for the GNSO, gnso.icann.org, which has been thoroughly scoped out and designed but we are facing just staffing and priority issues in terms of bringing that online.

But that work is well underway as well they just - we just have not awarded ourselves a checkmark until that site goes live probably sometime between now and the Senegal meeting later this year.

So that's the general overview in terms of the areas of focus. In terms of the latest news on process developments you see from the slide before you that as I already noted the working group guidelines had been approved by the GNSO Council.

For those of you who are interested in participating in future working groups that the GNSO Council will be forming you'll want to familiarize yourselves with the guidelines.

And on the current gnso.org Webpage there is not only a link to the guidelines themselves but at the Council's direction the staff prepared a

summary set of guidelines to give those of you who might be new to the process an opportunity to get a general overview of the guidelines without diving into the specifics and details about every piece and part of the process.

But suffice to say that it is a very broad document with a lot of detail taking you from how the GNSO Council forms a working group all the way through how people join, how they reach decisions and taking things down to reporting back to the GNSO Council. So it's a fairly broad and comprehensive document.

The other document that is if one can say even more comprehensive the recommended improvements to the policy development process their final report has just been submitted to the GNSO Council. I believe there will actually be some sessions and some discussions in Singapore between the work team and the GNSO Council to talk about the details of the over or nearly 50 recommendations coming from the work team to the GNSO Council.

And we have a while to go for the finish line on the new policy development process rules - we still have to have GNSO Council approval and ultimately Board approval because these policy development process steps are enshrined in the ICANN bylaws. We're really at a good point now where if you go to the GNSO Website you can also see the stage of where those recommendations are and they're very complete at this time.

As I mentioned in the previous slide recommendations have been made to the GNSO Council. Right now there is a drafting team that is putting together a charter for a working group that will be talking about how to implement recommendations, about how to improve outreach by members of the GNSO community to include more people, more opportunities for participation by various parties, more promotion about the GNSO and its activities to members of the Internet community worldwide.

And so there will be some exciting things we think happening in terms of those discussions and those implementation plans over the course of the next year.

The next to last bullet point on the slide talks about the GNSO Council's standing committee. What's happening is that we are slowly dismantling the bureaucratic structures that were created to quite frankly deal with a tremendously large amount of decisions that the community had to make about improvements to the GNSO that the board adopted a couple of years ago.

And the formation of the GNSO Council standing committee actually reflects a maturing of that process and creating some oversight over the longer term to make sure that a lot of the implementation steps that were approved by the Council and by the community are actually put into place.

And by monitoring them and keeping their eyes open the standing committee will be able to assure that unforeseen developments can be quickly remedied and that processes and procedures that are in place will actually operate effectively. So we're looking forward to some good oversight work from that group.

And as I mentioned before the improvements to the GNSO Website are in process. We hope certainly from a staff perspective that we'll be able to get that fully functional and posted before the Senegal meeting. We're frantically working on various additions to the content process and the rest right now. And so we hope to see that come to fruition before too long. And you see on the screen right now just a picture of what that will look like.

In terms of structural developments and improvements there are several that are still underway but actually in their final stages. The commercial stakeholders group and the noncommercial stakeholders group have been operating over the past year and a half under transitional charters that were

approved by the board. Both those communities have moved forward to ratify permanent charters. Those are now before the Board for review.

There is a new process for recognition of new GNSO constituencies that the Structural Improvements Committee has developed that just came off public notice. And so we will very soon see a new more objective, more rigorous process for the evaluation of new constituencies.

There are actually two proposals for new GNSO constituencies currently pending; one for a consumer's constituency, the second for a not for profit operational concerns constituency. If both those proposals are granted they will find a home in the noncommercial stakeholders group.

And then finally as I mentioned at the previous slide we've moved forward and taking great strides in implementing a toolkit of administrative and support services for members of the GNSO community. There are a couple of areas that we'll have to have some further discussions on.

Those involve the ability to provide support for individual communities to have their own Websites supported within the ICANN infrastructure and then a second element that we've discussed with members of the community with respect to organizational recordkeeping.

Again the general theme to all of this is to really give all of you and members of your communities the opportunity to participate fully in the substantive policy discussions. And so if we had the back office processes, if we have the support that you need, if we have all the mechanisms in place then all of you can really focus on the substantive elements as opposed to the process and the behind the scenes work. The idea is to allow you to focus what free time you do have on the substance.

And, Marika, I've lost access to Adobe Connect so if you can forward to the next slide. Just briefly to show you all in terms of next steps and what we

expect to happen in Singapore we are very hopeful that the Board at its Friday meeting at the end of the week in Singapore will take on the review and discuss the authorization of a new constituency recognition process.

We hope that they will be in a position to evaluate and rule on the permanent charters for the commercial stakeholders group and the noncommercial stakeholders group. And we anticipate that they will be evaluating at least one of the two pending new constituency proposals.

And so we expect to see some great activity there at the Board level. As I mentioned earlier there will be some discussions taking place we anticipate between the PDP - the Policy Development Process work team and the GNSO Council.

And so in general in terms of how you can be involved going forward there are public comment forums that on a regular basis the ICANN staff posts. And so we want you to certainly keep your eyes open to additional elements on the public comment forums and those processes.

I encourage all of you to familiarize yourselves with the new working group guidelines. And this slide shows you what the link is for those guidelines. You can find them on the GNSO Webpage.

You're certainly welcome and encouraged to join an existing stakeholder group or constituency. That provides you the best sort of mechanism, an entrée into the policy development process, gives you a home and a place to get familiar with the issues so that you can sort of pick and choose what working groups you may want to participate in.

And of course in general we have set up and have had in place in now for a couple of years a Website solely developed to the GNSO improvements process that gives you the background and general familiarity about the

rationales for a lot of these structures and processes and why we've devoted so much time, attention and resources to them over time.

Marika, we can move on the slides to the next substantive topic. And I'll move to that just very briefly for all of you. It's an interest and importance that you should all be aware of this initiative that's been underway now for about 2.5 years where the ICANN Board basically chartered a cross community working group asking the community to look back and evaluate how the current geographic regions framework is operating within ICANN.

The geographic regions framework was something that was created back when ICANN was formed with the strong overriding principal of making sure that there was widespread geographic diversity in the activities that take place in ICANN from certainly a participation standpoint and also to ensure that there was a wide variety of viewpoints and perspectives at the Board level and throughout the community.

This existing cross community working group has spent the last couple of years doing some substantial research and outreach to the community to determine how the current geographic regions framework is being applied, whether it should stay the way it is, where there are opportunities for improvement to that.

The working group has essentially gotten through about 80% of their work. They produced an initial report at the very beginning of their process, you know, considering how GNSO, the SSAC, the ALAC and other supporting organizations and advisory committees currently apply the geographic regions framework.

And the expectation is that while that will continue there may need to be some adjustments made to the categorization of where countries are assigned, how the regions are set up and the rest. The working group has produced a interim report. That interim report teed up a number of potential

issues that the working group would look at potentially in terms of developing some recommendations.

And right now this working group is in its final stages. Working group members are deliberating, working on drafting proposals, coming together with a draft final report that they hope to share with the community either in Singapore or shortly thereafter that gives all of you a sense of the potential direction of the recommendations that they might offer to the Board for potential improvements to the geographic regions framework and how its applied throughout the ICANN community.

So we've included this item on our Webinar today basically as a head's up to let you know that this work is underway and also to reinforce for you the fact that at ICANN it's a constant sort of reevaluation and reexamination to make sure that the community is doing what's of most importance to its members, that all the processes and mechanisms are working efficiently and to identify potential areas for improvement wherever they are available.

So I'll stop there on the geographic regions framework. I will be back later to wrap things up for my colleagues and to entertain your questions. But for now, Marika, I'll turn the microphone over to you to talk about the inter-registrar transfer policy. Thanks a lot.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Rob. As a bit of an introduction the inter-registrar transfer policy which is also known as the IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 and has as a objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain names between registrars.

And as part of that implementation process it was decided to carry out a review of the policy in order to determine whether it was actually working as intended or whether there are any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvement.

And it might be worth pointing out that this is actually the number one area of complaint when it comes to issues raised with ICANN compliance staff. So as a result of that review a number of issues were identified which were then grouped together in five different policy development processes, also called PDPs, that were titled A-E which are being addressed in a consecutive manner by the GNSO.

The PDP working group has been considering the issues that are part of Group B and hence the name the IRTP Part B PDP working group. So this working group is looking at - it was tasked to address a number of issues that relate to the return of a domain name registration that has been either inappropriately transferred either as a result of a hijacking or conflict between the registrant and admin contact.

And they're reviewing whether a separate process or provision should be introduced to address such instances. And in addition the working group has also been discussing a number of questions that relate to the use of registrar lock status.

So this working group started its activities in 2009 and through a review of comments received on its initial report and its proposed final report the working group has now submitted its final report on the 30 of May to the GNSO Council for its consideration. This final report contains nine recommendations that are intended to address the working group's charter questions.

So what are those recommendations? So I'll briefly take you through the different recommendations but would strongly recommend that if you're interested you understand the background and thinking behind each of these recommendations that you review the final report itself.

So the first recommendation deals with the issue of registrars getting a quick response from another registrar in the case of an emergency such as a transfer as a result of a domain name hijacking.

So the working group proposes to require registrars to provide a transfer emergency action contact or TEAC - accordingly to invent a new acronym for every working group so this one developed TEAC.

So if the TEAC is contacted they need to provide a response within four hours. I think it's important to emphasize that the four hour timeline relates to a response and not necessarily to the resolution of the issue itself.

So the second recommendation encourages the promotion of a report of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee that details a number of proactive measures that registrants can take themselves to actually prevent their domain name hijacking.

So the next recommendation request deals with a number of - the next recommendation requests an issue report which is the first step of a policy development process on thick Whois. In order to assess whether it would be desirable to require all incumbent gTLDs to actually provide thick Whois which in the context of transfers might have real benefit but the working group recommends the PDP as it wants to make sure that any undesired consequences are also explored as part of such a PDP.

So Recommendation 4 is another request for an issue report. And this time it recommends looking at issues that deal with the subject of change of control as well as the review of locking procedures that are outlined in the IRTP as reasons for denial Number 8 and 9.

And Recommendation 5 relates to a provision that is currently optional in the IRTP whereby the losing registrar may notify the registrant of a transfer out. And the working group actually recommends that this provision is made

mandatory so that it - that there's early awareness on the part of the registrant that a transfer has been requested by the admin contact and any issues may be resolved prior to the transfer happening instead of after the fact which is currently causing issues.

So Recommendation provides proposed language to clarify denial Reason 6 of the IRTP to make clear that registrant have to give an informed opt-in consent to have registrar locks apply. But they also must be able to remove the lock upon reasonable notice and authentication.

So Recommendation Number 7 deals with locks in the context of the UDRP and working group actually recommends that this issue should be considered as part of a review of the UDRP should such a review take place as they consider that to be the more appropriate place to deal with that specific question.

So Recommendation 8 deals with standardizing and clarifying Whois status messages regarding registrar lock status as these are found to be confusing and not necessarily consistent.

And in relation to reasons for denial Number 7 the working group recommends to delete this provision as in its current state it's not even possible to actually apply this reason for denial and instead replace it with a provision that details how domains may be locked or unlocked.

So what are the next steps? The working group has submitted its report to the GNSO Council and the GNSO Council will now consider the report and its recommendations. It's actually scheduled to have the first exchange of views on the report at its meeting tomorrow followed by further discussion at the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

So if, one, the GNSO Council has approved the recommendations those that relate to changes to the existing consensus policies will need to be approved by the ICANN Board before they'll move into implementation.

So on this slide you can just find some links to further information on this topic; the final report, a link to the public comment review tool so you can see how the working group has dealt with the comments they received on the proposed final report and how these have been incorporated and addressed in the final report and also a link to the actual existing inter-registrar transfer policy.

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

In addition to those issues the working group has also been addressing questions like do registrants have adequate opportunity to redeem their domain name registration following expiration? And is there adequate notice that a domain name registration is about to expire?

So this working group took a similar path as the IRTP working group and has arrived at its final report via review of public comments it received on the initial report and a proposed final report I believe. This working group is actually in the process of finalizing its report and expects to submit it to the GNSO Council for its consideration next week.

So in general the working group is of the opinion that the recommendations it's putting forward will provide additional guarantees to registrants, will improve registrant education and comprehension of renewal and post expiration related processes and are actually in line with existing practices.

So to give you an idea of the recommendations in the report - in the latest draft of the report - so the following recommendations are included there amongst others. So to provide a minimum of eight days following expiration during which the registration can be renewed by the original registrant.

The working group recommends that the redemption grace period should actually become a consensus policy for all unsponsored gTLDs and registrars offering registrations in those unsponsored gTLDs.

The working group recommends that the fees charged for renewal must be clearly posted and communicated at the time of registration. The working group also recommends that at least two notices need to be sent to the registrants at set times to warn the registrant about the upcoming expiration and one notice following expiration.

The working group also recommends that the expired registration's Website must explicitly say that the domain name registration has expired and provide instructions on how the registration can be redeemed by the registrant.

There are several recommendations that encourage the development of educational materials aimed at registrants that explain how unintentional loss of a domain name registration can be prevented.

There are a couple of best practices recommendations that outline certain approaches that might prevent unintentional loss for example by providing guidance on how registrants can ensure that notices are actually received.

And the working group recommends that regular updates on the effectiveness and status of the implementation of the recommendations is provided following approval and implementation so that it can be tracked whether the recommendations are working as intended or whether any changes should be contemplated.

So I've mentioned before that this working group intends to submit its report to the GNSO Council next week which will hopefully allow the GNSO Council to have a first exchange of views on the report and its recommendations at the ICANN meeting in Singapore. And again if one is approved by the GNSO Council those recommendations that relate to consensus policy will need to be approved by the ICANN Board.

Again here you'll find some links. There's actually a link to the proposed final report, the previous version that was released and you'll find as well a link to the working group work space where you'll be able to find the final version once approved and published.

Now we'll move onto the discussion paper on the creation of nonbinding best practices to address the abuse of registration of domain names. And I invite all of you to come up with a good acronym for that one because I don't think we've created one yet and it's definitely necessary as it's such a mouthful.

So this is a project that stems from one of the recommendations of the registration abuse policy's working group that delivered its final report to the GNSO Council in May of 2010.

One of the recommendations in that report stated that nonbinding best practices to help registrars and registries to address the illicit use of domain names should be developed. In addition the RAP working group provided a list of subjects that should be considered as part of such an effort.

So the GNSO Council acted on this recommendation by requesting a discussion paper from ICANN staff to explore this issue in further detail. So staff has been working on this discussion paper in which we intend to raise a number of questions and issues relating to this topic in addition to providing a preliminary inventory of existing best practices that may be considered as part of any follow up activity.

But in order to obtain the GNSO and community's input on this topic we've scheduled a workshop at the ICANN meeting in Singapore which will take place on Thursday the 23rd of June from 11:00 to 12:30 local time.

And at this workshop where we're planning to provide an outline of the discussion paper based on our current thinking followed by community discussion and input which we hope to use to finalize this paper for submission to the GNSO Council. So if you're interested in this topic you are more than welcome to join the session and share your views.

Again on this slide you can find some links to some information - some background information on this issue and also the link to the session that will take place in Singapore.

And with that I'll hand it over to Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you, Marika, and hello everyone. I'm going to talk to you about a project that I've spent a lot of time on over the last trimester. And really this is the - related to the current state of the UDRP, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy that deals with cyber squatting in gTLDs.

So as Marika mentioned there was a registration abuse policy - a final report that made various recommendations and one of them related to the UDRP. And so in February of this year the GNSO Council asked that staff write an issue report on the current state of the UDRP and asked specifically that the issue report address several points.

One, whether the UDRP has addressed the problem of cyber squatting to date and to identify any insufficiencies or inequalities associated with the process. They've also asked for an evaluation of the definition of cyber squatting and whether it needs to be updated or reviewed. And finally they asked that some suggestions be made on how a possible PDP on the UDRP might be managed.

So with that we started a process of doing research and identifying issues related to the UDRP which has been in effect for over 10 years. And as you can imagine there's a tremendous amount of cases and treatises and documents about the UDRP and so it was quite a task to identify the issues.

With the help of the drafting team put together by the GNSO Council we conducted - staff conducted a webinar on May 10 where experts talked about their views on the current state of the UDRP. And this Webinar was about two hours long. It's available for review if any of you missed that Webinar.

And it really solicited the views of UDRP providers, of panelists, of attorneys on both sides and even of academics to get a flavor for what the issues are with the current implementation of the UDRP and its processes. And staff also put together a questionnaire to the UDRP providers to get some facts that would be included in the issue report.

The other thing that was done is we've taken a novel approach with respect to issue reports. In the past staff has just drafted an issue report and not solicited public comment prior to doing that. Well with the new processes under the new PDP process that Rob referred to that will be adopted hopefully soon there's a recommendation that there be a preliminary report that's posted for public comment and then a final issue report that takes into account the public comment period.

So that is what we've done; we've published a preliminary issue report that is open until July 15. And we also scheduled a UDRP session to take place in Singapore. And so if you're interested in sharing your views on the UDRP and the current state of the UDRP we invite you to participate in that session.

It's going to focus on the recommendations in the preliminary issue report so that the final issues report can be issued after Singapore. And then when the

final issue report is released the GNSO Council will decide whether to initiate a PDP on the UDRP - a policy development process.

So as you look through the preliminary issue report we covered a couple of aspects that I'd like to share with you today. In general we view the UDRP as a success. I mean, since it's been adopted over 10 years ago there have been over 30,000 complaints filed. And there's been four service providers that have been approved by ICANN that really provides choice and competition in providing these services.

And the UDRP is viewed as a viable alternative to costly litigation involving parties from different jurisdictions. And if you listened to the Webinar on May 10 you heard examples of what it was like to litigate cyber squatting disputes before the UDRP actually was adopted.

The other thing is that the UDRP has served as a model for ccTLDs and so it's really, you know, been proven both through the implementation and through adoption through other ccTLDs.

And finally the thing that we find interesting is that service providers have really dedicated a lot of resources and education to publishing the decisions, publishing materials that help both respondents and complainants understand how the UDRP is implemented.

So on this slide I briefly summarized the community's opinion that was reflected in that May 10 Webinar. And essentially it was - from all viewpoints the UDRP was looked on as a policy that is effective. Certainly it's not perfect but it's certainly - it's something that has served the need that was described when you're considering the alternative which is court litigation so it is viewed as cost effective.

It's also viewed as flexible and fair to respondents. As - over the 10 years the providers have done a good job of really looking at issues that affect

respondents and encouraging the panelists to deal with those issues so think of things like free speech, fair use or even reverse domain name hijacking; all those things have evolved over the last 10 years.

And it's also viewed as predictable and transparent because of all this publication of materials that are out there and it's very easy to understand how cases have been interpreted. And when there's been a problematic dispute you'll often see articles written about it when the decision has been maybe not viewed as entirely appropriate. And so there's a lot of transparency associated with the UDRP.

And so the consensus that came through the Webinar was that although the UDRP is not perfect, I mean, clearly there's, you know, it's not perfect but many viewpoints felt that there'd be more harm than good if a PDP was - a policy development process was initiated at this time.

And in fact if there was to be a review a lot of the speakers suggested that the best thing to do would be to focus on process improvements as opposed to the policy itself.

And so, you know, we took away from that Webinar that the consensus was that a PDP could undermine the effectiveness of the UDRP. And several speakers actually did say that from various viewpoints.

So as you review the preliminary issue report there is a staff recommendation. And this is what will be discussed in the Singapore session that we've highlighted. And the staff really (unintelligible) to the community viewpoint and recommended against initiating a policy development process at this time on the UDRP.

However if the Council does feel that the UDRP needs to be reviewed staff suggests that a better way to do it is to convene a team of experts that would focus purely on the process issues to see if improvements could be made

through the process that would make the overall implementation of the UDRP more fair.

And certainly a PDP could be initiated at a later time if after that process it's clear that there are things that need to be tweaked within the policy itself. And so the recommendation really is to delay a PDP at this time and set up this team of experts of folks that really have experience with the implementation of the UDRP and the process to provide a report that would outline a process improvement that could help the implementation of the UDRP.

And so for additional information I've got some information on this slide - a link to the UDRP and a place where you can actually download and review the Webinar on the current state of the UDRP. There's also a transcript posted there if you don't feel like listening to the two-hour Webinar.

And also as I indicated before I invite you to participate in the public comment forum which will be open until July 15. And then we will summarize the comments from the public comment forum and produce the final issue report.

And with that I will pass it onto my colleague, Liz Gasster, who will provide you an update on the Whois. Liz.

Liz Gasster: Thank you, Margie. I'm going to be updating you today on some recent GNSO activities regarding studies of Whois that the Council - GNSO Council has been considering for some time.

Just real quick to cover the agenda on Whois I'll be talking about four studies, the misuse of public data study, Whois registrant identification study, a proxy and privacy abuse study and these are just kind of shorthand labels for the studies - and we use abuse on this third study not misuse not because we think there's really a distinction in the terminology but just to help distinguish between the two studies - and then a proxy and privacy relay and reveal study.

I'll also be talking briefly about some subsequent action that the Council has taken recently on the Whois service requirements inventory report that was written by staff last July.

So as most of you know the Whois policy issues have been debated for many years and the GNSO has focused on doing some factual studies of Whois to provide data and factual basis for policy development in the future. So we've been working for quite some time to identify four areas, whether the studies would be feasible or not and how much they would cost.

All of that research is done. And now the Council has decided to proceed with three studies - the three of those that I mentioned and is still deciding on the fourth so that's what I'm going to cover today.

The first study, a misuse study, which the Council has approved and which we have awarded publicly to Carnegie Melon University, the Cyber Lab there, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in the United States to perform the research for that study.

It will assess whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and also look at the impacting of anti-harvesting measures. They're two approaches to - basically two separate studies that Carnegie Melon will be performing for us.

This was approved last September. We just initiated the study in April. It took a little time to just negotiate the contract. And it'll take about a year for the study to be complete. But that study is progressing apace.

The second area of study that we're referring to as the registrant identification study will look at information about how registrants are identified and classify the various types of entities that register domains.

This study is not yet approved by the Council. There were some questions that the registries raised that resulted in some changes that were made to this study to recast it as more of an exploratory study rather than a sort of hypothesis driven study which also this changing of the focus of the study a bit is kind of more consistent with the related GAC proposals that were offered in 2008 that were kind of the foundational proposal that led to this study being examined.

So I am hoping that the GNSO Council decides tomorrow at its Council call whether to proceed with this study or not. It is scheduled to be considered tomorrow. It is possible that the vote could be held over until Singapore and then this would be an action item if that were the case for Singapore but that's to be determined on tomorrow's Council call.

The third area of study which looks at privacy and proxy registered domains associated with alleged harmful acts and answers the questions or tries to examine the questions that are listed there on the slide; how often bad actors try to obscure their identity in Whois, how this rate of abuse would compare to overall privacy and proxy abuse, how this rate would compare to alternatives like falsified Whois data, compromised machines and the like.

This is a study that the Council just approved on the 28th of April. We are finalizing a contract with an independent research entity to perform this study which is estimated to take about a year.

And as soon as the contract is final we'll be announcing the organization that's actually conducting that study and I'll be providing status reports as requested by the Council periodically on the progress of this study but it is also proceeding a pace at this point. Although the study has not actually begun yet and it won't until the contract is finalized.

The fourth area of study relates to Whois proxy and privacy relay requests and reveal requests. The original study that the GNSO Council asked staff to

investigate the feasibility of would analyze communication relay and identity reveal requests, actual real cases, that are identified for proxy and privacy registered domains to explore and document how they're processed and to identify factors that may promote or impede timely communication and resolution.

So this would be a qualitative study to examine specific cases. And when we posted an RFP potential bidders were unsure of whether the study would be feasible. And so we actually got no responses.

We solicited some input from those we thought would have been potential bidders who we thought had looked at the study to try to understand what their hesitations were and learned that they were concerned both about the feasibility of obtaining a sufficient data sample and also some issues regarding confidentiality of data that they felt might be challenging to overcome.

And so we proposed a pre-study survey to basically try to answer those initial questions. Could we obtain a sufficient data sample and set up the right confidentiality structure so that we would have enough respondents participating in the study itself?

So the Council did approve on the 28th of April this pre-study to survey and answer those questions. We are finalizing a contract again with an independent entity to perform that pre-study survey. And then once that's final we'll proceed with the survey, provide the Council with the results and then based on that we can - the Council can decide whether the actual study - whether to proceed with the actual study.

That is a quick update on the status of the Whois studies. Before I talk about the inventory of Whois service requirements report I just want to briefly reinforce that for Singapore the only activity that we are expecting could

come up is a possible vote on that Study Number 2 if the Council does not vote on that study tomorrow but it is scheduled to do so at that time.

So now to turn to the inventory of Whois service requirements; many of you may recall that in May of 2009 the GNSO asked the policy staff to compile a comprehensive set of technical requirements that reflect not only known deficiencies in the current service but also technical requirements that might be needed to support various policy initiatives that have been previously proposed.

The Council - excuse me - staff did produce such a report and I just want to emphasize that again this was not to identify or gather actual policy requirements for Whois or to recommend policy on Whois but rather just to identify technical requirements that would be needed to support those policy proposals that had been previously made.

On this slide there is a list of some of what the compilation includes. You've seen this material before so I don't - I won't review it now. But recently the Council did decide to convene a drafting team to develop a survey to ask the ICANN community for its views on the extent to which there is agreement with these various technical requirements that have been suggested.

And the survey results might help determine whether, you know, there's a benefit to convening a working group to consider those technical recommendations. So we had a first kick-off meeting of that group and that group will be meeting to formulate that survey.

Here is more information, again, on Whois - on the service requirements report and also another link to a technical evolution discussion Web page that's also underway.

Before I turn it over to Olof I want to just briefly mention that there is also a pending working group examining the internationalized registration data

issue. This is a joint GNSO SSAC working group. Its activities are also underway and there is a link there for more information about their activities.

So with that I'll turn it over to my colleague Olof Nordling for a short briefing on the ASO's policy activities. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, Liz. Hello everybody. And we're reaching the home stretch of this ICANN policy safari. And that means we're entering the area of numbers, IP addresses, and autonomous system numbers, ASNs and that's the (realm) of the Address Supporting Organization or ASO as it's abbreviated. So we'll have to acquaint ourselves with some additional acronyms actually.

Because what ICANN does is to - or rather the IANA function of ICANN hands out - delegates IP addresses and AS numbers to the regional Internet registries which in turn delegate addresses to local Internet registers or Internet service providers who in turn provide you, as individual users, with the IP numbers you need.

And while Regional Internet Registries - that's RIRs - and there are five of those; one in Africa, AfriNIC, one in Asia-Pacific, APNIC, one in North America, ARIN, one in South America, LATNIC - or Latin America is properly spoken and RIPE for the European region.

And these - they have a corporation organization called the NRO - another acronym which is the Number Resource Organization. And that's a needed background to explain what is the ASO, notably the Address Supporting Organization, which is set up through a memorandum of understanding between ICANN and the NRO.

Not particularly easy all of this but that's the way it's handled. And it means that the ASO function is handled by the NRO in accordance with this memorandum of understanding. And one major task of the ASO - it's not the

only one - is to handle the so-called global policy proposals, another - well it's a broad word and it has a particular meaning.

So global policies made in the ASO sense has a particular importance because the RIRs - the Regional Internet Registries - has developed many regional addressing policies for the regional allocation of IP addresses and AS numbers.

There are plenty of those but there are a few which affect the IANA function which is upstream of the RIRs and is handled by ICANN. And only those are called global policies. So there's a very, very precise definition of global policies in this context.

And well as of today we have global policies for the allocation by IANA for - IPv4 addresses, IPv6 addresses and autonomous system numbers. So one could ask what is there left to define?

Well there is one important global policy proposal in pipeline and that addresses recovered IPv4 address base post exhaustion. And as you probably all know there is no more IPv4 addresses in the so-called IANA-free (fold). So this is quite an important matter.

Let's have a closer look at that one and why it is important because as of the current - the existing IPV4 global policy just enables IANA to hand out so-called /8s. There are no more /8s left. There's a block of roughly 16 million addresses. But in the case that addresses bases return to IANA there must be some policy to enable the IANA to hand it out to regional Internet registries again.

And there have been attempts - actually we're now onto the third proposal on this particular theme which is the current proposal. The two previous ones they ended up in - a little bit (unintelligible) the first one because it was

adopted with two different versions in different RIRs, and just a very, very small difference but quite important between the verbs may or must.

So that one couldn't be adopted or proceed as a global policy because that calls for all the regional Internet registries to agree on the exact very same text.

The second one met with concerns in one RIR because it didn't allocate - it didn't provide for an equal allocation of - this returned or recovered IPv4 space to all RIRs at the same time. And so it was abandoned in that RIR and now with the third one it provides for equal allocation when there is available space, return to the IANA in equal sizes to all the RIRs at the same time.

And this one has been adopted in one RIR; the APINIC, Asia Pacific, and is in final call as it's called in LATNIC - or Latin America. And it remains in discussion for the time being in the three other RIRs.

But once it's - provided it's adopted it would then be forwarded to the NRO for their review and then to the ASO Address Council to speak which in turn will forward it to the ICANN Board for ratification. That's not likely to happen before around about autumn this year but it's at least well underway and hasn't met any obstacles so far.

Now if you're at all interested in this particular area well how do you get involved in it? It's very, very easy; it's very, very open. Actually for all addressing policies you can participate in the bottom up policy development in any RIR; it doesn't even need to be in your particular region; they're open to all.

And they all conduct open meetings where the policy proposals both regional and global are discussed and they all have open mailing lists for such matters just subscribe.

But well a final little advertisement there will be an ASO session on Wednesday in Singapore - Wednesday afternoon. And all the RIRs or representatives of all the RIRs will be present and discuss both their regional developments and what's happening with the global policy development.

So don't miss that one. And with that little advertisement I return you to your tour guide, Rob, for a final information on how to stay updated. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks very much, Olof. I've got a couple slides for wrap up about staying in touch and then we'll have time for questions and answers. And I alert you, Olof, to a question that (Karen) has asked in the chat that you may want to address online rather than by voice. But we'll be getting to questions and answers very briefly.

By noting many of the participants on this call this next couple of slides is really by way of I think reminder more than teaching you anything. But for those of you who are new and you want to stay up to date between Webinars or ICANN meetings wanted to remind you that we do as a policy team on a monthly basis produce a policy update.

That document is intended to provide the latest and greatest in terms of activities, accomplishments, benchmarks, goals reached by the various communities with whom we work. It's intended to be a dispassionate sort of recitation about where things are, what their status are, sort of what the next steps are. And that comes out about the middle to third week of every month.

We continue to - and this is something that (Karen) and I actually started almost two years ago now - to publish the monthly update in all six UN languages. Unfortunately - and this is still something that we work hard on every month is that we are working hard to get the non-English versions of the document out as quickly as we can.

That continues to be a challenge but please understand that we are constantly trying to improve that timeframe and how quickly those come out. But the idea is to have at least on a monthly basis an update on what changes are happening and what things are happening from a policy development perspective in all our supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The other main way to stay updated is using the ICANN Websites. And I use the plural of that because individual organizations, the ccNSO, GNSO, the At Large community all have their own specific Websites. In the case of the SSAC their own specific Web page on icann.org that talk about or provide documents that they have been working on recently.

In the case of the ccNSO and the GNSO those Websites have either been just recently improved or are undergoing the improvements as I mentioned with respect to the GNSO a little bit earlier.

The other way that more and more of you are using is when you go to the front page of icann.org it's subscribing to the RSS feeds, the email alerts or otherwise following ICANN on Twitter so that you are at least getting some sort of automated update at the very least about, you know, significant policy comment opportunities, public comment forums and the rest.

So there are a number of tools for staying up to date and we encourage you to use the ones that work best for you and use as many of them as you can. The other tool that many of you in the community are aware of that's come online is that we have shifted to the confluence Wiki tool and are aggressively and proactively pushing that out to all the various community groups.

It's a much more robust platform than the social text wiki; something that we hope will provide some additional tools and a lot more capabilities for individual working groups, for individual constituencies, stakeholder groups,

SOs and ACs, the supporting organizations and advisory committees, to use themselves as well.

So, you know, when you get involved in some of those groups you'll want to bookmark those wiki pages or otherwise use that tool to follow along as things change.

Just briefly you've heard from a number of members of the policy team during this Webinar. I think we had brought this Webinar to you over four different time zones at different places around the globe.

There are currently 16 of us, 17 of us on the current policy staff. We are in seven different time zones around the world and literally one or two of us is working at every hour of the day so we've got good 24-hour coverage.

On occasion we will bring in outside expertise; folks who are particularly skilled in a particular technical matter or organizational expertise or structural expertise. So generally there's around 20 of us working for the community at any one point in time. And these two slides show you the complement of folks who are currently on our team.

And so we thank and appreciate all of you not only for participating in this but for being good partners and colleagues with us as we all work to promote the best interests of the community and the policy development process within ICANN.

So I will stop there. I see that we've got about six minutes for questions and answers. Mr. (McCarthy) has taken good opportunity of the chat pod in the Adobe Connect room to ask a number of questions. But I'd like to open up the floor and I don't know, Marika, if we want to bring all the phones - the various lines live now.

But to give people the opportunity to ask a question please either if you're in Adobe Connect raise your hand; that's the little person icon at the top of the Adobe Connect screen or feel free to go ahead and type your question in the chat pod and we would be happy to try to answer it.

I'll give folks a couple moments perhaps to come off mute or stop multitasking and give you an opportunity to ask a question. Thank you for the theme music in the background, somebody.

If there are no questions I'd like to thank all of you particularly my colleagues for participating and attending this session. We do have - oops - let me stop for a second. (Karen) asked the question, are there any other issues in front of the Council that have not been covered? Liz, do you want to address that?

Liz Gasster: Yes but I need a moment to think.

Rob Hogarth: Well one quick - as you think about that one quick way to find that out is I believe that the pending project list from the GNSO Council perspective is circulated right around this time - at the time of every GNSO Council meeting. I believe that project list still has over 20 items on it which would cover any of the particular matters that may not be hot at this time but that are still pending.

And I don't know if there...

Liz Gasster: And I'll just jump in say, you know, there are a few other things we didn't cover today. There is a new group that the Board requested to look at metrics for competition and consumer trust and consumer choice that will be meeting in Singapore and we'll be soliciting views from the community but no work has really gone on besides some organizing work in advance of that so that might be something to look forward to.

The Council has also organized a drafting team to look at some of the issues that have arisen with regard to community working groups; some of the strengths and benefits, the challenges associated with community working groups. That's a fairly new group. I think Jonathan Robinson is taking the coordination lead on that for the GNSO so that might be something that you're interested in.

We actually have quite a number of cross community working groups that have been convened in the past and that are going on right now. And so some of the issues that are of interest and perhaps concern about how those groups are managed in the future are going to be discussed in that context.

And while I'm on the subject of community working groups there are others that are quite active that will also be meeting in Singapore, the Joint Applicant Support working group. I know the Joint Internationalized - Internationalization working group - the JIG - which will be responding to some questions as will the SSAC that the Board and staff has posed to them so they're quite active.

And I'd like to just also recognize Bart for a minute - or if Bart didn't leave the call because he may also have a couple of items that weren't covered today as well so feel free to also check with us offline if you'd like to know more about some of the groups that we didn't cover on today's call that are definitely meeting in Singapore.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks Liz. Bart or anybody else want to make a quick comment from the staff side?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, just with regard to the JIG say I've covered it in the first bit but the JIG is - the JIG final report is - was sent to the Board. There were some implementation questions through the ccNSO and GNSO Council. These questions were referred back to the JIG.

And also if there are any future questions they will be referred directly to the JIG and these questions were also raised for the - to the SSAC so both the JIG and SSAC are involved directly now with the in the implementation process.

Rob Hogarth: Great, thanks very much, Bart. Thank you again all for attending. As a reminder there will be a second opportunity for going over this material tomorrow at 1200 UTC I believe same telephone number, same Adobe Connect link. So if you found this to be helpful or interesting and want to share it with members of your community or other colleagues please promote this event.

And for those of you who won't be going to Singapore we will miss you; for those who are we will see you soon. Thank you all very much for participating.

END