

TRANSCRIPT
Pre-Beijing Policy Update Webinar
Thursday 21 March 2013 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the call on the Pre-Beijing Policy Update Webinar on Thursday 21 March 2013 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://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-policy-update-webinar-1900-20130321-en.mp3>

on page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar>

And presentation:

<http://www.icann.org/en/resources/policy/presentations>

David Olive: Greetings to all and thank you for joining this policy Webinar. I would like to introduce myself. I am David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development Support at ICANN.

And the policy team will be presenting some updates of policy activities as we prepare for the Beijing meeting.

But before I go into other details I would also like to turn it over to Dr. Steve Sheng from our staff to provide a welcome and a greeting to our Chinese language speaking community and participants. Steve please?

Steve Sheng: Thank you David. ((Foreign Language Spoken)). David over to you.

David Olive: Thank you very much Steve. And as Steve was informing people about some of the welcome and the rules for today's Webinar I just want to let you know that we'll be stopping after each section and un-muting the lines for people to ask questions.

But of course at any time you can put questions in the chat room. And at the end of the conference we'll also have a time for questions and answers.

In addition the slides and the transcripts will be posted on our Web site. And we will give you that URL at the end of our session. And we will also have it translated into Chinese for use by our Chinese language community.

So in essence you can go back and look at the slides at your leisure in addition to that and if you have any questions we have a way for you to provide them to us.

It has been almost six months since we last gathered in Toronto for the ICANN meeting and of course a lot has happened during that time.

And so it is fitting that we will be in the Asia-Pacific region and in the Beijing in particular noting the growth of Internet users in that area.

We would of course like to point out that the week in Beijing will be a busy one filled with more than 200 meetings and sessions designed to foster dialogue around a range of critical issues, policy activities, exploring the international domain name variants, new gTLD program, the gTLD directory services, multi-stakeholder governance and much more including a session on a policy development and policy implementation.

So it will be an active week and we hope this briefing will provide you with some of the highlights of the policy development activities in Beijing.

Of course policy recommendations are formed and refined by the community through its Supporting Organizations the SOs, and influenced by Advisory Committees the ACs, all comprised of volunteers from many countries in a bottom up open and transparent process.

The stakeholders include companies that offer domain names to the public, companies that operate top level domain registries, Internet service providers, intellectual property interest, business users, noncommercial users such as academics, nongovernmental organizations, nonprofits and of course individual Internet users and governments.

These are our communities and are represented here by the supporting organizations and advisory committees that create policy recommendations or advise on policy recommendations to the board of directors as they apply to the DNS.

The goals for the sessions are to update you on current work, review the issues being discussed in Beijing, inform you of upcoming initiatives and ways you can participate and input your comments, and answer any questions you may have on the subjects that we'll be talking about today.

We will also be covering by the various supporting organizations and advisory councils for the generic names supporting organizations.

We'll be looking at these particular issues that they are working on at this moment, for the country codes supporting organizations their work in the PDP and study groups, the activities of the at large advisory committee, the address supporting organization, the number side.

And with that we'll turn to the GNSO policy issues. These will be discussed by our policy team experts. And I'm turning it over now not to Marika Konings our Senior Policy Director Whois unable to join us today but to our associate

Lars Hoffmann to take us through the issues facing the gTLD. Lars the floor is yours.

Berry Cobb: David actually this is Berry I'll be taking over the locking of the domain name subject UDRP and then turn it over to Lars.

David Olive: Okay. Very good (Berry) please.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you David. Welcome everyone. David teed this up. I'm filling the shoes of Marika which I assure you is no easy task.

The first PDP that we'll be discussing is the locking of the domain name subject to the UDRP proceedings.

Following the issue report on the current state of the UDRP the GNSO council decided to initiate a PDP on this specific item only as a more extensive review of UDRP is scheduled at a later point in time.

Currently there is no requirement to lock a domain name in the period between the filing of the UDRP complaint and the commencement of the proceeding - as the UDRP only refers to maintaining status quo but it does not define what this means or at what point in the time status quo should be maintained.

This has resulted in different interpretations and practices by registrars somewhat resulting in confusion, lack of clarity, as well as UDRP providers or complaints and registrants.

So in order to help inform the deliberations of the working group they developed a survey in which it asks some registrars as well as some UDRP providers about their existing practices as well as experiences with the entire process.

The feedback that we received clearly identified that currently there is no standard approach in relation to the locking of a domain name subject to a UDRP proceeding.

Further the working group did reach out to the different ICANN stakeholders as well as the broader ICANN community to obtain input on this topic and charter questions had been asked to be addressed.

As a result of the feedback we've collated all the feedback received and continue this activity within the working group deliberation. And all of that has been compiled into what we've delivered for an initial report for community input.

This initial report in addition to information on the background and input received contains 11 preliminary recommendations which the working group expects will help clarify as well as standardize the process that is to be followed in the case of the UDRP proceeding with regard to locking of the domain name.

First it should include a proposed definition of blocking I should say it will include a definition of blocking. It's a term that is currently not defined or mentioned in the UDRP or UDRP rules.

But in this context it is proposed that locking means preventing any changes of registrar and registrant without necessarily impairing the resolution of the domain name.

And it should be noted that this last aspect with regards to resolution is a critical element that the working group is looking for input from the community as to whether this kind of language should be maintained within the final recommendation.

In addition the working group proposes that a registrar is required to prevent any changes of registrar and registrant within two business days of receiving a verified request from a UDRP provider.

Other - are a few proposed changes to the UDRP is also to remove the requirements for the complainants to send a copy of the complaint to the respondent at the time of filing as this was also discovered in associated with an increased risk of cyber flight.

Cyber flight meaning that the person that owning the domain name could try to try to transfer the domain in question to another registrar before the proceedings begin.

So all in all the recommendations together aim to provide a step by step process on what needs to happen when a UDRP complaint has been filed and what the responsibilities are of the different parties involved.

In addition the working group proposes that if when these recommendations are adopted accompanying educational materials would be developed to ensure that all affected parties and stakeholders are aware and appreciate what the new requirements are.

So the initial report and its recommendations have been posted for public comment. And public comments can be submitted through 26 April.

The working group is also organizing a session in Beijing on Thursday 11th of April from 9:00 to 1030 local time to Beijing during which there'll be opportunity for the community to ask questions and provide input.

Once the public comment period closes the working group will collate all the comments received, deliberate on those comments and course correct on recommendations and compile a final report for submission to the GNSO council.

And so with that I'll turn it over to Lars and he'll brief you on the purpose of gTLD registration data.

Lars Hoffmann: Hello everybody. As you may know another policy development process that has recently kicked off deals with purpose of gTLD registration data commonly often referred to as Whois.

And as many of you probably also know Whois was created in the early 1980's as a mechanism to contact those responsible for operating network resource on the Internet.

However since then Whois has been used for many additional reasons. And we also has seen its objection of other scripts but very few fundamental changes have been made to the underlying protocol will affect the services using the protocol.

Of course this lack of reform is not the result of not trying but rather the consequence of the myriad of issues and the large variety of perspectives that is involved in any conversation on Whois.

Though today no agreement has been reached on how to deal with highly personal issues such as accuracy, reliability, and also accessibility of gTLD registration data nor has it on related issues of privacy or readability.

Recognizing the importance of addressing these issues however and also inspired by the recommendations of last year's Whois review team the ICANN board requested last November an issue report on specifically the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data as well as on solutions to improve accuracy and access to it.

As you probably know requesting an issue report is a first step in a GNSO policy development process.

And in parallel to the request in fact the board also directed the creation of an Expert Working Group to look into these issues related to gTLD registration data.

The recommendations of this Expert Working Group in turn are expected to feed into the final issue report and inform the subsequent policy development process the subsequent PDP.

In the meantime since the board has passed the resolution the Expert Working Group has been formed and has in fact start it's deliberations.

Similarly the primary issue - preliminary I'm sorry issue report has now been published for public comments and can be found on the ICANN Web site.

The report outlines the background to this very complex topic of Whois data and the underlying protocol.

And in addition it provides an overview of the many past and present initiatives related to it that hopefully may have informed the PDP deliberations.

The report the preliminary issue report also includes the staff recommendation which confirms that this topic is considered to be within the scope of ICANN and the GNSO development process. And it does recommend taking into account the importance of this issue that a PDP proceeds.

Public comments to this report can be submitted up until 19 April. And this is then followed by a reply period of course.

And as mentioned before the final issue report is then expected to be published following the finalization of the Expert Working Group recommendations so that these can be included in the final report.

And I think I'm passing it on now to my colleague (Barbara).

Barbara Roseman: Thank you. I'm going to give the update on the Whois studies that have been underway for some time.

The Whois study one which is the Whois misuse study. This examines the extent to which public Whois contact information for domain names is being misused.

And it is in the last stage of their work with the final draft report due to be published sometime in April. And we anticipate that this will be published after the Beijing meeting not prior.

Whois study three is the Whois privacy and proxy services abuse study. And this study is focusing on the extent to which gTLD domain names which are used to conduct apparently illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via privacy or proxy services.

The MPL is the group that is doing this study. And their results are expected sometime midyear probably around the June or July timeframe.

Whois study two is a little bit different. It is the Registrant Identification Study. And it's classifying entities that registered gTLD domain names and comparing the data with the Internet content for the registered domain names.

They're trying to determine whether there are differences in the types of activities that legal persons versus natural persons show on their Web sites

versus - and in addition there is some data on the use of privacy and proxy services.

So you can see there the link to the comments. And this period has already - will be closing on 31 March so well before the meeting.

The key findings so far have been that approximately 39% appeared to be registered by the legal persons, 33% appear to be registered by natural persons, and 20% were registered using a privacy or proxy service.

Approximately 8% were unable to be classified. Approximately 45% to 57% and that's a wide range of all the samples domains were perceived to have potentially commercial activity depending on whether pay for crook sites were included.

So if you do include them it's 57% and if you do not include them its 45%.

For both the parent registrant type and registrant Whois address the country or region of the world differences between the relative percentages among domains with potentially commercial activity and, you know, comparing that to the entire samples percentage the differences are quite small.

Knowing that a domain has potentially commercial activity does not provide any additional insight as to the registrant type or the Whois address of the registrant.

So the percentages of users both legal and natural persons who have some type of apparent commercial activity on their Web site is virtually similar. And I'm going to hand it - this back over to my colleague you Brian Peck.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much (Barbara). Hello and my name is Brian Peck. And I'm a Policy Director with the ICANN policy team.

I'm going to provide a brief overview of the current work being done with relation to the consideration of protection of Red Cross and International Olympic Committee and IGO names from unauthorized reservation in the new gTLDs.

Last November the GNSO council did initiate a PDP to determine whether there should be special protections permanently in place to prevent the unauthorized registration of domain names utilizing the Red Cross for Crescent IOC and IOjO names at either the top or second level of new gTLDs.

That - that PDP is currently ongoing as an interim measure the ICANN Board has adopted certain resolutions to protect these organization names.

In particular for the Red Cross, Red Crescent, and IOC names their names are now on a reserve names list in the new gTLD registry agreements which basically prohibit the registration of such names at the second level of the first round of new gTLDs.

With regards to IGO names or International Government Organizations the Government Advisor Committee or GAC and the IGOs have been collaborating or are in the process of finalizing a list of IGOs that would qualify to be placed on this reserve name list in the new gTLD agreements and thus be protected from the registration of their names at the second level of the first round of the new gTLDs as well.

In terms of the current PDP working group work the - as I mentioned the PDP was initiated last November.

The group continued to work on - and meets on a weekly basis. And they are in addition looking at not only special protections for these organization names in new gTLDs but at the top and second level in all gTLDs.

In considering the possible permit protections for these organizations the working group is currently considering as factors quantifying the entities to be considered for special protection that is to determine the scope of how broad or how narrow the number of organizations that would qualify for such special protections.

They are also evaluating the scope of existing protections under current international treaties. And laws that provide a certain level of protection for certain IGOs the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement and the International Olympic Committee.

The PDP Working Group is also working to establish a qualification criteria for the special protection of these international organization names.

And they are also looking at whether there should be any distinguishing or - due to any substantive differences between the Red Cross, Red Crescent, and IOC from other international organizations in particular International Nongovernment Organizations or NGOs.

With regard to next steps the working groups current goal is to submit its initial report, providing its policy recommendations on this matter for public comment forum in early April.

The working group is - has scheduled a face to face meeting at the ICANN meeting in Beijing on Monday the eighth from local time 14:00 to 17:30.

Further information can be obtained about the meeting by going to the ICANN Web site particularly the Beijing meeting schedule which is up to date at this time.

The working group once it receives our - the public comment forum submissions are based on the initial report will then review the input received and publish its final report.

For further information you can refer to - or you're welcome to refer the final issue report which identifies all issues that are being considered by the working group PDP as well as the Web site on the GNSO site that provides background and documents related to the ongoing work of the working group.

And with that I will pass it on to my colleagues Lars and (Barry) and Julie, Steve. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Hello. Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund. Just to briefly tell you a little bit about a policy development process that the GNSO council will consider initiating at its meeting in Beijing. It's on translation and transliteration of contact information.

There is a final issue report that has been submitted to the GNSO council for consideration. And in that report which I took into consideration comments from the preliminary issue report that was published in the public forum.

The staff has recommended that the council should initiate a PDP. But that it should defer starting the PDP working group until after the work of the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services has completed its work. And that is the Expert Working Group that was referred to previously by my colleagues.

And so that will be under consideration by the GNSO council at its meeting on 10 April in Beijing. For more information you may go to the link that is on this slide. Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Julie. This is (Berry) and I'll be giving you an update for the next three projects that we have going.

The first is uniformity of reporting. This is a preliminary issue report that was founded from a recommendation of the registration abuse policies working

group back in circa 2009 and as a result of identifying the need for access to data and reporting of common complaints related to domain registration as well as various forms of registration abuse to help better inform certain policy development activities.

Based on deliberations by the council staff has created this preliminary issue report. And it basically outlines much of the latest efforts within ICANN that are predominantly focused around contractual compliance activity, accomplishments for improving the contractual compliance function.

I won't go into the details of the issue report but in short compliance team is completing its last year of a three year transformation plan much of which we believe satisfies the original intent of the recommendation that was created by the RAPWG.

In the coming months ICANN will be deploying dashboards to provide community access to much of the data related to the compliance efforts. So stay tuned for that.

As well as I should touch on that the public comment period for this issue report closes tomorrow with the reply period closing three weeks after that.

If we don't receive any comments back for this issue report staff will prepare the final issue report and deliver it to the GNSO council for its meeting in Beijing.

I'd also like to encourage community members to attend a contractual compliance session that's scheduled for Wednesday, April 10 at 11:00 AM local time at Beijing.

And they'll be able to provide you the latest updates on reporting the activities as well as the status of (unintelligible) year plan.

Now we'll briefly turn over to Whois service requirements survey. Basically this working group was formed to measure community input on various possible technical requirements of an improved Whois system based on a prior ICANN staff report.

The working group has pretty much deliberated throughout 2012 to develop a draft survey to elicit community input on the draft, deploy the final version of this survey which contained well over 60 questions all technical related to Whois and that that survey closed towards the end of last year.

Some such technical attributes that were considered is definition of standard query types, standards relating to error messages, queries of the Whois system, internationalized registration data, authentication framework as well as conversions to Thick Whois and some question relating to was.

Presently ICANN staff is analyzing the results of this survey. We intend to return an initial report back to the working group sometime after Beijing with eventual delivery to the GNSO council.

And if you're interested in more information our GNSO Web site has a dedicated page to this effort and it will help fill in some of the details that we can't provide today.

I'm going to skip one slide real quick and briefly touch on the Thick Whois PDP and then I'll turn it over to Lars for him to brief you on the remaining topics.

This PDP is to review issues and requirements of using Thick Whois for all gTLD registry. The working group was tasked with analyzing aspects of accessibility, authoritativeness, cost, competition, privacy, stability and synchronization of a Thick Whois versus a Thin Whois system.

The working group began late in 2012 and they are now reviewing input that was received from the community specifically the stakeholder groups and constituencies involved in the GNSO as we also reached out to other supporting organizations and advisory committees as well.

The working group is compiling all this information and they're starting to formulate possible recommendations and work towards publishing initial report targeting the Durban meeting in July. And of course there will be a public comment period opened up once that is released.

For the Beijing meeting there is a scheduled face to face breakfast session. It's scheduled for Monday, April 8 at 7:30 AM.

It is early but we're hoping to kind of dangle the carrot with some breakfast out there so we look forward to the community participating in that face to face meeting.

And of course for additional information you can also refer to the GNSO Web site to see some of the latest details about that effort.

And so I'll turn it over to Lars and he'll brief you on IRTP workings. Thanks.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you (Berry). The inter-registrar transfer policy or IRTP is an existing consensus policy that is currently under review.

As you can see this current PDP is - its Part D and the preceding parts A to C in fact concluded already in the year so 2009 to 2012 subsequently.

The current PDP deals with six issues or questions that are laid out in detail in the working groups charter. Four these charter questions related specifically to the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy TDRP.

One of the question concerns the assessment of IRTP related penalties. And the final question concerns the usefulness of the continued use of forms of authorization with regards to inter-registrar transfers.

The working group has in fact only just started and had its inaugural meeting on February 25 this year. Since then it has adopted the work plan and has sent out input request to the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as to the other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The next step for the group is to deliberate possible answers and debate the charter question. And of course also to review the common inputs. And let us hope that an initial report might be published for the ICANN meeting in Durban in July later this year.

At the upcoming ICANN meeting in Beijing they will be also a face to face meeting of the working group and as with the other groups we'll encourage you to participate if you're in Beijing in person or otherwise also remotely.

The meeting is currently scheduled for Wednesday, 10 April from nine sorry from 7:30 AM to 9:00 AM Beijing time. I believe that's all for now and it'll go back to David.

David Olive: Thank you very much. We're going to ask that the lines be un-muted and ask if there are any questions from our participants on the materials presented on the GNSO activities and the working groups in their policy development process.

I open the floor to questions. You can also of course ask questions within the chat and they'll be time afterwards as well.

If there are not any questions at this stage we will proceed to the next part of our program. And in terms of the chat this session will be recorded and made available.

And we'll provide you with that URL at the end of the session. It'll probably be posted shortly after our session today.

With that I would - if there are no more questions on the GNSO I move to the ccNSO policy issues and turn it over to Bart Boswinkel our Senior Advisor.
Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Good day everybody. I just want to touch briefly on the activities in the ccNSO which are policy and policy related.

And at the end I will touch upon some of the other activities again with maybe of interest to the broader community.

First of all on the ccNSOs still attracts new members. The ccNSO as you can see is now 136 members as of February this year.

The latest member is the ccTLD manager of .MK and yes we'll see if more will come.

The policy related and policy issues I want to touch upon are the IDN PDP. The study group on the use of country names as TLD and the framework of interpretation working group.

The IDN PDP is one of those very long ongoing projects which hopefully will end this year. It start - it was the PDP was launched in April 2007.

In the meantime the community has developed a fast track methodology and the IDN PDP is taking the experiences and from the IDN fast track into

consideration and build upon that experience and the methodology developed.

It has now reached a stage to produce recommendations for the overall policy and on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

The interim report is currently up and today is the last date for the public comment period and reply period. And hopefully by Beijing the final report will be accepted by the ccNSO council and adopted.

And then the next step will be a member's vote and which is anticipated to conclude by the Durban meeting.

On the overall policy selection it's for the selection of IDN ccTLD itself as I said it builds on the fast track methodology. The major requirements are the IDN string needs to contain at least one non-ASCII character. And the string needs to be a meaningful representation of the name in - of a country or territory in a designated meaning official language of the country.

The major changes if you compare it to the fast-track process are the two panel - a two panel mechanism is introduced to evaluate confusing the similarity.

There is a placeholder for the IDN variant management. And there is an updated clarification of processes if compared to the fast-track methodology.

One major underlying principle is that the current policy for delegation and re-delegation applies to the IDN ccTLDs as well.

So the overall policy is just looking and to the selection of IDN ccTLD strings after that has been validated the current policy for delegation of ccTLDs applies to IDN ccTLDs as well.

On the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs first of all the underlying principle there is that IDN ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs should in principle be treated similar.

As a result the voting mechanics in the ccNSO will change. There will be one vote per territory in order to allow (parity) between the different ccTLDs some including IDN ccTLDs. Some countries will have more than one IDN ccTLD and ccTLD and while other countries and/or territories will just have the ccTLDs.

And in order to maintain parity which is underlying the current ccNSO the proposal is one vote per territory. And further there needs to be an adjustment of the definition of the ccNSO membership in order to include the cc IDN ccTLDs.

The next topic I briefly want to touch upon is the progress of the study group on the use of country names as TLDs.

In previous Webinars I've touched upon the purpose and scope of activities. So I will not touch upon it now.

Currently the working group is preparing a final draft report and which hopefully will be published before the Beijing meeting in principle for the ccNSO but also for the broader community as there are aspects that will touch upon other policies as well.

To date the main results has been the UNESCO survey which was launched some time ago. The survey was based on a topology of country names, so categorization of country names developed by the study group.

UNESCO selected not - 33 - 39 countries and 15 plus countries responded on these to the survey.

Based on the results it's - we are very difficult to signal or to find a trend. But at least the results so far affirm that that apology so it's a workable categorization of country names. So there were no questions, et cetera.

And secondly -- and that's a side effect -- it became very - it became obvious that it is very difficult to engage relevant authorities in the member states of UNESCO to respond on the - on to the survey. So that may be a lesson for the future as well.

Finally briefly with - on the framework of interpretation working group again this is a policy related activity, not policy development in the strict sense it is no no policy but it's interpretation of the current policy on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

The progress of this working group since Toronto is that it's still discussing one of the major contentious issues within the ccNSO and the ccTLD community. And that's the revocation and unconsented re-delegation of a ccTLD.

The Working Group hopes to finalize that discussion at the Beijing meeting. And it has and it will publish a progress report and post Beijing hopefully an interim report for public comments.

And the working group awaits response from the GAC its interim report on significantly interested parties.

Other projects in the ccNSO in particular the working groups, I want to just highlight two standing groups. One is the finance working group it's which we used the financial contributions of the ccTLDs to ICANN. It is exploring an alternative value-based approach for financial contribution. And it made considerable progress in its discussions with ICANN staff and hopefully will again set a major step forward at the Beijing meeting.

At the same time this working group is supposed to develop a fair and equitable model for distribution of the contribution across the ccTLD community. And again this will be a topic of discussion at the Beijing meeting.

A second standing committee is a strategic and operational planning working group. To date or since Toronto it hasn't taken very much, undertaken very much activities.

But at the Beijing meeting it will start again with advice on the strategic planning process and looking into ICANN's operational plan and budget.

Some council committees, first of all the committee on the review of the ccNSO election guidelines, as a result of the council election earlier this year the ccNSO found it necessary to review its election guidelines.

And these election guidelines are not just the council election but also the election of the ccNSO appointed board members. Some issues pertain to the voting tool used, some on the election method.

And as the - this council committee started to reviewing it it also initiated a discussion of underlying principles, for instance the need for geographic regions (unintelligible), et cetera which will be continued at the ccNSO council workshop in Beijing and following from that we are - we'll see what will happen.

And the ccNSO council is also initiated a ccNSO celebration committee at during the Durban meeting. The ccNSO will celebrate its 10th anniversary. So this committee is planning some events for that meeting.

And finally the study group on balancing workload and volunteer committee has just submitted its final report to the ccNSO Council.

And one of its recommendations will be to introduce a privatization model both Beijing and a triage committee to look into and advise the council which activity to undertake and to seek volunteers.

Excuse me. Yes, finally just a few notes on the joint working groups in which the ccNSO is participating. So this is the cross community working groups.

The first one is the joint ccNSO and GNSO IDN Working Group. This working group is drafting its final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, so IDN TLDs in general.

It will be an advise to the ccNSO and GNSO Council. The major recommendations will be to advise ICANN that universal acceptance of IDN TLDs should be a strategic priority, the recommendations to the ccTLDs and GTLDs to accept IDN TLDs as a point of reference with the registration of new domain names and an active approach of all stakeholders to accept delegated IDN TLDs.

On this is also - and this is based on experience with the IDN ccTLDs so far. The recommendations will be fully fleshed out in the draft final report.

And finally a - just a remark on the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group, the DSSA Working Group. This working group has been dormant since the Toronto meeting. And at the Beijing meeting it will revisit it - the need to continue its activities and will advise the participating SOs and ACs accordingly.

And just some general information on the ccNSO, the ccNSO itself, the Beijing meeting agenda is available at this URL. And Council and Working Group meetings are available at the ccNSO calendar.

That's all. Thank you very much. David, over to you.

David Olive: Thank you Bart for the preview of activities in the ccNSO.

We will now un-mute the telephone lines in case there are questions that people want to have.

And I see Krista but that maybe from the last time. But Krista I'll recognize you. I see your handout.

Krista Papac: Thanks David. This is Krista Papac.

Maybe this was posted somewhere. And if it is if you can may be just kind of direct me to that. But I'm trying to understand and my question comes from the previous session.

I'm trying to understand how all the different registration data slash Whois efforts interact with one another.

And I don't know if we've got some sort of roadmap that shows because I - in the first session you talked about gTLD registration date, directory - there's a - I don't think you discussed it but there's their a directory services expert working group. There's Whois studies. There's Whois service requirements and there's Thick Whois PDP.

And I'm just really confused about what the big picture is and how all of these things feed into what I assume is an ultimate result that they're all contributing to.

David Olive: Thank you Krista. The - many of these studies and activities have been going. And with the new expert group on directory, new directory services coming in to try to look at all of these, see where they can be better coordinated and also be a helpful guide path going forward for the GNSO when others in this area, that is really kind of the major issues.

Part of these studies and additional data was needed because it wasn't either available or wasn't in very precise form. And we're trying to again inform the policymaking process and policy development process so that decisions can be made if changes are going to be made.

And that's the main thrust. We're trying to make sure that we pull all these things together and coordinate their end results in their recommendations.

Krista Papac: Okay David thanks for that. And I guess the Whois study part makes - that makes sense to me. There's information that we need, you know, that we don't have. And we need to get to it as best as possible.

I guess it would just be helpful to understand how all of these things contribute to each other.

Is everything going to feed to the Expert Working Group? Does, you know, is the Thick Whois PDP, is everything going to feed to the PDP?

I just - I think it's not very clear who's doing what and are there overlaps and how does all of that information get compiled to produce some sort of output for the community to discuss and consider?

And I mean does - to also clearly state I mean I think I certainly believe and I think everybody agrees that Whois is a really important issue and something that we need to solve but.

It just would be helpful to understand how all of these things contribute to some outcome that the community will, you know, then evaluate.

David Olive: Good points Krista. I think some of the issues that are being considered now, Thick Whois and others, it's not intended to stop those efforts. Those are ongoing efforts.

And of course anything in the direction of improvement is what we'll be looking for. And obviously the Expert Working Group will be examining a lot of these reports and the direction of these reports in making a recommendation again to next steps mostly for the GNSO. So thank you for those comments.

Krista Papac: Thanks.

David Olive: Are there any other questions or comments on the ccNSO? We can get to other questions afterwards.

Okay we'll move on to the numbers, the address support organization and the (RSAC) policy issues. (Barb Rosen) please.

Barbara Roseman: Thank you again (David).

The ASO, the Address Supporting Organization is going to be holding their annual face to face meeting at the ICANN Beijing meeting.

And this is a meeting where that they will conduct as their normal meetings. And so there is not an opportunity for outside participants to engage in the meeting.

But they want to do it in public where everyone can see them and, you know, give people a sense of how they conduct their work.

They're also going to be hosting a workshop on the Wednesday of the week. And it is going to be held back to back with the IPv6 workshop that is scheduled.

The agenda for the ASO workshop will be posted shortly.

At this time there are no global member resource policies under consideration. And the ASO's working on finalizing their choice as a board member for the seat that's due to come open shortly.

We - I expect that they will conclude the board member search prior to the Beijing meeting and have that as an announcement. But otherwise they will announce it that week.

The Root Server System Advisory Committee is proceeding with reorganization based on the review that was done. And they're adopting a new structure that is currently being approved by the current members. So it's under consideration as to how that exact structure will take place by the current members.

The bylaws amendment that recognizes this restructure will have that new structure taking - setting up in place by July 1 of this year.

The - RSSAC is also moving forward with documenting a measurement and metrics plan for assessing the health of the root server system. This document is an last calls meaning it's accepting final comments and includes agreements on which measurements to collect data and the common with repository for the data can be agreed by everyone.

Another document under review establishes basic performance standards for the server operators. There's already an IETF RFC that covers this but it's a bit out of date, does not cover any past instances or the use of IPv6.

So these discussions are still preliminary but the root server operators are making quite a good effort in getting these documents underway.

And that is all for my area so I'm going to hand this off to my colleagues Julie Hedlund Steve Sheng.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Barbara). This is Julie Hedlund. Then I'll start off this presentation and then turn it over to my colleague Dr. Sheng.

And I just wanted to briefly give you a little bit of information about the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the SSAC.

This committee was formed in 2001 and began its operations in 2002. It does provide guidance to the ICANN board, supporting organizations, advisory committee, staff and the general community.

In its charter which is found on the Web site link also on this slide the SSAC advises the ICANN community and board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

The SSAC has 38 members currently. They are appointed by the ICANN board for periods of three years. And roughly 1/3 of the SSAC members come up for review each year.

At this point I will turn over - oh pardon me. There is one more slide I wanted to address. And that is the current work of the SSAC.

And in 2013 as part of the work plan there are several committees and work parties and working groups in which the SSAC participates.

There is the Membership Committee that considers the review of the members and also new candidates. There are work parties relating to identify or abuse metrics, root key rollover, arranging meetings with law enforcement at ICANN meetings, planning the IGF workshop, new gTLD success metrics, abuse of the DNS for DDOS attacks, MDMS complexity and challenges in the DNS and other groups that the SSAC is running include the DNS workshop Program Committee that plans the DNS SSAC workshops and beginner sessions at the ICANN meetings.

And the SSAC also participates in the DSS working group that my colleague Bart Boswinkel mentioned during his ccNSO update.

Now I'd like to turn the presentation over to Dr. Sheng. Thank you.

Dr. Steve Sheng: Thank you Julie. I'm going to highlight two advisories that the SSAC has produced or is about to release.

The first advisory is SAC 57 or internal name certificates.

In this advisory the SSAC explored the following topics, what are internal name certificates, what is the certificate authority practice and what kind of risk he has to the security and stability of the Internet.

And the SSAC went to do both an empirical study as well as a case study outlining these security issues.

And then with these findings the SSAC issue a set of recommendations.

In this paper the - ICANN also performed some mitigation steps already on this security risk. And these are highlighted in Appendix A of this report. So if you're interested I would encourage you to read this report.

The next report is an upcoming report to be released prior to the Beijing meeting is on the domain name registration data validation.

As we heard earlier one of the hot topics in ICANN is about the accuracy, improving the accuracy of the registration data.

And one way to improve the accuracy is through a validation of registration data.

In this SSAC advisory it talks about why accurate registration data is important. You know, some of the past SSAC advisories talk about this issue. And then the advisory, the report also discuss the current reasons for the accuracy today.

And then it proposed a taxonomy a validation into different categories and have a section on how these validations can be implemented for each types of data elements in the registration data and finally based on this produces a set of findings and recommendations.

The report is currently in SSAC final review and will be published before the Beijing meeting.

And with that I'd like to hand over to my colleagues Heidi to talk about the ALAC issues. Thanks.

Heidi Ulrich: Okay. Thank you Steve. Hello. My name is Heidi Ulrich. I'm the Director for At-Large and lead support staff for the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community.

Again, I'm delighted to give you a brief update on the ALAC, ALAC's and the At-Large community policy, process and as well as outreach and capacity building sessions taking place in Beijing.

So the - and the first on the policy issue (unintelligible) the ALAC, the ALAC produced 19 policy advised statements in response to open public comments between mid-September 2012 and mid-March 2013.

Of those, some of those included four related to IDNs, three related to Whois and two related to trademark clearinghouse issues.

The policy advice development process that the ALAC uses including close collaboration with the five regional At-Large organizations are the

(unintelligible) and over 16 active working groups ensures that the ALAC statements reflects the views from the edges of the at-large community.

Also At-Large periodically holds briefing sessions on topics of interest to the at-large community as part of their ongoing capacity building activities as well as their policy advice development process.

And since Toronto they've held four. And I'm going to just very briefly go over those.

The first is - was on the (unintelligible) white paper using ICANN relevant responses and respected.

The At-Large Future Challenges Working Group has been working on a white paper since late 2011 that identifies four challenges ICANN is facing and makes recommendations for how to overcome those challenges.

This has been endorsed by the ALAC and is currently without for public comment.

And in Beijing this working group will be holding an open roundtable on this paper on Monday 8th of April focusing on the next steps in its recommendation.

The second was a post (wicket) Webinar following the World on International Communications in which several members of At-Large participated. The ALAC held a Webinar that offered an exchange of perspectives on the outcome and implications of the meeting both for ICANN and At-Large.

A third was a Whois briefing session very well attended working with the At-Large Whois Working Group. It highlighted the diversity and perspectives on Whois focusing in the At-Large community as well as within other parts of the ICANN community.

And in Beijing the At-Large Whois Working Group will be holding an open meeting on Wednesday that 10th of April for further discussion on this topic.

And finally the ALAC bridging session on the post 2013 RAA was held recently. And it had both staff giving the background and some of the key details of the proposed 2013 RAA as well as a member of the registrar negotiating team and a member of At-Large giving the perspective of the at-large community.

And that break in call was intended to help the At-Large community develop it's statements on this public comment.

And all of the breaking sessions are viewable at the link that I just posted into the Chat.

So let's now move on - and also all of the statements that the ALAC has submitted are available at the correspondence page at the link listed on the slide deck.

So I'd like to now move on to process activities of ALACs.

Now the first is the current efforts to revise ALAC rules and procedure. Revisions of the ALAC rules and procedure were mandated by the ALAC At-Large Improvement projects.

And the revised ALAC RRP's, so the project has an extensive process carried out by some 33 members of the At-Large community in both face to face and teleconferences over the last half year and to review the ALAC rules on participation and preservation, organization of ALAC, conduct of duplicative adoption and amendment of the rules and procedure.

And after a very extensive discussion the ALAC is going to begin voting on these revised RFPs this next week.

The second process activity is the ALAC strength operational role when considering the recent objections to new gTLD applications.

In ICANN's new gTLD program the ALAC will give them the responsibility to consider and possibly file objections to new gTLD applications. And these are limited to limited public interest grant objection grants and community objection grants.

And following the full review of objections received by all levels of the At-Large community in a process that was fully designed by the At-Large community and a bottom-up process and a full analysis by the At-Large new gTLD Review Group and finally of vote by the ALAC objections based on community grants of three separate .health applications were filed.

And the third process related activities is preparing for the transition from ALAC Version 3 to that of Version 4.

And the ALAC has identified a need for At-Large to move from its current version to the next in its progress in light of challenges to the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model in the post-(wicket) environment.

In some of the key ALAC and At-Large Version 4 elements include increasing the effective inputs from the At-Large working groups and the (Ralos) into ALAC policy process, by increasing outreach to new members including within universities as well as increasing capacity building and leadership training and orientation activities.

And in Beijing the members of At-Large are - will be discussing this transition moving forward.

I'd like to now talk about the (unintelligible) Beijing activities by going on at the (46) meeting.

During the - (APLRO) will be holding a series of meetings for over 25 of their At-Large structure organization. These are the grassroots organizations making up the base of the At-Large community.

These meetings that were planned entirely by the members of (APLRO) are intended to strengthen the ability of the (APLO ALS) the person (that paid) effectively in the At-Large community.

And then as you can see on the slide they include a series of meetings. One will be the At-Large (APLRO) multi-stakeholder roundtable. There will be two panels, one on the new gTLDs and implications for the Asian Austral- Asian-Pacific region. And the second will be on IDNs and implications for the Asian Austria-Asian-Pacific region. And that's going to be held on Monday, the 8th of April between 1700 and 1900.

There'll also be an (APRLO) general assembly and a monthly meeting as well as four joint capacity building sessions with the ICANN fellows. And they've been working closely with (Janice) on that.

And there's also going to be a Chinese speaking At-Large structure meeting for the Chinese speaking At-Large structures. This will be a first. And there'll also be (APLRO) outreach activities intended to gain new members with the At-Large community.

And finally they are going to be sponsoring a showcase and reception in Beijing celebrating (APRLO)'s regional diversity.

In addition to a short speaking list including Fadi Chehade ICANN President and CEO this event will also feature a showcase of the activities and cultures of over 25 (APRLO) At-Large structures. That's going to be taking place on

Monday the 8th of April between 1900 and 2100 in the (Vending) hotel. And you're all very warmly invited to participate in these events.

And this concludes the ALAC update and I hand it back over to David. David?

David Olive: Thank you very much Heidi. And we'll now unmute the telephone lines for people to ask any questions about the discussions that we just had from the Advisory committees both excuse me, RSSAC, SSAC and At-Large.

And with that if there aren't any questions we'll move to a general session to provide people with an ability to ask questions on the entire presentation now that we have our policy staff here and able to answer some of the issues you may raise on the presentations they made.

And to Avri's question about did you miss the GAC report, that you're going to have to refer to their Web site for that. We're not yet at that stage to provide the previews.

We will have something in our policy monthly update that will be coming out shortly that talks about in general terms their activities and refers to some of their work on their Website.

If you're thinking of other questions that's fine, in the meantime how best to stay updated and informed about the policy activities within the SOs and ACs I draw your attention to our monthly report.

We are soon to release the special edition for the Beijing meeting in a couple of days. And with that you can subscribe to it so it is delivered to you directly.

And it is available in the languages that you see posted here. It is a good source of information. And we also add the issues that are currently in the public comment forum to draw your attention to those topics as well.

And noted and thank you (Natalie) for posting that, to be sure all the recordings and presentation slides and the transcripts will be posted at the URL that's there in the Chat for your further review.

And if you have any questions of course you're more than welcome to direct them to us. This is the policy staff as we know it today. And they are serving various SROs and ACs as subject matter experts and secretariat services.

Again, if you need to contact us about any questions policy-staff@icann.org.

I will take one more look to see. The lines are open if we have a question or if you want to type it in the Chat we're happy to have that.

Marilyn Cade asks - she was about to ask a question but seems to be unable to do that. So Marilyn may be in the Chat -- and I'm happy to read the question to the group -- and so Marilyn's comment -- and I appreciate the comment -- is she thanks people for this as you can see but it will be helpful to have the slides in advance to - it'd be an enticement for even more participation.

And that is very important and we will think about that is the next improvement the next time. Thank you Marilyn.

Also Avri about useful to have a slide that shows the number of working groups, et cetera and the number of people participating in each, thank you.

And Marilyn Cade ends with a thank you so with that last call for any questions or comments?

And there's some good comments about the slides, greater information about the working groups, a helpful guide to the various activities on Whois to direct the community's attention to the various elements and how they fit into a larger whole. Thank you for those comments. We will indeed take this back.

And we look forward to seeing all of you either in person or online in remote station at our ICANN meeting in Beijing.

And so with that I'd like to thank everyone for their participation, see you or listen to your comments in Beijing on remote participation. Good evening, good afternoon and good morning to whatever you may be. Thank you so much.

Woman: Thank you all.

END