



POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

<http://www.icann.org/topics/policy/>

Volume 11, Issue 4 – April 2011

Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

ccNSO

[Delegation and Redelelegation Working Group Recommendations Adopted; WG Closed](#)

[Framework of Interpretation Working Group to Create Structure for Consistent Delegation and Redelelegation Decisions](#)

[Implementation Incident Repository Working Group Established; Volunteers Needed](#)

[Working Group to Enhance Fast Track Process by Improving String Confusion Test](#)

[Highlights of ccNSO Meeting in San Francisco](#)

[Four New ccNSO Councilors and New Chair Assume Seats](#)

GNSO

[GNSO Council Requests Issue Report on the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy \(UDRP\)](#)

[GNSO Council Continues Discussions on the Whois Studies and Service Requirements Report](#)

[IRTP \(Part B\) WG Reviewing Public Comments Before Issuing Final Report](#)

[RAP Recommendations Approved; GNSO Council Requests Best Practices Paper](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input](#)

[GNSO Improvements: New Working Group Guidelines; Charter for Implementation Committee; Statement of Interest Procedures; Recognition of New Constituencies](#)

ASO

[Global IPv4 Address Reclamation Pool and Allocation Plan Unlikely to Go Global](#)

Joint Efforts

[Issues Active as Joint Efforts](#)

At-Large

[At-Large Participates Actively in 40th ICANN Meeting in San Francisco](#)

[In Response to Requests, ALAC Submits Numerous Policy Statements](#)

[At-Large Improvements Work Team Proposals Aim to Increase “Edge” Participation](#)

Read in Your Preferred Language

ICANN Policy Update is available in all six official languages of the United Nations. *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN’s [website](#) and is available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, visit the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select “Policy Update” to subscribe. This service is free of charge.

[**ICANN Policy Update Statement of Purpose**](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: policy-staff@icann.org.

Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	ASO
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	ccNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization	GNSO
At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC
Governmental Advisory Committee	GAC
Root Server System Advisory Committee	RSSAC
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	SSAC

Across ICANN

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

Numerous public comment periods are open on issues of interest to the ICANN community. Act now for the opportunity to share your views on such topics as:

- [Proposed ICANN Bylaw Revisions Regarding the ALAC](#) were created by the Office of the General Counsel in coordination with the ALAC to reflect the ALAC's purpose within ICANN: providing advice on policy, providing input into ICANN's operations and structure, being part of ICANN's accountability mechanisms, and being an organizing mechanism for ICANN outreach. The comment period ends 9 May 2011.
- [Proposal for Renewal of the .NET Registry Agreement](#). The .NET registry is due to expire on 30 June 2011. The proposed draft renewal agreement, from Verisign, includes modified provisions to bring the .NET agreement into line with comparable agreements (e.g. BIZ, COM, INFO, ORG), on traffic data, limitation of liability, indemnification, and notice provisions. Verisign also requested more flexibility to act to protect the security and stability of the DNS and Internet and to offer training, technical support, and incentive programs to help develop the Internet in underserved markets. The comment period on the draft agreement ends 10 May 2011.

For the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived Public Comment Forums, visit the [Public Comment page](#).

Delegation and Redelegation Working Group Recommendations Adopted; WG Closed

At a Glance

The ccNSO has adopted recommendations of the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group's Final Report, including creation of a Framework of Interpretation Working Group (Fol WG) on the delegation and redelegation of Country Code Top Level Domains (ccTLD). With submission of its Final Report, the DRD WG has been closed.

Recent Developments

At the San Francisco meeting, the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working group (DRD WG) presented its Final Report to the community and submitted it to the ccNSO council for adoption. The council adopted recommendations including:

- Create a Framework of Interpretation working group on the delegation and redelegation of Country Code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs).
- Initiate a Country Code Policy Development Process (ccPDP) on the retirement of ccTLD's.

Per the DRD WG recommendations, priority will be given to developing interpretations of three policy statements: Request for Comment (RFC) 1591, Government Advisory Committee (GAC) 2005 Principles and the Internet Domain Name System Structure and Delegation (ICP-1). The framework will be presented to the ICANN Board to guide decisions of the Board and Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) in their decisions and procedures on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLD's.

Background

The DRD WG was created to advise the ccNSO Council on whether it should launch a policy development process to recommend changes to the current policy for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs. The Council considered possible solutions to resolve issues that the DRD WG identifies.

More Information

The DRD WG published its first progress report in February 2010 and subsequent progress reports in June and December 2010. See the [charter, progress reports, full reports and final reports](#).

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO senior policy advisor

Framework of Interpretation WG to Create Structure for Consistent Delegation and Redelelegation Decisions

At a Glance

The Framework of Interpretation Working Group's (Fol WG) objective is to develop a Framework of Interpretation for the current Policy Statements RFC 1591, GAC 2005 Principles and the Internet Domain Name System Structure and Delegation (ICP-1). The framework will help resolve the issues regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs (including IDN ccTLD's) identified by the Delegation and Redelelegation Working Group (DRD WG. and foster consistent and predictable decisions while enhancing accountability and transparency for all stakeholders.

Recent Developments

In San Francisco, the ccNSO Council adopted the charter of the Fol WG and appointed Keith Davidson (.NZ), as chair. The purpose of the framework effort is to set boundaries on how to interpret the policy statements cited above. This addresses issues identified by the DRD WG, and is expected to enable more consistent and predictable decisions from IANA and the ICANN Board regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs (including IDN ccTLD's) while increasing accountability and transparency.

Next Steps

The ccNSO sent out to the ccTLD community a call for volunteers, which closed on 15 April 2011. As the new Fol WG forms, the GNSO and ALAC have been invited to appoint one liaison each to the WG. The GAC also has been invited to participate. The first task of the Fol WG will be to develop and propose a work plan.

More Information

[Framework of Interpretation Working Group page](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

Implementation Incident Repository Working Group Established; Volunteers Needed

At a Glance

The Implementation Incident Repository Working Group (IIR WG) will advise the ccTLD community and ccNSO Council on the implementation, operation and maintenance of an incident response repository as proposed by the original Incident Response Working Group (IR WG).

Recent Developments

At its most recent meeting, the ccNSO Council established a new working group to advise the ccTLD community and ccNSO Council on an incident response repository. The WG's purpose is to:

- Explore in detail the costs and other relevant factors for creating and maintaining a repository and to inform the ccTLD community and Council accordingly.
- Explore various funding, management and governance models and recommend a preferred option to the ccTLD community and Council.

After steps 1 and 2, at the request of the ccNSO Council, the IIR WG will:

- Prepare and send out a request for proposal (RFP) and review the responses.
- Advise the ccTLD community and ccNSO Council on a preferred option for implementing, operating and maintaining an incident response repository.

Next Steps

A call for volunteers has been sent out. The volunteers will be appointed at an upcoming ccNSO Council meeting. Once appointed, the members' first task will be to develop a work plan.

Background

The activities of the WG will build upon the work of the original Incident Response Working Group as proposed in their Final Report.

More Information

[Presentation on the status of the IR WG](#) [PDF 283KB]

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

Working Group to Enhance Fast Track Process by Improving String Confusion Test

At a Glance

The Internationalized Domain Names Policy Development Process Working Group (IDN PDP WG) will propose guidelines to improve, for applicants, the predictability of the string confusion test under the Fast Track IDN Country Code Top Level Domain (ccTLD) process.

Recent Developments

At its meeting in San Francisco, the ccNSO Council asked the IDN PDP WG to develop, as soon as possible, guidelines (within the framework of the existing rules for the Fast Track) to improve the predictability of the evaluation relating to string confusion as defined in the IDNC Final Report and the Final Implementation Report.

Next Steps

A small sub-group, with help from external experts, will develop the guidelines as soon as possible and propose them to the ccNSO Council.

Background

During the ccNSO meeting in San Francisco, the results of the review process of the Fast Track were presented and issues discussed, particularly string confusion. This led to the initiative for a WG to seek clarity and assistance for IDN ccTLD Fast Track applicants to improve the string confusion evaluation in the Fast Track process.

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

Highlights of ccNSO Meeting in San Francisco

At a Glance

The ccNSO has posted summaries of its numerous sessions at the San Francisco meeting in March.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO highlights during the San Francisco Meeting have been summarized in various ways. Participants rated most of the sessions “good” or “excellent” in

surveys. In particular, 92% of the participants rated the panel discussion on “DNSSEC–After Implementation–Getting Registrar and Registrant Buy-in” on Day 2 as “excellent.”

More Information

- [ccNSO San Francisco Meeting Page](#)
- [ccNSO San Francisco Meeting Report](#)
- [ccNSO San Francisco Meeting Evaluation](#)
- [ccNSO San Francisco YouTube](#) clip
- [Tribute film to departing ccNSO Chair Chris Disspain](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Four New ccNSO Councilors and New Chair Assume Seats

At a Glance

Four new ccNSO councilors and the new ccNSO Chair have taken their seats on the ccNSO Council.

Recent Developments

New Councilors from the African, Asia-Pacific, European and Latin American regions have taken their seats on the ccNSO Council. The ccNSO welcomes Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ci (African region); Keith Davidson, .nz (Asia-Pacific region); Roelof Meijer, .nl (European region) and Victor Abboud, .ec (Latin American region). Lesley Cowley, .uk has taken over Chris Disspain’s position as ccNSO Chair.

The ccNSO Council thanks the departing councilors for their work for the ccNSO Council: Mohamed El-Bashir, .sd (African region), Chris Disspain, .au (Asia-Pacific region and ccNSO Chair), Ondrej Filip, .cz (European region) and Patrick Hosein, .tt (Latin American region).

Background

The new councilors were nominated and elected in October 2010 by members of their respective regions to act as their representatives. Keith Davidson was selected in February/March 2011 to take the seat that became vacant with Chris Disspain’s departure. Lesley Cowley was formally appointed new ccNSO Chair in March 2011.

More Information

[List of the ccNSO council members](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

GNSO

GNSO Council Requests Issue Report on the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)

ICANN Report to Examine the Current State of the UDRP

At a Glance

The Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) was created as an alternative to costly litigation in gTLD cyber-squatting disputes. The Issue Report will describe how UDRP policy has addressed the problem of cyber-squatting to date, and identify deficits or disparities in the UDRP.

Background

The UDRP was created in 1999, to avoid costly litigation around resolving gTLD cyber-squatting disputes. Since the adoption of the UDRP, more than 30,000 complaints have been filed with the dispute resolution providers authorized by ICANN. The UDRP has not been reviewed or updated by the GNSO Council since its inception.

As recommended by the Registration Abuse Policy (RAP)'s Final Report, the GNSO Council has requested an Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP. Staff is currently conducting the research and analysis necessary to deliver the Issue Report on the UDRP for the Council's consideration by the June ICANN meeting.

The Issue Report is expected to describe how the UDRP has addressed the problem of cyber-squatting to date, identify problems or inconsistencies and make recommendations on whether to initiate a policy development process (PDP) on the UDRP. Upon review of the Issue Report, the GNSO Council will consider whether to start a PDP on the UDRP.

Recent Developments

At the ICANN Silicon Valley Meeting, staff presented an overview of its progress in preparing the issue report. Due to the complexity of the issue, the GNSO Council convened a drafting team to guide the research and analysis. The drafting team is helping ICANN staff members understand the intended scope of the report, and is assisting with the design of a webinar to solicit information on potential issues with the UDRP. The webinar will be held in early May (tentatively 10 May 2011). For information on the upcoming webinar, check the [ICANN announcements page](#).

More Information

- To understand the RAP recommendations, please refer to the [RAP WG Final Report](#) published in June 2010.
- Details on the [Silicon Valley Meeting Session on the UDRP Issue Report](#)
- Mailing list for the [UDRP Drafting Team](#)
- Information on the upcoming webinar on the current state of the UDRP on the [ICANN announcements page](#)

Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

GNSO Council Continues Discussions on the Whois Studies and Service Requirements Report

At a Glance

Whois is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts, and other critical information. Because of the global scale and critical importance of Whois, adjustments to it must be handled with great care. Questions persist concerning the use and misuse of this important public resource. The GNSO Council is considering four studies to provide current, reliable information for community discussions about Whois.

Recent Developments

ICANN staff members have completed scoping of all proposed studies for cost and feasibility; the GNSO Council began to discuss these studies as well as the Whois Service Requirements Report at the Silicon Valley meeting.

The Whois studies are grouped into four broad categories:

- **Whois Misuse.** This study is to discover to what extent public Whois information is used for harmful purposes. The GNSO Council decided to proceed with this study and ICANN staff recently announced that the Carnegie Mellon University Cylab in Pittsburgh, PA, USA, would conduct this yearlong study.
- **Whois Registrant Identification.** This effort would examine the extent to which domain names registered by legal persons or for commercial purposes are not clearly represented in Whois data. ICANN issued an RFP, and staff members prepared an analysis of vendor responses for GNSO Council and community consideration. The Council is still considering whether this study should be conducted. [Staff Analysis of Whois Misuse and Registrant Identification Studies](#) [PDF, 488 KB]
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services Abuse Study.** This study would focus on the extent to which domain names used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via privacy or proxy services to obscure the perpetrator's identity. ICANN staff posted an RFP on 20 May 2010 to engage independent research organizations to undertake this study. Three responses were received. More information was requested of those submitting the strongest responses. Staff has analyzed this information and the GNSO Council is now considering Next Steps. See [Staff analysis of the Whois Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse Studies](#) [PDF, 436 KB]
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services Reveal Study.** This study would measure proxy and privacy service responsiveness to registrant "identity reveal" requests. An RFP to conduct this study was posted in September 2010 but no bids were received. ICANN staff found that potential bidders had significant concerns with the feasibility of this study, and whether a pool of able volunteers would be willing to participate, given concerns about the sensitivity of data to be shared. To address this concern, staff proposed that a feasibility survey be conducted to clarify the uncertainties and determine whether a full study would be possible. See the most recent [Staff report on Whois Proxy and Privacy Relay and Reveal study](#) [PDF, 247 KB]
- The GNSO Council is also discussing an [Inventory of Whois Service Requirements – Final Report](#) [PDF, 636 KB], which was completed last year. This report is a comprehensive list of Whois service requirements based on current policies and previous policy discussions, but does not make policy recommendations.

More Information

- [GNSO Whois policy development page](#)
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)
- [Whois misuse RFP announcement](#)

- [Whois registrant identification RFP announcement](#)
- Whois privacy and proxy abuse study [announcement](#)
- Whois privacy and proxy relay and reveal study [announcement](#)
- [Staff analysis of the Whois Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse Studies](#) [PDF, 436 KB]
- [Staff Analysis of Whois Misuse and Registrant Identification Studies](#) [PDF, 488 KB]
- [Staff report on Whois Proxy and Privacy Relay and Reveal study](#) [PDF, 247 KB]
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding [display and usage of internationalized registration data](#)
- SSAC037: [Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data](#)
- [Internationalized Data Registration Working Group Charter](#) [PDF, 112 KB]
- Audio Briefing: [Introduction to the Whois Service Requirements Inventory](#) [MP3, 15 MB]
- [Inventory of Whois Service Requirements – Final Report](#) [PDF, 636 KB]

Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

IRTP (Part B) WG Reviewing Public Comments Before Issuing Final Report

At a Glance

The aim of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part B Working Group proposed the Expedited Transfer Reverse Policy (ETRP). The ETRP is a fast "reverse transfer" process to return a recently sold domain name to its original owner if it is hijacked, and to correct fraudulent or erroneous transfers.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

Following the review of the public comments on the [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 764 KB], the IRTP Part B Working Group published its proposed [Final Report](#) [PDF, 733 KB]. The Report contains nine recommendations including a Registrar Emergency Action Channel, an Issue Report on "Thick" Whois, an Issue Report on "Change of Control" function, the modification of denial reasons #6 and #7 of

the IRTP, and clarification of Whois status messages in relation to Registrar Lock Status.

The WG provided an [overview](#) of the report and its recommendations at the ICANN Meeting in San Francisco. In parallel, a public comment forum ran until 31 March 2011. Seven [contributions](#) were received and a [summary of the public comments](#) has been posted. The Working Group is reviewing public comments and deliberating on the proposed Registrar Emergency Action Channel proposed in the Final Report. The Working Group will deliver its Final Report to the GNSO Council before the ICANN Meeting in Singapore in June 2011.

For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B WG Workspace](#).

Background

The aim of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO Council established a series of five working groups (Parts A through E) to review and consider various revisions to this policy.

The IRTP Part B PDP is the second in a series of the five PDPs addressing areas for improvement in the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. The working group addresses five issues focusing on domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name, and lock status. For further details, refer to the group's [Charter](#).

More Information

- [IRTP Part B Proposed Final Report](#)
- [IRTP Part B PDP Initial Report](#) [PDF, 764 KB]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [IRTP Part B Status Report of Ongoing Progress](#) page
- [IRTP Part B Issues Report](#) [PDF, 256 KB]
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 124 KB]
- [Summary and Analysis of Public Comments received](#)
- *ICANN Start* podcast: [audio explanation of IRTP Part B](#) [MP3, 18 MB]

Staff Contacts

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

RAP Recommendations Approved; GNSO Council Requests Best Practices Paper

At a Glance

Registries and registrars lack uniformity when dealing with domain name registration abuse, and questions persist about what activities constitute "registration abuse." The GNSO Council launched the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAP WG) to examine registration abuse policies. After reviewing the RAP WG's proposed approach, the GNSO Council is moving ahead with several RAP recommendations.

Recent Developments & Next Steps

The GNSO Council reviewed and discussed the proposed approach of the Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Implementation Drafting Team (DT) at a [working session in Cartagena](#). At its February 2011 meeting, the Council decided to move ahead with a number of the RAP Recommendations, including:

- Request a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registration of domain names.
- Move forward on two recommendations that will require input from ICANN Compliance:
 - Whois Access recommendation #2 requiring the ICANN Compliance Department to publish more data about Whois accessibility, at minimum, annually. This data would include the number of registrars showing unreasonable restriction of access to their port 43 Whois servers and results of an annual audit of compliance with contractual Whois access obligations.
 - Fake Renewal Notices recommendation #1, which suggests that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN's Contractual Compliance department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of Whois data.

The GNSO Council has instructed ICANN Policy Staff to "add the remaining RAP Recommendations to the GNSO Project List so that the Council can keep track of the remaining recommendations and address these as appropriate."

ICANN Compliance Staff provided the GNSO Council with its [feedback](#) on Whois Access recommendation #2 and Fake Renewal Notices recommendation #1. The Council discussed the feedback received as well as an initial outline of the Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP at its Silicon Valley meeting (see [the meeting schedule](#) for further details).

Background

The RAP WG [presented its final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] and recommendations to the GNSO Council in June 2010. The Council then formed a group of volunteers, the Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team (RAP DT), to draft a proposed approach to implementing the report's recommendations. The Registration Abuse Policies (Implementation Drafting Team developed a matrix categorizing the RAP WG [final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] recommendations in order of priority, expected complexity and required resources and submitted a [letter](#) [PDF, 184 KB] to the GNSO Council outlining a recommended approach for its consideration. See the web site for [further information](#).

A short history of the RAP WG is available on [ICANN's website](#).

More Information

- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB]
- [Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report](#), 29 October 2008 [PDF, 400 KB] and [translation](#) of summary
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Workspace](#) (Wiki)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team Workspace](#) (Wiki)
- [RAP Implementation Drafting Team Letter to the GNSO Council](#) [PDF, 184 KB]

Staff Contacts

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director and [Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input

At a Glance

Should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether current registrar policies regarding the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate.

Recent Developments

After completing its review of community comments on the initial [GNSO Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery \(PEDNR\)](#) report [PDF, 1 MB] and the [accompanying survey](#) [PDF, 948 KB], the Working Group has updated the report

and developed specific recommendations. The proposed [Final Report](#) [PDF, 971 KB] was published for comment on 21 February 2011.

The [Public Comment Forum](#) has been extended to 22 April to accept community input before submission to the GNSO Council for its consideration. The WG organized a presentation and [discussion of the proposed Final Report](#) in San Francisco at the Silicon Valley Public meeting.

The proposed Final Report contains 14 recommendations including:

- Providing a minimum of eight days after expiration for renewal by registrant.
- Having unsponsored gTLDs and registrars offer Redemption Grace Periods (RGP).
- Requiring posting of fees charged for renewal; requiring that at least two notices prior to expiration are sent at set times, one after expiration; that an expired website must explicitly say that registration has expired, and offer instructions on how to redeem the domain.
- Development of educational materials about how to prevent unintentional loss.

Background

The PEDNR PDP WG published its Initial Report on 31 May 2010 – (see the related community [Public Comment Forum](#)). In addition, a survey asked several specific questions about renewal and expiration practices. Nine comments were submitted, including comments from representatives of the Registrars and Registries Groups, ALAC, and the Commercial and Business Users Constituencies. More than 400 survey responses were received (see [summary and analysis](#)).

For a history of the ICANN community's policy development activities related to Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery, please refer to the PEDNR [background page](#).

More Information

- [PEDNR Proposed Final Report](#)
- [PEDNR PDP Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1 MB]
- Details on [PEDNR Public Consultation Session in Brussels](#)
- [GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery](#) [PDF, 416 KB]
- [Translations](#) of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery
- [WG presentation: Registrar Survey Final Results](#) [PDF, 948 KB]

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

GNSO Improvements: New Working Group Guidelines; Implementation Committee Charter; Statement of Interest Procedures; Recognition of New Constituencies

Council Approves Working Group Guidelines and New Standing Committee; PDP and Outreach Public Forums Conclude

At a Glance

Members of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) community are working to implement a comprehensive series of organizational changes designed to improve the effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. The materials in this section relate to only the most Recent Developments regarding implementation of the GNSO Improvements.

GNSO Council Approves New Working Group Guidelines

At its March meeting in San Francisco, the GNSO Council approved new guidelines for GNSO Working Groups. The new guidelines feature a thorough review of every aspect of the Working Group process from the first meeting of a working group up through and including the final outputs of the group.

The new guidelines were adopted as [Annex 1 to the GNSO Operating Procedures](#) [PDF 344 KB]. At the Council's direction, Staff has prepared a [Summary of the new guidelines](#) [PDF 425 KB] that is available for all current and future working group volunteers.

More Information

- [Adopted New GNSO Working Group Guidelines](#)
- [Staff Summary of Adopted New Working Group Guidelines](#)

Comment Forum for New GNSO Policy Development Process Ends

The Public Consultation Forum regarding the proposed new [GNSO Policy Development Process](#) closed on 1 April 2011. The Staff has produced a [Summary and Analysis of the Public Comments](#).

More Information

- [PDP-WT Proposed Final Report](#)
- [Public Comment Forum For Proposed New GNSO Policy Development Process](#)
- [PDP Work Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Work Team wiki](#)

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

Council Adopts Charter for New Implementation Standing Committee

The GNSO Council decided to form a Standing Committee to oversee the implementation of the various improvements prompted by the ongoing GNSO Review process. It commissioned a drafting team to develop a charter for the Standing Committee. At its April meeting, the Council approved the [charter](#).

No Comments Received on Revised Statement of Interest Procedures

Late in 2010, the GNSO Council identified areas for improvement in Section 5, Statements of Interest, in its [GNSO Council Operating Procedures](#) [PDF, 417 KB] that would simplify and clarify the procedures. The GNSO Council tasked its Operations Steering Committee, which oversees changes to the Council's procedures, with revising and improving Section 5.

Last month, the OSC submitted a revised [Section 5](#) [PDF, 95 KB] that removes the requirement for Disclosures of Interest, and provides clearer guidance on the contents of Statements of Interest and on updating them in a timely manner. The document was posted in the ICANN [Public Comment Forum](#). No comments were received prior to the end of the comment period on 26 March 2011.

Board Committee Seeks to Improve Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies

At the direction of the ICANN Board's Structural Improvements Committee (SIC), the ICANN Staff conducted a 30-day public consultation forum for community comments through 3 April 2011 concerning the elements of a proposed new "Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies", including its procedures, sequences/steps, forms, tools, and evaluation criteria. Upon the closing of the forum, the Staff completed and posted a [Summary and Analysis of the public comments](#) submitted.

Background

The Public [Forum Announcement](#) for this proceeding provides a broad and comprehensive discussion of the background leading to the Public Forum as well as a brief overview of the proposed process.

For More Information

- [Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies \(including 3 Appendices\)](#) [PDF, 206 KB]
- [Process Flowchart](#) [PDF, 146 KB]
- [Application for Candidacy \(AFC\) as a New GNSO Constituency](#) [PDF, 165 KB]
- [Request for Recognition \(RFR\) as a New GNSO Constituency](#) [PDF, 261 KB]
- [Summary and Analysis of public comments](#)

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

Global Outreach Strategy Comments Under Review

The GNSO Council invited the community to provide comments in a [public forum](#) on proposed recommendations for a global outreach program. The public comment period ended 10 April. The GNSO Council will review comments and incorporate feedback into their recommendations.

The recommendations developed by the GNSO and published for comment describe a global outreach strategy, particularly aimed at non-English speakers and those from developing regions, and for development of a global outreach program aimed at increasing participation from both current members of the ICANN community as well as potential members, particularly non-English speakers.

The global outreach strategy is another step in the implementation of [GNSO Improvements](#) initiated in October 2009 after approval by the ICANN Board. The Board recommended that the GNSO should develop and implement a targeted outreach program to explore the formation of new constituency groups.

Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Director, SSAC & Policy Support

More Information about the GNSO Improvements

- [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)
- [PDP Work Team wiki](#)

- [Working Group Work Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Work Team wiki](#)

Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

ASO

Global IPv4 Address Reclamation Pool and Allocation Plan Unlikely to Go Global

APNIC to offer new proposal

At a Glance

Now that the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) has allocated all the addresses in IPv4, Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are discussing a proposed global policy for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. Under the proposal, IANA would establish a Reclamation Pool of returned address space and, because the free pool of IANA IPv4 address space is depleted, allocate IPv4 address space from this Reclamation Pool to the RIRs in smaller blocks than previously allocated.

Recent Developments

The proposal to establish a Reclamation Pool of returned IPv4 address spaces and allocate them in smaller blocks to the RIRs was discussed by all RIRs at their most recent meetings. The American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) has adopted the proposal and it entered the discussion stage of the policy development processes in the other RIRs, but was abandoned in the Asia-Pacific Network Information Center (APNIC) and withdrawn in the Réseaux IP Européens (RIPE).

Recent developments mean that this proposal is unlikely to become a global policy. If global policy proposal had been adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee (NRO EC) and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) would have reviewed the proposal and forwarded the policy to the ICANN Board for ratification and implementation by IANA.

Next Steps

A new proposal (the third) on the same theme--handling of recovered IPv4 address space--has been prepared within APNIC. More information about that proposal will be available in the next issue of *Policy Update*.

Background

IPv4 is the Internet Protocol addressing system used to allocate unique IP address numbers in 32-bit format. With the massive growth of the Internet user population, the pool of unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) has been depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) will take its place.

The Reclamation Pool will be declared active as soon as the first RIR exhausts its inventory of IPv4 address space, according to threshold criteria defined in the proposal. IANA will, once each quarter, allocate available address blocks from the Reclamation Pool evenly to all RIRs that are eligible for allocations at that time.

More Information

A [Background Report](#) is posted on the ICANN website

Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

Joint Efforts

Issues Active as Joint Efforts

Increasingly, individual ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have pursued bilateral and multi-lateral discussions regarding matters of common or overlapping interest in recent years. Some of the current issues being discussed include:

- [Single-Character IDN TLDs Report Published for Discussion in Cartagena](#)
- [Internationalized Registration Data WG Releases Interim Report](#)
- [Community-wide Geographic Regions Review Working Group](#)

At-Large Participates Actively in 40th ICANN Meeting in San Francisco

At a Glance

Twenty-nine members from all five At-Large regions participated in the 40th ICANN Meeting in San Francisco, including members of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), officers of the five Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs), representatives of At-Large Structures (ALSes), At-Large liaisons, At-Large delegates to the Nominating Committee (NomCom), and representatives of the At-Large Community. At-Large representatives actively took part in 19 At-Large meetings and 2 cross-constituency meetings.

Recent Developments

- **At-Large Improvements project nears completion.** The four At-Large Improvements WTs focused on their final implementation proposals, receiving feedback on them from the ALAC, RALOs and broader At-Large Community.
- **ALAC and GAC agree to develop closer relations to strengthen outreach activities.** Representatives of the ALAC and the GAC met to discuss common interests and strengthening ALAC-GAC relations. It was agreed to hold ALAC-GAC sessions at all ICANN meetings and to begin regular written communication between the two advisory committees.
- **At-Large Standing Working Group established to identify emerging challenges to At-Large and how to address them.** The ALAC adopted a motion to create a new At-Large Working Group that will discuss emerging challenges to At-Large and the ALAC and how they should be addressed. The first task of WG will be to propose a limited list of priority issues that the At-Large community should address quickly because of their impact on the global Internet, on ICANN, and on ALAC. These issues will be the core of the work program of the WG for 2011.
- **Statement of the ICANN African Community on ICANN Geographic Regions Review.** The ALAC recognized AFRALO and AfrICANN for their timely work in developing and adopting the [Statement of the ICANN African Community on ICANN Geographic Regions](#).

More Information

- Find the complete list of [At-Large meetings](#) at the 40th ICANN Meeting
- See the [ALAC Chair's Report](#) of the 40th ICANN Meeting

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), Director for At-Large

In Response to Requests, ALAC Submits Numerous Policy Statements

At a Glance

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) submitted more than 10 policy statements during February and March 2011 in response to requests for comments from the U.S. Government, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and ICANN public consultations. The policy statements were extraordinary for the extent to which they incorporated the views from the “edges” of the At-Large community, including the 130 At-Large Structures within the five At-Large regions.

Recent Developments

The ALAC statements submitted between February and March 2011 are:

- [ALAC Statement on the Whois Review Team's RFC on Scope of Work and Roadmap, Outreach and Action Plans for Whois Review Exercise](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Stability, Security, and Resilience of the DNS Review Team \(SSR-Team\)](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Proposed Recommendation for a Global Outreach Program](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Proposed Framework for the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Draft Proposal for the Study of Issues Related to the Delegation of IDN Variant TLDs](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Proposed New GNSO Policy Development Process](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B Working Group Proposed Final Report](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the GAC New gTLD Scorecard](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the US National Telecommunications and Information Administration \(NTIA\) Notice of Inquiry \(NOI\)](#)
- [ALAC Statement on Interim Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Proposed ICANN Meeting Dates 2014 - 2016](#)

- [ALAC Statement on the Draft Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies](#)

More Information

The [At-Large Correspondence](#) site lists all ALAC statements.

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), Director for At-Large

At-Large Improvements Work Team Proposals Aim to Increase “Edge” Participation

At a Glance

Armed with feedback from the At-Large Community during ICANN’s Silicon Valley Meeting, the four At-Large Improvements Work Teams (WTs) have begun drafting their final report. This report will focus on the WTs’ formal proposals on how to implement the 13 recommendations found in the [Final Report of the ALAC Review WG on ALAC Improvements](#). These proposals are the result of the WTs’ efforts over the last six months.

Background

The ALAC/At-Large Improvements Project grew out of the ALAC’s 2008 independent review, mandated by ICANN’s Bylaws. Based on the findings of this review and the input from two public comment periods, the Board Governance Committee-appointed Review Working Group on ALAC Improvements developed 13 recommendations published in its [Final Report](#) of June 2009.

These recommendations were then grouped into four areas and a WT was established to tackle each one.

- [WT A](#) works on clarifying ALAC’s continuing purpose.
- [WT B](#) focuses on increasing ALS participation.
- [WT C](#) tries to improve ALAC/At-Large planning processes.
- [WT D](#) concentrates on enhancing ALAC’s policy advice processes.

The WTs include members from all of the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs). Indeed, the majority of WT members and co-chairs are RALO members not also on the ALAC.

This framework has allowed the WTs to take a “bottom-up” approach. Since the WTs’ proposals will improve the basic ways in which the ALAC and Community

conduct business, the RALOs' and ALSes' leadership of this project has ensured their influence over At-Large activities for years to come.

At the Silicon Valley Meeting

By the time of ICANN's Silicon Valley Meeting, the WTs had made significant progress in developing their implementation proposals associated with each of the 13 improvements recommendations. The table below summarizes this progress.

Work team	Recommendation	Status of WT tasks (% completed)				Estimated completion date
		25%	50%	75%	100%	
A	1: ICANN Bylaws	100%				Completed
	2: Director-related Bylaws	100%				Completed
	10: Home of indiv Internet user	100%				Completed
	11: Board statement re Rec 10	100%				Completed
B	3: ALS-RALO-ALAC structure	100%				Completed
	4: ALS educ & engagement	100%				Completed
	7: Communication tools	100%				Completed
	9: Translation processes	75%		25%		~April 2011
C	5: Strategic/operational plans	75%		25%		~April 2011
	6: Cost models	75%		25%		~April 2011
D	8: Public comment period	100%				Completed
	12: Consumer rep input	75%		25%		~April 2011
	13: Policy advice mechanisms	100%				Completed

A significant portion of the At-Large calendar during the Silicon Valley meeting was dedicated to the improvements project. Each WT presented its implementation proposals, along with plans for proposals still in development, to the ALAC, RALOs and broader At-Large Community. For more information, see

the [ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 1](#) and [ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-up Meeting](#).

Following are some of the highlights from the WTs' proposals, many of which strive to enhance participation from the At-Large "edges":

- Amendments to the ICANN Bylaws to strengthen the role of the ALAC and At-Large as the primary home of individual Internet users within ICANN.
- A series of new communications tools for the RALOs and ALSes, including an ICANN-provided [wiki page tailored for each ALS](#).
- Enhanced participation by the regions and ALSes in the ALAC's strategic, operational, and budgetary planning, as well as policy advice development (PAD) process.

The Silicon Valley presentations gave the WTs the opportunity to receive feedback on their proposals from the entire breadth of the At-Large Community, which offered the WTs ideas about how to refine the proposals.

Next Steps

Since the Silicon Valley meeting, the Improvements WTs have continued their work.

- Three of the four WTs (B, C, and D) have continued working on their implementation proposals incorporating the feedback received. This stage of the Improvements Project will be completed within the next week.
- [The public comment period](#) on the ICANN Bylaw amendments regarding the ALAC's future role, developed by WT A, opened on 8 April 2011 and it will close on 9 May. The amendments may be revised depending on input and then submitted to the Board for final approval during ICANN's Singapore Meeting in June.
- The four WTs, with Staff's assistance, have begun preparing the final report with the WTs' implementation proposals for the ALAC. The report is expected by early May, after which the ALAC will begin its consideration of the proposals, and the work of the At-Large Improvements WTs will be complete.

More Information

- [At-Large Improvements Workspace](#)
- [Simplified At-Large Improvements Implementation Outline](#)
- [ALAC-At-Large Improvements Implementation Project Plan \(7 June 2010\)](#)
- [ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation: Update \(5 Dec 2010, Cartagena\)](#)

Staff Contact

[Seth Greene](#), At-Large Improvements Project Manager