



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

Volume 10, Issue 9 – September 2010

## **Across ICANN**

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

## **ccNSO**

[ccNSO Council Nominations Open](#)

[ccNSO Members Appointed to Joint Security and Stability Analysis Charter Drafting Group](#)

[ccNSO Realigns Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group Charter](#)

[Other Issues Active in the ccNSO](#)

## **GNSO**

[Progress Toward Consensus on Vertical Integration Slow Following Public Comment on Initial Report](#)

[GNSO Council Approves Initiation of Whois Misuse Study – Other Clarifying Studies Budgeted](#)

[Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy WG Absorbs Comments on Initial Report](#)

[GNSO Council Addresses Recommendations in the Registration Abuse Policies Final Report](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Closes Public Comment Forum; Seeks Consensus](#)

[GNSO Improvements: Council Approves New Operating Procedures for Council, Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups](#)

[Other Issues Active in the GNSO](#)

## **ASO**

[Adoption of Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses Seems Imminent - in Two Flavors](#)

[Global Policy Proposal on ASN Ratified by ICANN Board](#)

## **Joint Efforts**

[Issues Open as Joint Efforts](#)

## **At-Large**

[At-Large Attracts Globally Diverse Pool of Applicants for the ICANN Board](#)

[ALAC and Nominating Committee Announce Delegates](#)

[At-Large Community Teams Help Implement Improvement Recommendations](#)

## **SSAC**

[SSAC to Advise on Protecting Domain Names](#)

---

## **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 also 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](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

## Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ASO</a>
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ccNSO</a>
Generic Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">GNSO</a>
At-Large Advisory Committee	<a href="#">ALAC</a>
Governmental Advisory Committee	<a href="#">GAC</a>
Root Server System Advisory Committee	<a href="#">RSSAC</a>
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	<a href="#">SSAC</a>

## Across ICANN

---

### Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

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

- [Accountability and Transparency Review – Community Feedback](#). The Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) has opened a public forum so that the community can comment and make suggestions at any point during the ATRT review. A closing date has not been defined.
- [The New GNSO Policy Development Process: PDP Work Team Initial Report](#). As part of GNSO Improvements, the Policy Development Process Work Team (PDP-WT) has developed recommendations for a new GNSO policy development process. Who has the right to introduce a new issue into the PDP? What are the possible outcomes of a PDP? Deadline for comments has been extended to 30 September.
- [FY 11 Update to Plan for Enhancing Internet Security, Stability and Resiliency](#). For FY 11, the SSR Plan originally published in May 2009 has been updated to reflect ICANN's Security activities from June 2010–July 2011. The FY 11 SSR Plan is available for comment until 13 October 2010.
- [Privacy Proxy Registration Services Study Report](#). For years, the ICANN community has raised questions about domain names registered using a privacy or proxy registration service. A 2009 exploratory study by ICANN assessed an approximate percentage of domain names in the top five gTLD registries that used privacy or proxy registration services. The study revealed that at least 18% (and probably not much more than 20%) of the domain names contained in the top five gTLD registries used privacy or

proxy registration services. This report is available for public comment until 28 October 2010.

- [Numbers and Hyphens in .NAME Domain Names](#). VeriSign Information Services, Inc. has proposed an amendment to Appendices 6 and 11 of the .NAME Registry Agreement to include the use of numbers and hyphens in domain names. ICANN's preliminary determination is that the proposal does not raise significant competition, security or stability issues in .NAME. Comments on the proposed amendment will be considered until 16 October 2010.

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

## ccNSO

---

### ccNSO Council Nominations Open

#### At a Glance

*The process for nominating members for election to the ccNSO Council is open until 21 September 2010, 00.00 UTC.*

#### Background

At the ICANN meeting in North America on 13–18 March 2011, one ccNSO Council member from each region will step down, leaving that position open. Council members whose terms will end in March 2011 are:

Africa – Mohamed El Bashir, .sd  
Asia/Australia/Pacific – Hiro Hotta, .jp  
Europe – Ondrej Filip, .cz  
Latin America/Caribbean – Patrick Hosein, .tt  
North America – Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

All ccNSO members are entitled to nominate one candidate for election to the ccNSO Council and each member can second one candidate.

#### Next Steps

If you wish to nominate a candidate for the newly formed ccNSO Council, the procedure for nominations and for seconding nominations is [available](#).

#### More Information

[Archive of current candidate nominations](#).

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

# ccNSO Members Appointed to Joint Security and Stability Analysis Charter Drafting Group

## At a Glance

*The ccNSO Council has appointed volunteers members to the Joint Security and Stability Analysis Charter Drafting Group. The group will examine whether a DNS-CERT or other mechanism would benefit the security and stability of the Domain Name System.*

## Background

In their 25 March letter to ICANN CEO and President Rod Beckstrom, the chairs of ALAC, ccNSO and GNSO suggested the creation of a joint SO/AC DNS-CERT working group, to draw upon the community's collective expertise and to solicit input on:

- The broad concept of a DNS-CERT
- The current work being undertaken to mitigate DNS-related threats
- The actual level, frequency and severity of these threats
- The gaps, if any, in the current security response to DNS issues
- Whether a DNS-CERT is a proposal they can support, and
- If so, the logistics of the proposal

## Recent Developments

During ICANN's June Brussels meeting, the SOs and ACs set up a joint working group to draft the charter for the proposed working group for adoption by each SO/AC involved.

At its August 2010 meeting the ccNSO Council appointed the following persons as volunteers to the Joint Security and Stability Analysis Charter Drafting Group:

Jay Daley, .nz  
Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr  
Chris Disspain, .au  
Ondrej Filip, .cz  
Hiro Hotta, .jp  
Hansang Lee, .kr  
Jörg Schweiger, .de  
Tan Yaling, .cn

## Next Steps

The secretariats will set up the email lists for all volunteers, including those from At-Large and the GNSO. Once operational, the drafting group will start to draft a charter for a joint working group to analyze the security and stability of the Domain Name System.

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

# ccNSO Realigns Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group Charter

## At a Glance

*In August, the ccNSO Council changed the mandate for the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group to realign its relationship with ICANN and its supporting organizations and advisory committees, and appointed additional volunteers to the group.*

## Background

According to its amended charter, the working group may take a position and provide input to the public comments fora, or provide its comments to ICANN or other supporting organizations and advisory committees on its own behalf. Until the charter update, the WG had to comment directly to the ccNSO Council. Of course, the working group does not represent the ccNSO or ccTLD community.

## Recent Developments

At its meeting in August the ccNSO Council adopted the amended charter of the SOP WG and appointed the following persons as working group members:

Jessica Calvo, .cr (observer)  
Atsushi Endo, .jp  
Mohamed Ibrahim, .so  
Staffan Jonson, .se  
Debbie Monahan, .nz  
Pablo Rodriguez, .pr  
Grigori Saghyan, .am  
Giovanni Seppia, .eu

## More Information

The working group's activities remain the same, and the updated charter can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/sopiwg.htm>.

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## Other Issues Active in the ccNSO

- [Must ccNSO Change to Include Internationalized Country Codes?](#)
- [Delegation and Redelelegation of Country Code TLDs](#)
- [ITEMS External Review of the ccNSO](#)
- [Strategic and Operation Planning Working Group Survey of ccTLD Priorities](#)

# GNSO

---

## Progress Toward Consensus on Vertical Integration Slow Following Public Comment on Initial Report

### *Working Group Develops Key Principles for the New gTLD Program*

#### At a Glance

*The revised Initial Report published in August includes public comments received on proposed restrictions on vertical integration and cross-ownership between registrars and registries.*

#### Background

ICANN is finalizing the implementation details for the launch of new gTLDs. ICANN's recently posted draft Applicant Guidebook proposes strict restrictions on vertical integration and cross-ownership between registrars and registries in the New gTLD Program.

A GNSO policy development process (PDP) is under way to evaluate policies on vertical integration (VI) between registrars and registries that affect both new gTLDs and existing gTLDs. This PDP is being expedited so that it can help shape the final Applicant Guidebook for the launch of new gTLDs.

#### Recent Developments

In July 2010, the GNSO's VI working group published its [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 730 KB] describing alternative proposals for vertical integration under the New gTLD

Program. At the end of that public comment period in August, the VI working group published its [revised Initial Report](#) [PDF, 2.41 MB], which includes the comments received.

While no proposal has yet achieved consensus support within the VI working group, the various proposals will be further analyzed and debated as the VI working group strives to develop a consensus position to recommend to the GNSO Council.

The GNSO Council forwarded the Revised Initial Report to the ICANN Board to inform the Board of the status of the VI working group's deliberations. To date, the GNSO Council has not endorsed or otherwise adopted any recommendations described in the Revised Initial Report, since the VI working group's work has not been concluded or its Final Report issued.

#### **Additional Information:**

- [Revised Initial Report on Vertical Integration Between Registries and Registrars](#) [PDF, 2.4 MB]
- [Vertical Integration PDP Working Group wiki page](#)
- Details of the [implementation planning activities for new gTLDs](#)
- To review comments in the Public Comment Period, go to <http://icann.org/en/public-comment/#vi-pdp-initial-report>.

#### **Staff Contact**

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## **GNSO Council Approves Initiation of Whois Misuse Study – Other Clarifying Studies Budgeted**

***ICANN staff members continue to scope additional study options; GNSO Council to discuss Whois 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 continues its inquiries into the suitability of Whois as the Internet evolves, and is considering studies that could provide current, reliable information to further inform community discussions about Whois.*

## Recent Developments

The first Whois studies being considered are grouped into four broad categories:

- **Whois Misuse.** This study is to discover to what extent public Whois information is used for harmful purposes. ICANN issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) in September 2009, asking qualified researchers to estimate the costs and feasibility of conducting these studies. The research firm selected to conduct this study will be announced shortly.
- **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.
- **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 to engage independent research organizations in undertaking this study. Three responses were received by the 20 July 2010 submittal deadline. Additional information has been requested of those submitting the strongest responses. Once staff has analyzed this information, the GNSO Council and ICANN staff will consider next steps. The staff analysis should be completed later this month.
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services Reveal Study.** This study would measure proxy and privacy service responsiveness to registrant "identity reveal" requests. ICANN staff members are scoping this study now and hope to post an RFP later this month.

At its meeting on 21 April, the GNSO Council passed a resolution recommending \$400,000 USD to fund Whois studies in ICANN's fiscal year 2011 Budget. The 2011 Budget framework approved by the ICANN Board, June 2010 in Brussels, includes this funding.

Two more important categories of potential study may follow the first four.

- **International Display Specifications.** Since its inception, Whois data has been primarily in English and other Western languages, but with Internationalized Domain Names in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, and other scripts in greater use, more and more Whois entries are expected in non-Roman character sets. Without standards, Whois could turn into an unreadable polyglot mess.

At ICANN's Sydney meeting In June 2009, the ICANN Board passed a resolution asking the GNSO and the SSAC to form a joint working group

to look at the feasibility of introducing display specifications so that the increasing prevalence of non-ASCII registration data does not compromise Whois accuracy. The working group is in the early stages of considering “What do we require from internationalized registration data?” The WG will also address technical questions on how data elements might be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from registration information displayed in familiar characters from local languages and scripts.

- **Whois Service Requirements Report Now Complete.** Another important study area, requested separately by the GNSO in May 2009, would compile a comprehensive list of Whois service requirements based on current policies and previous policy discussions. The report is a compendium of potential technical requirements and makes no policy recommendations. Some potential requirements included in this report are a mechanism to find authoritative Whois servers; structured queries; a standardized set of query capabilities; a well-defined scheme for replies; standardized error messages; improved quality of domain registration data; internationalization; security elements; thick vs. thin Whois; and a registrar abuse point of contact.

On 26 March, ICANN staff released an initial report on this matter. Staff conducted [two webinars](#) to discuss this report with the community in April and May. Staff has since prepared a draft final report that reflects input from the SOs and ACs, and conducted a consultation on the report at the ICANN Brussels meeting in June. A Final Report was presented to the GNSO Council on 29 July. The Council is likely to discuss this report in the coming weeks.

### More Information

- [GNSO Whois policy development page](#)
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)
- [Whois misuse RFP announcement](#)
- [Whois registrant identification RFP announcement](#)
- SSAC037: [Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data](#)
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding [display and usage of internationalized registration data](#), approved in Sydney, 26 June 2009
- [Internationalized Data Registration Working Group Charter](#) [PDF, 112 KB]
- [Staff analysis of Whois Misuse and Registrant Identification Reports](#) [PDF, 488 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

---

# Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy WG Absorbs Comments on Initial Report

## At a Glance

*The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) aims to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO Council is reviewing and considering revisions to this policy and has established a series of working groups to conduct these efforts.*

## Recent Developments and Next Steps

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP Working Group published its Initial Report on 29 May. The Initial Report presents several preliminary conclusions and recommendations for community input, including a proposed Expedited Transfer Reversal Policy (ETRP). A fast “reverse transfer” process for returning a recently sold domain name to its original owner if it is hijacked, the ETRP is designed to correct fraudulent or erroneous transfers. It does not address or resolve disputes arising over domain control or use. A legitimate new owner would probably contest an ETRP, but a hijacker would not because of the risk of exposure.

Publication of the Initial Report was followed by a public comment forum that ran from 5 July to 8 August. Seventeen community submissions from 13 parties were received, most focused on the proposed ETRP. The WG has started to review and analyze the comments received as part of its deliberations to develop a Final Report for submission to the GNSO Council.

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

## Background

The IRTP Part B Policy Development Process (PDP) is the second in a series of five PDPs addressing areas for improvement in the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. The Part B Working Group will address 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 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 Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

## GNSO Council Addresses Recommendations in the Registration Abuse Policies Final Report

### At a Glance

*Registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches for dealing with domain name registration abuse, and questions persist about what actions registration abuse refers to. The GNSO Council has launched a Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Working Group to examine registration abuse policies.*

### Recent Developments

The Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Working Group published its Final Report on 29 May. The report includes concrete recommendations to address domain name registration abuse in gTLDs for consideration by the GNSO Council. It includes recommendations addressing fake renewal notices, domain kiting, and deceptive or offensive domain names. The report also addresses a wide-ranging list of online abuses and problems, among them:

- Cybersquatting
- Whois access problems
- Malicious use of domain names
- Fake renewal notices
- Cross-TLD registration scams
- Uniformity of contracts

The RAP WG [presented its report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] and recommendations to the GNSO Council at the June ICANN meeting in Brussels. The GNSO Council then decided to form a group of volunteers to draft a proposed approach to the recommendations contained in the report. The proposed approach could include the timing of forming groups to consider some of the recommendations in the

final report, as well as how to deal with those recommendations that did not achieve unanimous consensus (click for [further information](#)). These volunteers held their first meeting on Monday, 13 September.

## Background

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

## More Information

- [Registration Abuse Policies Working Group 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 Working Group Workspace](#) (Wiki)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team Workspace](#) (Wiki)

## Staff Contacts

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

---

# Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery WG Closes Public Comment; Seeks Consensus

## At a Glance

*To what extent should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether the current policies of registrars on the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate.*

## Recent Developments and Next Steps

The GNSO Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group published its Initial Report on 31 May. On 12 July, a [public comment forum](#) opened on the report, which was extended to 15 August. During the public comment forum, it was also possible to participate in a survey that asked several specific questions about renewal and expiration practices. Nine public comment submissions were received, in addition to 412 survey responses (click [here](#) to see the summary and analysis).

## Background

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](#).

## Next Steps

The WG has started to review and analyze the comments received as well as the survey results as part of the second phase of the PDP, during which the WG hopes to reach consensus on a proposed way forward for each of the charter questions.

## More Information

- [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
- [Working Group presentation: Registrar Survey Final Results](#) [PDF, 948 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

# GNSO Improvements: New Operating Procedures for Council, Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups Approved

## 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 GNSO Improvements fall into five main areas:*

- *Restructuring the GNSO Council*
- *Revising the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP)*
- *Adopting a New Working Group Model for Policy Development*
- *Enhancing Constituencies*
- *Improving Communication and Coordination with ICANN structures*

*The following update relates only the most recent developments regarding implementation of the GNSO Improvements. To understand the GNSO's new structure and organization, see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements Information webpage](#). For the reasons and history motivating the improvements, see the [Background page](#).*

## Recent Developments

Since the June ICANN meeting in Brussels, the GNSO Council has approved the recommendations of several cross-constituency work teams that involve implementing important aspects of the GNSO improvements effort. Community efforts continue in several important areas.

1. **Restructuring the GNSO Council.** At its 5 August meeting the GNSO Council approved modifications to the Council's new operational rules and procedures, including matters regarding voting abstentions and Councilor Statements of Interest. The Policy staff remains available to assist GNSO constituency and stakeholder groups in addressing the new procedures. Specific information collection forms and graphic depictions of the new processes have also been prepared for the community. For further detail, see the new [operating procedures](#) [PDF, 428 KB] and [the GNSO Admin Documents web page](#).

2. **Revising the PDP.** On 31 May, the Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) presented its [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 2.36 MB] for community input. The report includes 45 draft recommendations and a flow chart intended as the basis for the new Annex A of the ICANN bylaws.

The PDP-WT hosted a public information and [consultation session](#) at the ICANN meeting in Brussels. The [public consultation period](#) was recently extended until 30 September. Once the period closes, the PDP-WT will analyze the comments received, seek to finalize the report, then submit it to the GNSO's Policy Process Steering Committee for review. Ultimately, WT recommendations will go to the GNSO Council for approval.

3. **Adopting a New Working Group Model.** The Working Group Work Team (WG WT) document, titled "[GNSO Working Group Guidelines](#)" [PDF, 681 KB], was submitted at the end of May 2010 to the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) for review. The proposed GNSO Working Group Guidelines will go eventually to the GNSO Council for approval.

4. **Improving Communications and Coordination with ICANN Structures.** The ICANN Policy staff is fully engaged in implementing new GNSO web site improvements approved by the GNSO Council in August. The department hopes to share its progress with the GNSO Council and the community in time for the ICANN Cartagena meeting, 5–10 December 2010.

5. **Enhancing Constituencies.** At its 5 August meeting, the GNSO Council approved a [report](#) from the Constituencies and Stakeholder Group Work Team on consistent operational guidelines and best practices for GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups. The recommendations have been incorporated into the GNSO [operating procedures](#) [PDF, 428 KB]. The work team also is drafting recommendations on a global outreach program to encourage participation in GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Those recommendations are now ready for review by the GNSO's Operations Steering Committee.

**Permanent Stakeholder Group Charter Efforts.** The GNSO's noncontract party communities continue work on developing permanent stakeholder group charters. Current community activities and discussions indicate that those efforts are still on track to conclude by the end of 2010.

### Next Steps

The GNSO's various implementation work teams will continue to develop recommendations for implementing the GNSO restructuring goals approved by the Board. Public comments will be reviewed and summarized by the ICANN staff. The ICANN Board is also due to consider a review of the permanent stakeholder group charters it approved in July 2009.

### More Information

- [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)
- [New bylaws relevant to the New GNSO Council](#) [PDF, 160 KB]
- [New GNSO Council Operating Procedures](#) [PDF, 428 KB]
- [PDP Team wiki](#)
- [Working Group Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Team wiki](#)

### Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## Other Issues Active in the GNSO

- [GNSO Work Prioritization](#)
- [Fast Flux Hosting](#)

---

## Adoption of Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses Seems Imminent – in Two Flavors

### At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are discussing a proposed global policy for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. According to the proposal, IANA would act as a repository of returned address space and, once the free pool of IANA IPv4 address space has been depleted, allocate such space to the RIRs in smaller blocks than it currently does.*

### Recent Developments

The RIRs discussed the proposal at their most recent meetings. APNIC, LACNIC and RIPE have adopted the proposal, which has also passed final call in AfriNIC where final adoption is imminent. In ARIN, the proposal has been modified. The modified version has passed final call and was recently formally adopted. The main question now is whether the different versions adopted lend themselves to reconciliation as a single global policy.

### Next Steps

If the proposals are adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) will review the proposal texts, consolidate if appropriate, and then forward the consolidated policy to the ICANN Board for ratification and subsequent implementation by IANA.

### 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 such unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) is being depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) will need to take its place.

The proposed global policy has two distinct phases: (1) IANA only receives returned IPv4 address space from the RIRs, and (2) IANA continues to receive returned IPv4 address space *and also* reallocates such space to the RIRs. This proposal is connected to a recently adopted global policy for allocating the remaining IPv4 address space. When that global policy takes effect, it also triggers phase two in the proposal.

## More Information

- [Background Report](#) (updated 4 December 2009)
- [Global Policy Proposal for Handling Recovered IPv4](#)

## Staff Contact

Olof Nordling, Director Services Relations

---

# Global Policy Proposal on ASN Ratified by ICANN Board

## At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) have agreed to a proposed global policy for Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs). The proposal would change the date for a full transition from 16-bit to 32-bit ASNs from the beginning of 2010 to the beginning of 2011 to allow more time for necessary upgrades of the systems involved.*

## Recent Developments

APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, RIPE and AfriNIC have formally adopted the proposal. The Number Resource Organization (NRO) Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) have reviewed the text and verified that applicable procedures were duly followed. In July, the ASO AC forwarded the proposal to the ICANN Board for ratification, and the Board ratified the proposal in September.

## Next Steps

This action modifies the existing Global Policy for ASNs by extending the period during which RIRs can operate two separate pools of numbers from 31 December 2009 until 31 December 2010. ICANN staff will take all necessary steps to implement the Global Policy.

## Background

Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs) are identifiers used for transit of IP traffic. ASNs were originally 16 bits long, but a transition to 32-bit ASNs is under way to meet increasing demand. In line with the adopted global policy currently in force for ASNs, 16-bit and 32-bit ASNs exist in parallel. Beginning in 2010 all would have been regarded as 32 bits long. The current proposal defers that date to the beginning of 2011.

## More Information

- Background Report  
<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-04sep09-en.htm>,  
(updated 3 June 2010)
- Announcement:  
<http://www.icann.org/en/general/global-policy-asn-blocks-21sep10-en.htm>

## Staff Contact

Olof Nordling, Director Services Relations

# Joint Efforts

---

## Issues Open as Joint Efforts

- [Improvements to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement](#)
- [Internationalized Registration Data](#)
- [Geographic Regions Review](#)

# At-Large

---

## At-Large Attracts Globally Diverse Pool of Applicants for the ICANN Board

### At a Glance

*The At-Large Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) recently announced the initial results of the call for Statements of Interests (SOIs) for the position of the ICANN Board Director to be selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee and Regional At-Large Organizations (see [August 2010 Policy Update](#)). A total of 43 SOIs were received, of which 21 were deemed to be too incomplete to proceed further. The remaining 22 SOIs will be evaluated against established criteria.*

### Recent Developments

Statistics of the 22 completed SOIs show a globally diverse pool with applicants from the five regions (Africa, 14%; Asia-Pacific, 18%; Europe, 32%; Latin

America and the Caribbean, 4%; and North America, 32%). Applicants also are from a wide array of professional backgrounds (For Profit, 23%; Non-Profit, 9%; Consultancy, 32%; Academia, 14%, Government Agency, 4%; and Other, 18%). From the 22 completed Statements of Interest, 16 (73%) applicants are not currently active in the At-Large community while 6 (27%) are currently active. Male applicants make up 18 (82%) applicants with only 4 (18%) female applicants.

### Next Steps

The names of the 22 applicants and the BCEC selected slate of 3 to 7 candidates will be released in October 2010.

### Background

The At-Large Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) opened a Call for Statements of Interest (SOIs) for Candidates for the post of Director to be selected by the At-Large Community on 21 July 2010. The BCEC is composed of At-Large Structure (ALS) representatives, two from each of the five At-Large regions and an independent Chair from the ALAC. These committee members are responsible for selecting the candidates who will make up the election slate for the post of ICANN Board Director. The call for applicants closed on 6 September.

This call for SOIs was part of the new process through which ICANN's ALAC/At-Large user community will appoint one voting member of the ICANN Board.

### More Information

- [The At-Large Director selection process](#)
- [Information on the BCEC, including member details](#)

### Staff Contact

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

---

## ALAC and Nominating Committee Announce Delegates

### At a Glance

*On 31 August 2010, the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) announced its delegates from each of ICANN's five geographic regions to ICANN's Nominating Committee (NomCom). On 7 September, the 2010 Nominating Committee announced its leadership position selectees to the ALAC.*

### **ALAC Nominating Committee Delegates**

Yaovi Atohoun (AFRALO)  
Dr. V.C. Vivekanandan (APRALO)  
Yrjö Länsipuro (EURALO)  
José Ovidio Salgueiro (LACRALO)  
Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)

### **Nominating Committee Representatives to the ALAC**

Sébastien Bachollet (NomCom appointed EURALO representative to the ALAC)  
Marc Rotenberg (NomCom appointed NARALO representative to the ALAC)

### **Recent Developments**

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC Chair, announced the ALAC delegates to the ICANN NomCom. Voting members of the NomCom are appointed for a one-year term, starting at the close of the annual general meeting 2010 and ending at the close of the annual general meeting 2011. Voting members may be reappointed for a further term of one year subject to the requirements of the [ICANN bylaws](#).

The 2010 Nominating Committee also announced its leadership selections to the ICANN Board of Directors, the ALAC, the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council. NomCom delegates to the ALAC will assume their positions at the end of ICANN's annual general meeting in Cartagena, Colombia, on 10 December 2010. Their two-year term will end at the close of the annual general meeting 2012.

### **More Information**

- [ALAC delegates to the Nominating Committee for 2011](#)
- [ICANN 2010 Nominating Committee Leadership Selections](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Matthias Langenegger](#), At-Large Secretariat

---

## **At-Large Community Teams Help Implement Improvement Recommendations**

### **At a Glance**

The goal of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements project is to review and improve both ALAC/At-Large participation in ICANN and the ALS participation in At-Large. This will be done through the implementation of the 13 recommendations outlined in the At-Large Review Work Group's Final Report and detailed in the [Simplified At-Large Improvements Implementation Outline](#).

As a means to facilitate the implementation of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements project, four At-Large community Work Teams have been created. Each of these Work Teams consist of At-Large Advisory Committee members as well as At-Large regional representatives. These Work Teams have held their initial calls and will continue their progress in the following months.

## **Recent Developments**

Additional information on the ALAC/At-Large Work Teams, including the recommendations for which they are responsible, follows. Please click on the name of each team for more detailed information.

### [Work Team A: Work team on ALAC's continuing purpose](#)

Rec 1: ICANN bylaws to reflect ALAC's continuing purpose  
Rec 10: ALAC/At-Large is home of individual Internet users  
Rec 11: Board statement recognizing Rec 10

### [Work Team B: Work team on ALS participation](#)

Rec 3: Remove any obstacles in ALS-RALO-ALAC structure  
Rec 4: ALS education and engagement  
Rec 7: ALAC should choose its own communication/collaboration tools  
Rec 9: ICANN should strengthen its translation/interpretation tools

### [Work Team C: Work team on ALAC planning processes](#)

Rec 5: ALAC should develop strategic/operational plans as part of ICANN's planning process  
Rec 6: At-Large should develop accurate cost models

### [Work Team D: Work team on ALAC's policy advice development](#)

Rec 8: ALAC may request public comment period be extended to 45 days  
Rec 12: Consumer representatives should have input into decisions and policy advice  
Rec 13: ALAC/At-Large policy advice mechanisms should be strengthened

## **More Information**

- [At-Large Improvements Project](#)

## **Staff Contact**

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

---

## SSAC to Advise on Protecting Domain Names

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee is continuing its preparation of a report to assist registrants in protecting their domain names and domain registration accounts against misuse. The report will complement [SAC040](#) [PDF, 276 KB], which described measures registrars could consider to reduce the risk of registration account compromise and domain registration abuse. The report, which is expected later this month, will identify measures that registrants can implement themselves, and will also provide guidelines for registrants to assist them in making informed decisions when they choose a registrar to manage their domain names.

For reports on other activities for 2010, refer to the [SSAC Work Plan](#).

### Staff Contact

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