



---

## Robust Policy Development and Advice Work Continues

At ICANN53, the Cross-Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Proposal on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship) presented its final proposal to the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) with the approval from its five chartering organizations. To learn more about this milestone, please [watch](#) CWG-Stewardship Co-Chair Jonathan Robinson provide an overview of the process and outline next steps.

Despite the extraordinary circumstances since NTIA's announcement of its intent to transition stewardship of the IANA functions, the ICANN community has remained deeply engaged in its core work of policy development. The GNSO Council recently approved the final reports of both the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process Working Group and the Policy & Implementation Working Group, among other [accomplishments](#).

Meanwhile, the advisory committees continue their work as well. The ALAC submitted statements on the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report and on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for Affirmation of Commitments and Organizational Reviews. The SSAC also recently published two comments, and the RSSAC will soon review the work of its Root Zone TTLs Work Party—just as a new work party launches in the Caucus.

The Policy Development Support Team joins me in congratulating the community for its exceptional work on the IANA Stewardship and ICANN Accountability efforts. We also thank the community for advancing ICANN's core policy development and advice work through sustained commitment and look forward to continued productivity and progress.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David".

David Olive

Vice President, Policy Development Support  
General Manager, Istanbul Hub Office

---

## Contents

### Across ICANN

- [Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

### Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

- [ASO Participates at ICANN53](#)
- [IPv6 Deployment Now More Critical Than Ever in Africa and Beyond](#)
- [Regional Internet Registries Number Resource Policy Discussions](#)

### Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

- [.BN Joins ccNSO](#)

### Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

- [GNSO Council Adopts Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Final Report](#)
- [GNSO Council Adopts All Consensus Recommendations from the Policy & Implementation Working Group](#)
- [GNSO Council Requests Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures](#)

### At-Large/At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

- [At-Large Onboarding Program Launches](#)
- [At-Large Website Revamp: ICANN53 Update](#)
- [ALAC/At-Large Achievements from ICANN53](#)
- [ALAC Unanimously Adopts Motion on Final IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal and Submits Two Statements](#)

### Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)

- [GAC Concludes ICANN53 Meetings](#)
- [GAC Endorses CWG-Stewardship Final Proposal](#)

### Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

- [RSSAC at ICANN53](#)

## Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

- [SSAC Publishes Comments on Cross-Community Working Group Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements](#)
- [SSAC Publishes Comment on the Cross-Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal](#)

---

## Publication Information

*Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [website](#) and is available via online subscription. To receive *Policy Update* in your inbox each month, please visit the [subscriptions page](#).

Please send questions, comments, and suggestions to: [policyinfo@icann.org](mailto:policyinfo@icann.org).

## 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

Several public comment proceedings are currently open on issues of interest to the ICANN community.

#### [Draft Report: Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization](#)

The purpose of this public comment proceeding is to request community feedback on the Draft Report issued by Westlake Governance Limited (Westlake) on the Review of Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO).

**Public Comment Period Closes: 24 July 2015, 23:59 UTC**

#### [Release of Country and Territory Names within the .GLOBAL, .BNPPARIBAS, .BRIDGESTONE, and .FIRESTONE TLDs](#)

This public comment period aims to gather community input on proposed amendments to the .GLOBAL, .BNPPARIBAS, .BRIDGESTONE and .FIRESTONE Registry Agreements to allow the registration of country and territory names currently reserved under Section 4 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement. These amendments are intended to implement the requests from the registry operators to offer a new registry service, which were submitted through the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) process.

**Public Comment Period Closes: 3 August 2015, 23:59 UTC**

#### [GNSO Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process \(PDP\) Recommendations](#)

This public comment proceeding seeks to obtain community input on the seven recommendations of the Generic Names Supporting Organization's Policy Development Process on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information.

**Public Comment Period Closes: 10 August 2015, 23:59 UTC**

#### [Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace WHOIS Preliminary Issue Report](#)

This public comment proceeding seeks to obtain community input on the new Preliminary Issue Report concerning Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) to Replace WHOIS.

**Public Comment Period Closes: 6 September 2015, 23:59 UTC**

At any time, the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived public comment proceedings can be found on the [Public Comment web page](#).

The staff also populates a web page to help alert the community and preview potential "upcoming" public comment opportunities. The [Upcoming Public Comment](#) page provides specific information about these future comment opportunities. The page is updated around

the scheduled time of every ICANN public meeting to help individuals and the community set priorities and plan future workloads.

## Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

### ASO Participates at ICANN53

The ASO participated actively at ICANN53, representing the numbers community in various public sessions and also advancing its work.

#### ICANN Engagement

ASO Address Council chair Louie Lee and NRO Executive Committee chair Axel Pawlik represented the numbers community on the first panel at the SO/AC High-Interest Topic session exploring the topic of new gTLD auction proceeds. The ASO and NRO also provided updates to the ICANN community during the [Names, Numbers, and Protocols Community Update](#) session.

#### Annual Face-to-Face Meeting

The ASO Address Council held its annual face-to-face meeting at ICANN53. This three-hour session was largely dedicated to administrative matters, including a debriefing on the Board Seat 9 selection process and initial planning for the Board Seat 10 selection process. The ASO Address Council also received briefings on the Leadership Training Program and met with the Public Safety Working Group.

#### Session with the Board of Directors

The [joint ASO/NRO session with the Board of Directors](#) focused on an update regarding the Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal (CRISP) and IPv4 Exhaustion, a topic that also explored ongoing discussions in the RIRs about transfer policies. Louie Lee also introduced Ron da Silva as the newly selected Board Seat 9 occupant, who will replace Ray Plzak on the Board after the annual general meeting at ICANN54.

#### Workshop

The [ASO Workshop](#) highlighted three topics for the ICANN community. Louie Lee provided an overview of the RIR policy development processes and how to get involved. Nirani Nimpuno, vice chair of the CRISP Team, provided an overview of the numbers community proposal for the IANA Stewardship Transition. Finally, Axel Pawlik presented an operational update from the NRO.

#### Communications Coordination

The RIR Communications Coordination Group (CCG) held a meeting with Carlos Reyes and Jana Juginovic from the ICANN policy development and communications teams, respectively.

The RIR CCG agreed to continue its collaboration on providing content to ICANN's *Policy Update* newsletter and will also explore opportunities to contribute to regional newsletters.

### More Information

- [ASO Website](#)

### Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Policy Specialist

---

## IPv6 Deployment Now More Critical Than Ever in Africa and Beyond

On 1 July 2015, AFRINIC became the only one of the world's five RIRs with an as-yet unrestricted pool of IPv4 from which to allocate to its members, as ARIN announced that it had activated its "Unmet Request Policy" for IPv4 space, effectively signaling the exhaustion of its IPv4 free pool. This event marked a crucial turning point in the evolution of the Internet and brings total, global IPv4 exhaustion one step closer.

### Ongoing Policy Development

Although supply is not yet critically low, AFRINIC is seeing an increase in both the number of requests and the amount of IPv4 space being requested. AFRINIC's Policy Development Working Group is currently discussing several policy proposals in preparation for the changing RIR landscape, including the "[Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources](#)" proposal. If accepted by the community, this policy will authorize the use of up to 40% of an AFRINIC member's space outside of the region while also acting as a disincentive for those who want to acquire IPv4s for out-of-region use in ways that are not in the best interests of the AFRINIC community.

As the global supply of available IPv4 address space continues to dwindle, more and more new connections will be made over IPv6 as opposed to IPv4. AFRINIC believes that the future of the Internet will be over IPv6 and, unless African networks and businesses also ensure that they are IPv6-ready, they risk becoming isolated from the global Internet. To this end, AFRINIC has worked with its community for many years to ensure that IPv4 exhaustion makes as little impact as possible on the smooth functioning of the Internet.

### IPv6 Training

AFRINIC provides IPv6 training throughout the region and offers free courses on IPv6 deployment to network engineers, academics, and governments as part of its capacity building activities. It also provides an IPv6 test bed for engineers to test their deployments and offers information and statistics on IPv6 and what IPv4 exhaustion means for the local, regional, and global Internet.

## More Information

- For more information on AFRINIC's IPv6 training program, please see: <http://learn.afrinic.net/en/>
- For more information about IPv4 Exhaustion at AFRINIC, please see: <http://afrinic.net/en/community/ipv4-exhaustion>

## ICANN Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Policy Specialist

---

# Regional Internet Registries Number Resource Policy Discussions

## At a Glance

Each of the five Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) has a web page that lists all the Internet number resource policy proposals that are under discussion. Policy discussions take place on open policy mailing lists and at Public Policy Meetings (list and meeting information is provided below).

These are some examples of Internet number resource policy and other discussions that took place recently on the RIR policy mailing lists and/or at meetings.

## AFRINIC

Proposal page: <http://www.afrinic.net/en/community/policy-development/policy-proposals/>

AFRINIC held its Policy Development Sessions on 3 June 2015 in Tunisia, where the community discussed the following policy proposals:

- Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources:  
*No Consensus – back to the mailing list*
- AFRINIC Service Guidelines:  
*Withdrawn by the author*
- Resource Reservation for Internet Exchange Points:  
*Consensus – Posted to Last Call*

The text of these proposals is available at:

<http://www.afrinic.net/en/community/policy-development/policy-proposals/>

## APNIC

Proposal page: <http://www.apnic.net/community/policy/proposals>

The submission deadline for policy proposals to be discussed at the APNIC 40 Open Policy Meeting is 31 July 2015. Those interested in proposing a policy change may

review the Proposal Author Guidelines:

<https://www.apnic.net/community/policy/process/guidelines-for-proposal-authors>

## **ARIN**

Proposal page: <https://www.arin.net/policy/proposals/>

### *Waiting List for IPv4 Address Space*

On 1 July 2015, ARIN activated the IPv4 Unmet Requests policy (NRPM 4.1.8). This was caused by the approval of an address request that was larger than the available inventory in ARIN's IPv4 free pool. Full details about this process are available at:

[https://www.arin.net/resources/request/waiting\\_list.html](https://www.arin.net/resources/request/waiting_list.html)

ARIN has limited amounts of IPv4 address space available in smaller block sizes. ARIN encourages customers to monitor the IPv4 Inventory Counter on the ARIN homepage and the breakdown of the remaining IPv4 inventory found on the IPv4 Depletion page:

[https://www.arin.net/resources/request/ipv4\\_countdown.html](https://www.arin.net/resources/request/ipv4_countdown.html)

Organizations that need larger amounts of address space are encouraged to make use of the IPv4 transfer market for those needs. ARIN also reminds organizations of the ample availability of IPv6 address space, and encourages organizations to evaluate IPv6 address space for their ongoing public Internet network activities.

ARIN also hosts a recurring blog on IPv4 depletion status on the Team ARIN website to keep the community informed about the status of the ARIN IPv4 free pool:

<http://teamarin.net/category/ipv4-depletion>

## **LACNIC**

Proposal page: <http://www.lacnic.net/en/web/lacnic/politicas>

LACNIC Policies: <http://www.lacnic.net/en/web/lacnic/politicas>

LACNIC consulted the community on the reserved pool of IPv4 address space that is held for new members. The reserved pool is 32 /16s. Any returned address space and any space received from the IANA will be added to it. Based on initial allocation trends (new members), it is possible that this pool of IPv4 address space could last through April 2025.

## **RIPE-NCC**

Proposal page: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/policies/current-proposals/current-policy-proposals>

Proposals in Last Call:

- 2015-01, "Alignment of Transfer Requirements for IPv4 Allocations" – Last Call until 21 July 2015



Currently, IPv4 allocations received from another Local Internet Registry can only be re-allocated after 24 months, while IPv4 allocations made by the RIPE NCC can be transferred immediately. This proposal aims to align the transfer requirements with a 24-month holding period for all IPv4 allocations.

RIPE NCC Impact Analysis includes the point that currently around 10% of the allocations made by the RIPE NCC are transferred shortly after they have been allocated.

Proposals under discussion:

- 2015-02, “Keep IPv6 Provider Independent When Requesting IPv6 Allocation”
- 2015-03, “Assessment Criteria for IPv6 Initial Allocation Size”
- 2014-03, "Remove Multihoming Requirement for AS Number Assignments"

### Next Steps

- APNIC40 will be held 3-10 September 2015 in Mega Kuningan, Indonesia.
- LACNIC24 will be held along with LACNOG 28 September-2 October in Bogota, Colombia.
- ARIN36 will be held following NANOG65 8-9 October 2015 in Montreal, Canada.
- RIPE71 will be held 16-20 November 2015 in Bucharest, Romania.
- AFRINIC23 will be held 21-27 November 2015 in Brazzaville, Congo.

### Subscribe to RIR Policy Development Mailing Lists

- AFRINIC (RPD): <http://www.afrinic.net/en/community/email-a-mailing-lists>
- APNIC (Policy SIG): <http://www.apnic.net/community/participate/join-discussions>
- ARIN (PPML): [http://www.arin.net/ mailing\\_lists/index.html](http://www.arin.net/ mailing_lists/index.html)
- LACNIC (politiclas): <http://www.lacnic.net/web/lacnic/lista-de-discusion>
- RIPE (address-policy-wg): <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/mail/ripe-mailing-lists/address-policy-wg>

### ICANN Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Policy Specialist

## Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

### .BN Joins ccNSO

#### At a Glance

On 24 June, the ccNSO approved Brunei Darussalam Network Information Centre (.bn) as a new member. The ccNSO welcomes .bn to its membership and looks forward to ongoing collaboration.

#### Background

Starting with 35 members in 2003, the ccNSO membership has experienced extensive growth in the last decade and now totals 156 members. The ccNSO looks forward to welcoming more ccTLDs to its membership.

#### More Information

- [.bn Announcement](#)
- [ccNSO Membership](#)
- [ccNSO Membership Growth](#)

#### Staff Contact

[Gabiella Schitteck](#), Policy Specialist & ccNSO Support Manager

## Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

### GNSO Council Adopts Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Final Report

#### At a Glance

On 24 June 2015, the GNSO Council [adopted](#) the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process Working Group's Final Report, containing seven recommendations. The recommendations include the conclusion that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory because the costs of collecting and providing that information outweigh the benefits of providing it. The complete list of recommendations may be accessed in the [Final Report](#).

#### Recent Developments

The Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group (WG) completed its work on 12 June 2015 when it submitted its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council. The report contains seven recommendations including that it is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory; and that data fields be stored and displayed in a way that allows for easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language(s)/script(s) have been used by the registered name holder. The full list of recommendations can be found

in the [Final Report](#) (pp. 18-20). Since its adoption by the GNSO Council, staff has posted the report for [public comment](#) prior to consideration by the ICANN Board of Directors. Public comment may be submitted until 10 August 2015.

### **Next Steps**

At the end of the public comment period, staff will summarize the submissions received and submit these to the Board of Directors as it considers the Translation and Transliteration PDP recommendations for adoption, which is expected in the coming months.

### **Background**

The Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process Working Group was concerned with how contact information data—commonly referred to as ‘WHOIS’—are collected and displayed within generic top-level domains. According to its [charter](#), the WG was “tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the translation and transliteration of contact information. As part of its deliberations on this issue, the WG should, at a minimum, consider the following issues:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script?
- Who should decide who should bear the burden [of] translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?”

### **More Information**

- [Final Report](#)
- [Public Comment on Final Report](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Julie Hedlund](#), Policy Director

[Lars Hoffmann](#), Policy Specialist

---

## **GNSO Council Adopts All Consensus Recommendations from the Policy & Implementation Working Group**

### **At a Glance**

On 24 June 2015, the GNSO Council [adopted](#) the Policy & Implementation Working Group’s Final Report, which contains a set of recommendations on principles, requirements, and processes to guide GNSO policy development and related implementation discussions. The recommendations, made by full consensus of the Working Group, include three new policy-related processes that will complement the GNSO’s existing Policy Development Process. The

complete list of recommendations may be accessed in the [Final Report](#) from the Working Group.

## Recent Developments

The Policy & Implementation Working Group (WG) submitted its [Final Report](#) to the GNSO Council on 2 June 2015. The report includes a set of Policy and Implementation Principles and Requirements as well as a set of Implementation Review Team (IRT) Principles and Guidelines developed by the WG to guide future GNSO policy and implementation work. In addition, three new processes were recommended by the WG:

1. a GNSO Input Process (through which the GNSO can provide feedback on non-gTLD policy matters),
2. a GNSO Guidance Process (through which the GNSO can provide guidance on adopted gTLD policies), and
3. an Expedited GNSO Policy Development Process (to supplement the existing GNSO PDP for suitably limited issues not resulting in the creation of binding Consensus Policies on ICANN's Contracted Parties).

The WG also recommended that, where use of the processes is currently discretionary, the GNSO Council should mandate the use of them for future adopted gTLD policies, except in exceptional circumstances.

## Next Steps

As the proposed new GNSO Guidance Process and Expedited PDP will require amendments to the ICANN Bylaws if adopted by the Board of Directors, a Recommendations Report will be prepared and sent to the Board of Directors proposing that it initiate a specific public comment period for these recommendations. Following this, the Board of Directors will be expected to consider and act on the GNSO Council's resolution adopting all the WG's recommendations.

## Background

The GNSO Council chartered the Policy & Implementation WG in July 2013 to develop a set of recommendations on:

- A set of principles to underpin future GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures.
- A process for developing gTLD policy, possibly in the form of "Policy Guidance," including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process (for developing policy other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process;
- A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO policy recommendations;

- Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation; and
- Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams, as defined in the PDP Manual, are expected to function and operate.

The WG issued an Initial Report for public comment in January 2015. Following review of all public comments received, the WG completed its deliberations and submitted its Final Report containing all its consensus recommendations to the GNSO Council on 2 June 2015.

### More Information

- [Final Report of the Policy & Implementation Working Group](#)

### Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Director, Policy Development Support and Team Leader for the GNSO  
[Mary Wong](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## GNSO Council Requests Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

### At a Glance

On the recommendation of the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group, the GNSO Council approved a request for a Preliminary Issue Report on new gTLD subsequent procedures, which is the first step in a policy development process. This Preliminary Issue Report will be published for public comment to allow for community input and feedback.

### Recent Developments

The GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group (DG) has concluded its work, which focused on reflecting upon the experiences gained from the 2012 New gTLD round and identifying a recommended set of subjects that should be further analyzed in an Issue Report. The DG's scoping exercise resulted in the delivery of a collection of documents for the GNSO Council, the wider community, and ICANN staff to review. The [final deliverables](#) consisted of the following:

- Executive Summary – Provides a brief background of the New gTLD Program development and current status, as well as a narrative describing the work undertaken by the DG and the work products developed. Two Annexes are included:
  - Identified Issue Matrix – The DG identified a set of issues, which were then mapped against the Principles, Recommendations, and Implementation Guidance provided in the [2007 GNSO Final Report on the Introduction of New](#)

[gTLDs](#). The intention was to provide guidance for a possible course of action to address each issue (e.g., amend/adjust/supplement existing recommendation, create new recommendation, etc.).

- Draft Charter – The DG developed a draft charter that helps provides the minimum expected scope for a future possible PDP WG. In addition to providing scope, the topics are organized into 5 provisional groupings that may facilitate work.

These deliverables, along with a Request for a Preliminary Issue Report were submitted to the GNSO Council for deliberations during the June 2015 Council meeting, where it was subsequently [approved](#), marking the successful conclusion and closure of the DG.

### **Next Steps**

ICANN staff will use the final deliverables from the DG to serve as the primary basis in preparing the Preliminary Issue Report, which will be published for public comment.

### **Background**

With the application submission period for the 2012 New gTLD round closing in June of that year, the GNSO Council noted that it has a continuing interest and role to play in evaluating the experiences of the 2012 round and proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes that may need to be made to the existing *Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains* policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. As the original policy recommendations as adopted by the GNSO Council and Board of Directors have “been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains,” those policy recommendations remain in place for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program unless the GNSO Council decides to modify them via a policy development process.

The GNSO Council chartered a discussion group to begin that evaluation process and to identify possible areas for future GNSO policy development. The DG reviewed the 2012 round of the new gTLD program and discussed and reflected upon experiences gained. The DG then reported its findings to the GNSO Council where it recommended a set of subjects for further review in a single issue report (a required first step in a policy development process which can result in modification of existing policies or the creation of new policies).

### **More Information**

- [New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group Final Deliverables](#)
- [Discussion Group workspace](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Steve Chan](#), Senior Policy Manager

## At-Large / At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

### At-Large Onboarding Program Launches

#### At a Glance

With a significant increase in the number of accredited At-Large Structures (ALS) and individual members joining the At-Large community over the last several months, an At-Large Onboarding Program is launching this month. The aim of this new staff-initiated program is to facilitate ALS and individual member participation within the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) and to promote policy development activity within At-Large and ICANN.

#### Recent Developments

During the ICANN53, staff formally presented the At-Large Onboarding Program to At-Large community members where it was widely well received.

The At-Large Onboarding Program, which will be held periodically whenever there are a number of new ALSes and individual members, consists of the following activities:

- **Welcome to At-Large Webinars:** A set of two “Welcome to At-Large” webinars will be held with new ALSes’ representatives and individual members. The first webinar will be an informal introduction to At-Large support staff where staff will introduce themselves, explain their roles, and how they can assist the ALSes and individual members, followed by a question and answer session. The second webinar will consist on a formal introduction with the At-Large Chair and Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) Chairs. This webinar will offer new ALS representatives and individual members an opportunity to introduce themselves formally to the At-Large Chair and RALO Chairs, and receive an overview of At-Large and its policy development methods by the Chair, as well as an explanation on how to engage in RALO activities by the RALO Chairs.
- **Additional Assistance:** A special New At-Large Member Skype Chat Helpline aimed at providing additional assistance to new ALS representatives and individual members for a period of three months will be set up to enable new members to liaise with At-Large support staff covering multiple time zones. At the end of the three months, they would be directed to their RALO Skype chats and encouraged to engage with experienced members. This At-Large Member Skype Chat Helpline will be added formally to the ALS accreditation process.
- **New ALS Onboarding documents:** The current ALS onboarding documents, including the ALS Starter Kit and ALS Beginner’s Guide, will be merged and updated by staff to better reflect current At-Large activity. Additionally, the welcome/onboarding

message to new ALS members will be translated into Spanish and French, since it currently only exists in English.

## Next Steps

The inaugural Welcome to At-Large webinar was held on 16 July 2015; representatives from nine At-Large Structures were invited to introduce themselves and to discuss At-Large structural and support issues with members of staff. Subsequently, those same ALS representatives met with the Chair of the ALAC and the RALO Chairs as part of a more formalized first-step into At-Large activities.

## Background

One of the main focuses of RALOs is, and always has been, outreach. RALO leaders and staff work hard together to ensure that organizations or associations across the world with similar goals to those of the ICANN community know about At-Large and are motivated to be part of it. In order to manage this, they need to gain the ALS status and be supported during the engagement phase of their At-Large activities.

## More Information

[Why register as an At-Large Structure?](#)

## Staff Contact

[Nathalie Peregrine](#), Secretariat Operations Coordinator, At-Large & GNSO

---

## At-Large Website Revamp: ICANN53 Update

### At a Glance

At-Large community members greatly appreciated the live demonstration of the alpha version of the new At-Large website. They commented positively on the progress, enjoyed the user experience, and provided a large amount of valuable feedback.

### Recent Developments

During ICANN53, a 45-minute session was held on the At-Large Website Revamp project featuring a live demonstration of the alpha version of the [new At Large community website](#). An interactive pie chart on the alpha homepage provides visitors a visual representation of ALAC policy advice since 2003 on 18 key issues impacting Internet users, including WHOIS, IDN, and New gTLDs. Visitors can click on each slice of the pie and be directed to a dedicated page to learn the basics about a given issue, read its latest news and developments, and track the history of ALAC advice on the issue.

The new At-Large site will also integrate with the [ICANN Public Comment page](#). Corresponding to a given public comment period, a 'Policy Detail' page on the At-Large website will be created automatically with metadata pertinent to the public comment period.



If the ALAC wishes to issue a statement on a public comment proceeding, ALAC staff will be able to customize that page to help visitors understand why and how the statement is made, to record the statement's development milestones, and to direct interested visitors to the ALAC wiki workspace to get involved in the process. Once a Statement is final, ALAC staff will be able to upload a PDF document for visitors to download and will also be able to submit the Statement to public comment with one click.

At-Large community members commented on the user experience of the policy section on the website. They were pleased to see how the site will improve the policy management process system and facilitate the participation from both newcomers and experienced members in providing policy advice to ICANN.

Another highlight of the live demonstration was the interactive map on the alpha homepage. Visitors can view the number of At-Large Structures (ALSes) in individual countries and click on a country to conduct research on individual ALSes. The map can also switch into the 'RALO' view, which provides visitors a gateway to the future homepage of each Regional At-Large Organization in the website.

Two other pages were also shown to the community: 1) an At-Large Calendar page that allows users to browse and download At-Large meetings and events to their own Google Calendars, and 2) a Policy Summary page that enables users to search ALAC Policy Advice Statements based on topics, stakeholders, and other filter values.

During the live demonstration, community members were pleased to see the progress. They spent time interacting with the site and provided a large amount of valuable feedback. They emphasized the importance of keeping historical data, creating a document depository, having a translation strategy, showcasing individual members on the map, and presenting multimedia resources among other requirements. Several At-Large community members also volunteered to join the At-Large Website Revamp Taskforce, offering to help in the next stage of development of the new site.

### **Next Steps**

The next stage of website development will focus on the remaining site sections, including the About page, Get Involved, Working Group section, and RALO homepages. The At-Large Website Revamp Taskforce will be expanded to include more community members for gathering additional information and insights. In the autumn, a webinar on the new At-Large website will be organized to help At-Large community members understand how the new site will facilitate their work in At-Large and in ICANN. The beta site is scheduled to launch at ICANN54.

### **More Information**

- [New At-Large Website \(In Development\)](#)
- [At-Large Website Revamp Taskforce Workspace](#)

## Staff Contact

[Xinyue \(Ariel\) Liang](#), Policy Analyst

---

## ALAC/At-Large Achievements from ICANN53

### Activities

The ALAC and At-Large community held [29 meetings at ICANN53](#), which resulted in many [Action Items](#). The ALAC unanimously passed the [ALAC Motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions \(CWG-Stewardship\)](#).

The ALAC also moved towards a consensus on the ALAC/At-Large position on CCWG-Accountability. The ALAC submitted its [contribution](#) to the public comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability) on 12 June 2015.

The ALAC and RALO leaders started the process to review ALS criteria and expectations, and how the ALAC and RALOs should be interacting with ALSes. The ALAC Leadership Team (ALT) and ALAC Finance and Budget Sub-Committee agreed to develop a roadmap identifying the schedule for RALO General Assemblies and the third At-Large Summit.

### More Information

Additional information on ALAC/At-Large activities at ICANN53 is available on the [workspace](#), which includes the At-Large meeting schedule and agendas, reports, actions and action items.

### Staff Contacts

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

[Silvia Vivanco](#), Manager, At-Large Regional Affairs

---

## ALAC Unanimously Adopts Motion on Final IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal and Submits Two Statements

### At a Glance

During ICANN53, the ALAC unanimously passed a motion to adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship). The ALAC submitted additional comments accompanying the motion.

Furthermore, two ALAC statements in response to public comment requests were drafted during ICANN53. In the interest of time, those statements were submitted pending ALAC ratification.

## Recent Developments

### [ALAC Motion to Adopt the Final Transition Proposal of the Cross Community Working Group on Naming-Related Functions \(CWG-Stewardship\)](#)

- The ALAC co-charted the CWG-Stewardship effort and with the support of its Members and Participants on the CWG-Stewardship, as well as other interested parties, the ALAC duly considered the CWG-Stewardship Final Proposal dated 11 June 2015.
- The ALAC believes that the Final Proposal is significantly dependent and expressly conditioned on the implementation of ICANN-level accountability mechanisms by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability). If any element of these ICANN level accountability mechanisms is not implemented as contemplated by the CWG-Stewardship proposal, this CWG-Stewardship proposal will require revision and re-approval by the ALAC.
- The ALAC approves the CWG-Stewardship Final Proposal and its submission to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group and wishes to record the following comments:
  - The selection of the two Post-Transition IANA (PTI) Board members by the Nominating Committee or similar mechanism should attempt to address geographic diversity without sacrificing competence.
  - The success of PTI will be contingent on ICANN ensuring adequate operational and R&D funding as well as other resources.
- The ALAC reaffirms its commitment to continue to support the CWG-Stewardship in any and all follow-on activities related to the submission of this report.

### [ALAC Statement on the GNSO Privacy & Proxy \(P/P\) Services Accreditation Issues Working Group Initial Report](#)

- The ALAC agrees that all contact requests must be forwarded, including: Those required under the RAA, and from ICANN; all requests from law enforcement agencies and other third parties alleging domain name abuse. The ALAC asserts that requests from law enforcement agencies and ‘other third parties alleging domain name abuse’ should include government agencies (in the jurisdiction of the P/P provider) charged with the regulation of potentially criminal behaviour and/or consumer deprecations. It should be left up to individual P/P providers as to whether other contact requests are forwarded (possibly excepting spam, etc.). The ALAC recommends that the classes of such contacts subject be clearly stated and published in the provider’s terms of service.
- According to the ALAC, it should be left up to the individual provider as to the circumstances in which a contact request will be forwarded by other means. Equally, it should be left to the provider as to whether they are prepared to use other means to contact the customer and whether they are prepared to absorb the costs. In general terms, however, the cost should be on the party making a contact request. In any event, persistent failure to reach a customer by means properly noted in the terms of service should trigger re-verification of customer’s contact by the provider in keeping with existing terms of the RAA. If the matter involves potentially serious criminal behaviour or

serious misuse of the DNS, law enforcement agencies can become involved. In other cases, dispute resolution processes such as the UDRP can be used.

- According to the ALAC, it should be mandatory for accredited P/P service providers to comply with express requests from law enforcement agencies in the provider's jurisdiction not to notify a customer.
- If misuse of the DNS and/or illegal activity has been proven, most likely other and more severe responses will have been made including termination of use of the domain name by the party providing the privacy or proxy service.
- With regard to unwarranted publication of personal details, depending on the facts of each case, ALAC states there may be compensation for damage caused by a breach of contract through civil means. ICANN Compliance must be notified since such breach may also amount to a breach of the Specification.
- It should be up to individual providers on how they handle contact requests from third parties, as long as the customer is informed of the individual provider's policies on this issue.
- Proxy services can be provided by a registrant who, in turn, licenses the use of the domain name to their customer; it is the registrant's details that appear in the WHOIS database rather than the proxy service customer. The ALAC says in those circumstances, it may be possible for registrars (and their affiliates and resellers) to include in contracts with their customers (registrants), a requirement that if the registrant provides a proxy service, they will comply with the Specification. In that way, enforcement of specification requirements can be through that contractual arrangement.

#### [ALAC Statement on the Proposed Schedule and Process/Operational Improvements for AoC and Organizational Reviews](#)

- While this is the second review of At-Large, it is the first opportunity to review the RALO and At-Large Structures, which were not in place at the time of the first review, and it is now timely to review.
- Given the very heavy demands that have been placed on the time of ALAC volunteers in responding to the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function to ICANN, the ALAC says the extension of time of this review is very welcome. The extended timeframe will allow a period for self-assessment of key ALAC players, as well as participation of all the RALOs in identifying questions that should be part of the review, and key individuals whose insights and experience will be critical to the review. It will also allow time to assess the effectiveness of recommendations coming out of At-Large.
- That input will provide a clearer framework in which an independent examiner can be selected.

## More Information

[At-Large Policy Development page](#)

## Staff Contact

[Xinyue \(Ariel\) Liang](#), Policy Analyst

# Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)

## GAC Concludes ICANN53 Meetings

### At a Glance

ICANN53 was a positive and productive meeting for the GAC. In addition to CWG-Stewardship matters, the GAC focused on remaining issues regarding prior advice on safeguards and noted progress in the work of a number of GAC Working Groups.

### Recent Developments

The CWG-Stewardship outcome was high on the GAC's agenda at ICANN53. The GAC also paid special attention to issues related to previous advice, including, among other items, safeguards for new gTLDs. The GAC also advanced its handling of notification requests for country and territory names at the second level.

Currently, GAC working groups cover the following areas: Protection of Geographic Names, Public Safety, Underserved Regions, GAC Relations with the Nominating Committee, Human Rights and International Law, Government and IGO Engagement, plus Review of GAC Operating Principles. Various GAC working groups held information sessions for the community or reported on progress or had their terms of reference adopted.

The GAC also welcomed Kiribati and Mauritius as new members, bringing the total number of Members to 152 - plus 32 IGOs as observers.

### Next Steps

In preparation for ICANN54, the GAC agreed to minor amendments to its Operating Principles that will enable the election of up to five Vice-Chairs.

## More Information

[GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué](#)

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Senior Director, GAC Relations

[Karine Perset](#), GAC Relations Advisor

[Julia Charvolen](#), Senior Coordinator, GAC Services

---

## GAC Endorses CWG-Stewardship Final Proposal

### At a Glance

The GAC prioritized its consideration of the CWG-Stewardship final proposal at ICANN53, becoming the first chartering organization to state its support for forwarding the proposal to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG).

### Recent Developments

On 24 June 2015, after discussion and drafting sessions, the GAC announced its support for submission of CWG-Stewardship final proposal to the ICG.

This support was carefully worded: “The GAC notes and recognizes the provisions of paragraph 106 of the CWG Final Proposal which states that the CWG-Stewardship proposal is significantly dependent and expressly conditioned on the implementation of ICANN-level accountability mechanisms by the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability). If any element of these ICANN level accountability mechanisms is not implemented as contemplated by the CWG-Stewardship proposal, this CWG-Stewardship proposal will require revision.”

Following the GAC’s statement, the other chartering organizations issued similar support declarations, thereby enabling the process to advance.

### Next Steps

As highlighted by the GAC, there are dependencies related to the outcome of the CCWG-Accountability. This work remains a high priority for the GAC, and GAC members are currently providing replies to a set of questions agreed upon at ICANN53 in order to inform the further progress of this work.

### More Information

- [GAC website](#)
- [GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué](#)

### Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Senior Director, GAC Relations

[Karine Perset](#), GAC Relations Advisor

[Julia Charvolen](#), Senior Coordinator, GAC Services

## Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

### RSSAC at ICANN53

RSSAC members actively participated at ICANN53, holding three work sessions, a public session, and various meetings with community groups and ICANN senior staff. The work sessions enabled the RSSAC to make significant progress on key issues relating to administration, planning and caucus development, as well as planning for its first workshop.

The two RSSAC co-chairs participated in the various community leader sessions and met with the ICANN Fellows and chief technology officer, David Conrad. The RSSAC met with the Chairs of the CCWG-Accountability and clarified its concerns regarding the recent CCWG-Accountability proposal. Finally, the RSSAC and SSAC held a joint meeting.

During its public session, the RSSAC briefed the community on the implementation status of RSSAC002: Advisory on Measurements of Root Server System, as well as the ongoing work of the Root Zone TTLs Work Party.

### New Work Party Launches

The RSSAC also appointed Joe Abley and Suzanne Woolf as the leaders for a new work party investigating the pros and cons of renaming the root servers, as well as the pros and cons with signing the root-servers.net zone with DNSSEC.

### More Information

[RSSAC Public Session](#)

### Staff Contact

[Carlos Reyes](#), Policy Specialist

## Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

### SSAC Publishes Comments on Cross-Community Working Group Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements

#### At a Glance

On 5 June 2015, the SSAC published [SAC071: SSAC Comments on Cross Community Working Group Proposal on ICANN Accountability Enhancements](#).

#### Recent Developments and Next Steps

The SSAC notes that it has no comment at this time on the rationale for the Reference Mechanism (Section 5.1.2 of the Proposal), but makes the following observation and request concerning the role of the SSAC in any proposed new structure. According to its Charter, the role of the SSAC is to “advise 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 neither been given nor sought any standing for its advice other than that it be evaluated on its merits and adopted (or not) according to that evaluation by the affected parties. The SSAC believes that this purely advisory role is the one to which it is best suited, and asks the CCWG–Accountability to take this into account in its review of the options described in Section 5.1.2 of the Proposal.

In its comments the SSAC further notes that it has no comment at this time on whether or not a legal structure is required or desirable to compel ICANN and the Board of Directors to respond to the SSAC’s advice. However, the SSAC is concerned about the way in which the proposed new SO/AC membership model might affect the way in which the SSAC operates, considering its narrow focus on security and stability matters and its reluctance to become involved in issues outside that remit. The SSAC expects that the community will adopt an organizational structure that recognizes the role and importance of high–quality expert advice on security and stability.

Finally, the SSAC notes the relatively short time available for consideration of the draft proposal, driven by a timeline set by external events such as the expiration of the contract between NTIA and ICANN related to IANA. Accordingly, the SSAC reserves the right to make additional comments as further details are developed.

### **Background**

In Section 5.1.2 of the CCWG–Accountability Proposal, “Influence in the Community Mechanism,” the CCWG notes that it considered three mechanisms for allocating votes to Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs), and that the “Reference Mechanism” was the “most supported approach.” The Reference Mechanism allocates five votes to every AC and SO except SSAC and RSSAC, which are allocated 2 votes each.

The CCWG provides the following rationale for preferring the Reference Mechanism to the two alternatives that it considered:

“b. The reasons to allocate a lower number of ‘votes’ to SSAC in the Reference Mechanism is that it is a specific construct within ICANN designed to provide expertise on security and stability, rather than a group representing a community of stakeholders.”

At the end of Section 5.1.2, the CCWG asks:

“What guidance, if any, would you provide to the CCWG–Accountability regarding the proposed options related to the relative influence of the various groups in the community mechanism? Please provide the underlying rationale in terms of required accountability features or protection against certain contingencies.”

### **More Information**

- [SSAC Web Site](#)
- [SSAC Publications](#)



## Staff Contact

[Steve Sheng](#), Director, SSAC and RSSAC Advisories Development Support

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

---

## SSAC Publishes Comment on the Cross-Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal

### At a Glance

On 24 June 2015, the SSAC published [SSAC Comment on the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions Proposal](#).

### Recent Developments and Next Steps

In its comment, the SSAC finds that the recommendations in *SAC069: SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition* are satisfied by the Cross-Community Working Group (CWG) proposal. The SSAC:

1. Thanks the CWG for its hard work on developing its proposal for consideration by the chartering organizations;
2. Wishes to continue to participate in the dialogue until the CWG work officially concludes;
3. Approves the CWG Proposal (11 June 2015 version), with the following comments:
  - a. SAC069 Recommendation 6 calls for effective arrangements to be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the Root Zone Management Process post-transition. The SSAC believes that post-transition, it will be important to conduct the study recommended by the Proposal to investigate whether there is a need to increase (and if so, how) the robustness of the operational arrangements for making changes to the root zone content to reduce or eliminate single points of failure.
  - b. SAC069 Recommendation 2 calls on each of the communities to review and (if necessary) enhance its policy development process to ensure that all of the instructions that it provides to the IANA Functions Operator are clear and implementable. The SSAC believes that the Framework of Interpretation Working Group's Final Report should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible by ICANN.
  - c. SAC069 Recommendation 6 calls for effective arrangements to be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the Root Zone Management Process post-transition. The SSAC seeks the following clarifications regarding the standing committee to evaluate the changes to the Root Zone Management

- Architecture and Operation: 1) whether the standing committee's recommendations are binding and 2) how they relate to the formal advice issued by the advisory committees, especially if the two are in conflict.
- d. SAC069 Recommendation 6 calls for effective arrangements to be made for the reliable and timely performance of all aspects of the Root Zone Management Process post-transition, and Recommendation 7 specifically calls on NTIA to clarify the processes and legal framework associated with the role of the Root Zone Maintainer. As current agreements among the Root Zone Management partners include the NTIA, failing to put revised or new agreements in place prior to transition would seriously jeopardize the stability of the Root Zone Management Process.
4. Understands that the CWG-Stewardship Final Proposal is dependent on the ICANN-level accountability mechanisms being developed by the CCWG-Accountability (Work Stream 1), and that these mechanisms will need to be:
    - a. Adopted by the Board of Directors;
    - b. Accepted by the CWG; and
    - c. Implemented before the transition—or, if not implemented beforehand, subjected to an irrevocable commitment of such implementation to be complete within a reasonable time period after the transition, conforming to best practices and preserving the security and stability of the domain name system.
  5. Welcomes and will consider the CWG's invitation to SSAC to participate in the following proposed post-transition IANA structures:
    - a. Standing Committee on Root Zone Management Architecture and Operation
    - b. IANA Functions Review Team
    - c. Customer Standing Committee
    - d. Separation Process Working Group

### **Background**

On 11 June 2015, the CWG on Naming Related Functions produced the Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition.

Several SSAC members participated in the development of the CWG proposal. As a chartering organization of the CWG, the SSAC is required to review and approve the Proposal. To do that, it conducted an analysis of the CWG proposal and SAC 069: SSAC Advisory on Maintaining the Security and Stability of the IANA Functions Through the Stewardship Transition.

## More Information

- [SSAC Web Site](#)
- [SSAC Publications](#)

## Staff Contact

[Steve Sheng](#), Director, SSAC and RSSAC Advisories Development Support

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

#####