



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

Volume 12, Issue 3 – April 2012

## **Across ICANN**

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

## **ccNSO**

[ccNSO Chair and Vice-Chairs Selected for One-Year Terms](#)

[Longtime ccNSO Councilor Patricio Poblete Steps Down With Thanks](#)

[Framework of Interpretation Working Group Issues Final Report on Obtaining and Documenting Consent](#)

[Typology of Country and Territory Names Adopted](#)

[Nauru and Timor-Leste Join ccNSO](#)

[Preliminary Survey Results Indicate ccTLD Financial and In-Kind Contributions Higher Than Reported](#)

[Informal Group to Study ccNSO Volunteer Needs and Resources](#)

[ccNSO Members Laud Sessions on Regulatory and Legislative Issues, New gTLD Program and Finance Update](#)

[Costa Rica Activities Captured in Video and Photos](#)

## **GNSO**

[Significant Progress Reported on Registrar Accreditation Agreement Negotiations](#)

[GNSO Recommends Additional Protections of Certain Names in New gTLD Program – Board Reacts](#)

[Advancing Outreach at ICANN](#)

[GNSO Working Group Addresses ICANN Board Request for Consumer Metrics](#)

[Council and Board Address Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#)

[“Thick” Whois Policy Development Process Initiated But Not Starting Yet](#)

[Call for Volunteers for “Domain Name Locking Subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP” Working Group](#)

## **ASO**

[Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Address Blocks Submitted to ICANN Board for Ratification](#)

## **Joint Efforts**

[Joint SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Publishes Final Report](#)

## **At-Large**

[The At-Large Community Expands to 142 At-Large Structures](#)

[Policy and Project Achievements Highlight At-Large in Costa Rica](#)

[ALAC Approved Many Policy Statements, Comments and Communications in 2012 to Date](#)

## **SSAC**

[Issues Active in the SSAC](#)

## **GAC**

[Where to Find GAC Information](#)

---

## 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 [web site](#) and 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.

**[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 currently open on issues of interest to the ICANN community. Act now to share your views on such topics as:

- [Interim Report on Support from Significantly Interested Parties for ccTLD Delegation or Redelegation Requests](#). The Framework of Interpretation Working Group published draft recommendations on how to document consent from the local Internet community for the delegation or redelegation of ccTLDs. Reply period closes 20 April 2012.
- [Fake Renewal Notices Report](#). This report details the findings of a survey of registrars regarding the complaints they receive about fake domain name renewal notices, and provides recommendations for next steps. Comment period closes 20 April 2012.

- [ICANN Board Conflicts of Interest Review – Revised Conflicts of Interest Policy and Related Governance Documents](#). Reply period closes 24 April 2012.
- [.com Registry Agreement Renewal](#). Verisign’s proposed agreement for renewal of its 2006 contract with ICANN. Comment period closes 26 April 2012.
- [Second Annual IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process Review](#). An opportunity for participants in the Fast Track Process to provide feedback on their experience. Comment period closes 30 April 2012.
- [IDN Variant Issues Project – Proposed Project Plan for Next Steps](#). The proposed plan outlines eight projects related to performing feasibility studies on certain types of variants and developing tools, processes, and protocols to support specific solutions. Reply period closes 29 April 2012.
- [Review of the ASO](#). The results of an independent review of the ASO are posted for review and comment. Reply period closes 30 April 2012.
- [Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS Review Team \(SSR RT\) – Draft Report](#). The SSR RT, constituted under the Affirmation of Commitments, published its Draft Report and Recommendations. Reply period closes 7 May 2012.
- [Draft Advice Letter on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition](#). The GNSO’s Consumer Metrics Working Group requests feedback on how to measure consumer trust, choice, and competition after implementation of the New gTLD Program. Comment period closes 8 May 2012.
- [.post Agreement Amendment](#). The Universal Postal Union requests the ability to register previously-reserved IANA domain strings (like biz, com and uk) at the second level. Comment period closes 9 May 2012.

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

## ccNSO Chair and Vice-Chairs Selected for One-Year Terms



### At a Glance

*ccNSO Council re-confirms Lesley Cowley as ccNSO Chair and appoints two Vice-Chairs.*

### Recent Developments

At the ccNSO Council meeting in Costa Rica on the 14 March 2012, the ccNSO Council re-appointed Lesley Cowley, .uk as ccNSO Chair.

Byron Holland, .ca was re-appointed as one of the two Vice-Chairs.

Keith Davidson, .nz took on the role as the second Vice-Chair, after Hiro Hotta, .jp, who decided to step down from the position. The Council thanked Hiro for his dedication to its work during the last years and welcomed Keith into his new position.

### Next Steps

The Chair & Vice Chairs are appointed for a one-year term.

### Background

The Council meeting in Costa Rica was the ccNSO Council annual general meeting, where Chair and Vice-Chair selections are performed.

### More Information

- [ccNSO Council meeting minutes Costa Rica](#) [PDF, 112 KB]
- [ccNSO Council Members](#)

### Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## Longtime ccNSO Councilor Patricio Poblete Steps Down With Thanks



**Photo 1 - Lesley Cowley, ccNSO Chair, thanks Patricio Poblete, .cl, for his service.**

### At a Glance

*Patricio Poblete of .cl steps down from ccNSO Council after serving for seven years.*

### Recent Developments

The Council meeting in Costa Rica, 14 March 2012, was the last one for Patricio Poblete as a Councilor. He decided not to re-stand for the position, noting that he thought it

was time to leave space for new faces. Council members thanked Patricio for his long and engaged service to the ccNSO and expressed their hope he would stay active in the work of the ccNSO in the future.

### Next Steps

Margarita Valdes, .cl, is taking over Patricio's position, representing the Latin American & Caribbean region. The Council warmly welcomed her into her new role.

### Background

The departure of Patricio from the ccNSO Council is historic, as he was an active founder of the ccNSO and was a member of the very first ccNSO Council (formed in 2004). Patricio was also a Councilor of the ccNSO Council's predecessor, the DNSO (Domain Name Supporting Organization) Council.

### More Information

- [Former ccNSO Councils](#)

### Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

# Framework of Interpretation Working Group Issues

## Final Report on Obtaining and Documenting Consent

### At a Glance

*The Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOI WG) recommendations on obtaining and documenting consent for ccTLD delegations and redelegations were submitted to the ICANN Board for approval.*

### Recent Developments

The FOI WG has completed its Final Report on obtaining and documenting consent from proposed and/or incumbent operators for ccTLD delegations and redelegations. At ICANN 43 in Costa Rica, both the GAC and ccNSO expressed their support for the recommendations. The Chair of the ccNSO submitted the Final Report to the ICANN Board of Directors.

The WG has also consulted the ccTLD community on obtaining and documenting support for requests of delegation and re-delegation by Significantly Interested Parties (also referred to as the Local Internet Community). Examples of Significantly Interested Parties are the relevant public authority, and registrars in the affected country.

### Next Steps

The FOI WG will publish its Final Report on Significant Interested Parties prior to the Prague meeting, and publish an Interim Report on its third topic – re-delegation without consent.

### Background

The objective of the FOI WG is to develop and propose a Framework of Interpretation for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on the interpretation of the current policies and guidelines pertaining to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. Having a framework can foster consistent and predictable decisions while enhancing accountability and transparency for all stakeholders.

The scope of the FOI WG also clearly specifies that:

- Any proposal to amend, update or change the Policy Statements is outside the scope of the FOI WG.
- The IANA functions contract between the U.S. Government and ICANN (including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it) is also outside the scope of the FOI WG's work.

The FOI WG is looking at five topics individually and in the following order:

1. Obtaining and documenting consent for delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.
2. Obtaining and documenting support for delegation and redelegation requests from Significantly Interested Parties (sometimes referred to as Local Internet Community or LIC).
3. Developing recommendations for "un-consented" redelegations.
4. Developing a comprehensive glossary of the terms used for the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.
5. Developing recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and redelegation.

### More Information

- [Framework of Interpretation WG Web Page](#)

### Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor

---

## Typology of Country and Territory Names Adopted

### At a Glance

*The ccNSO Study Group on use of country names as TLDs has adopted a typology to categorize different types of country and territory names.*

### Recent Developments

Since ICANN 42 in Dakar, the ccNSO Study Group on use of country and territory names has been working on a typology of country and territory names. At the Costa Rica meeting the study group officially adopted this typology. It is a summary of different types of country and territory names (country names in full or short form, country name in foreign languages, etc.). It will be used in further work of the study group and as a basis of a survey by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

### Next Steps

UNESCO will conduct a test survey among its member states to test the process of the survey and the typology. Survey results are scheduled to be available at or shortly after the ICANN 44 Public Meeting in Prague in June 2012. For the duration of the survey, the study group will analyze the current set of rules for the selection and delegation of TLDs, to identify issues, if any, with respect to the rules, if a TLD would be applied for that represents the name of a country or territory.

The study group will present its progress to the broader community at ICANN 44 in Prague.

## Background

The Study Group's goal is to provide the ccNSO Council, ccTLD community and other interested stakeholders, including the GAC and GNSO Council, with an overview of the scope and issues associated with the use of Country and Territory names as TLD strings and the scope and impact of alternative action paths on IDN ccTLD and new gTLD processes.

## More Information

- [Study Group web page](#)

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor

---

## Nauru and Timor-Leste Join ccNSO

### At a Glance

*The country code operators for Nauru and Timor-Leste were approved as ccNSO members in March.*

### Recent Developments

CENPAC NET, the ccTLD operator of .nr (Nauru) and the Ministry of Infrastructure Information and Technology Division, the manager of the .tl (Timor-Leste) ccTLD, have joined as the latest ccNSO members. Nauru is an island in the South Pacific Ocean, south of the Marshall Islands. Timor-Leste is in Southeastern Asia, northwest of Australia in the Lesser Sunda Islands at the eastern end of the Indonesian archipelago.

There are now a total of 127 ccNSO members.

## More Information

- [List of ccNSO members](#)
- [ccNSO Membership Growth 2003-2011](#) [PDF, 61 KB]
- [Announcement for .tl](#)
- [Announcement for .nr](#)
- [ccNSO Membership Application](#)

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## **Preliminary Survey Results Indicate ccTLD Financial and In-Kind Contributions Higher Than Reported**

### **At a Glance**

*At the Costa Rica meeting the ccNSO Finance Working Group presented preliminary results of its survey on ccTLD contributions to ICANN.*

### **Recent Developments**

Since the Dakar the ccNSO Finance WG conducted a survey to:

- Gather insights that will help the ccNSO Finance WG better understand existing ccTLD contributions to ICANN.
- Address which contribution models may be acceptable to the ccTLD community.

After an initial analysis by the WG the initial findings were presented to the ccTLD community present, the ICANN Board of Directors and the GAC. The initial findings were:

1. The ccTLDs that use the least amount of ICANN services make the largest financial contributions.
2. The financial contribution of a ccTLD is independent of a formal arrangement between ICANN and ccTLD. Or in statistical terms: There is no correlation between financial contribution of a ccTLD and a formal arrangement between ICANN and ccTLDs.
3. The ccTLD financial contributions disclosed by ICANN are materially less than the actual financial and non-financial contributions made by the ccTLD community.

### **Next Steps**

The WG will further analyze the data and present a full report to the community at the ICANN 44 Public Meeting in June.

### **Background**

The purpose of this WG is twofold:

1. To discuss with ICANN the amounts attributed to ccTLDs and a methodology that individual ccTLDs can use to calculate a fair and equitable voluntary financial contribution, including proposing such a methodology to the ccTLD community.
2. To coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of ccTLD managers in the financial aspects of ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes.

The scope of the activities of the WG is “to do whatever it deems relevant and necessary while taking into account the current ccTLD contribution guidelines, ICANN's expense area group analysis, and yearly overviews of ccTLD contributions.”

### **More Information**

- [Finance Working Group web page](#)
- [Preliminary results of the survey](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor

---

## **Informal Group to Study ccNSO Volunteer Needs and Resources**

### **At a Glance**

*The ccNSO Council established an informal Council Study Group to advise on ways to balance workload and volunteer capacity.*

### **Recent Developments**

The ccNSO Council and chairs of the ccNSO Working Groups reviewed and updated the ccNSO Workplan for March 2012-March 2014. The Council noted that currently the ccNSO is at full capacity of its volunteers and therefore must find ways to influence the balance between anticipated workload and capacity (for example, by prioritization of work or engaging more volunteers). The ccNSO Council will set up an informal study group to advise the Council on further steps to balance the anticipated increase in workload with the capacity of ccNSO volunteers.

### **Next Steps**

The informal study group is expected to present its findings to the ccNSO Council at ICANN 44 Public Meeting in Prague in June 2012.

### **Background**

As a result of the ccNSO improvement process, the ccNSO Council has adopted practice of reviewing and updating its work plan on a yearly basis. The 2012 work plan was adopted by the ccNSO Council and now includes elements of project resource loading.

### **More Information**

- [2012-2014 ccNSO work plan](#)

## Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), Senior Policy Advisor

---

# ccNSO Members Laud Sessions on Regulatory and Legislative Issues, New gTLD Program and Finance Update

## At a Glance

*The results of the ccNSO Meeting Evaluation survey have been tallied and published.*

## Recent Developments

The results of the ccNSO Meeting Evaluation, which is traditionally conducted after days one and two of ccNSO meetings, have now been published. The sessions that received the top three scores were the Regulatory & Legislative session, the panel discussion on new GTLDs and the Finance Working Group update.

## Next Steps

The ccNSO Programme Working Group analyzed the survey results and is working on some improvements, as suggested by the respondents. It is also basing future agendas to a great extent on the replies and scores received in the surveys.

Another goal is to try to get more respondents to reply to the surveys, as the current rate still is considered too low to be fully representative.

## Background

The survey is an important tool for the ccNSO Programme Working Group to find out how the ccTLD community assessed the various meeting sessions and what improvements can be made.

## More Information

- [Survey results](#)

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## Costa Rica Activities Captured in Video and Photos

### At a Glance

*Highlights from the ccNSO meetings, activities and impressions during ICANN 43 in Costa Rica can be viewed on YouTube and Flickr.*

### Recent Developments

The ccNSO Secretariat has uploaded a ccNSO Meeting movie from the Costa Rica meeting and has published photos on its Flickr page.

### Background

It has become a tradition that the ccNSO Secretariat is trying to capture the events at every ICANN meeting in a short film and on its Flickr page. Both have become a well-received post-meeting element within the community.

### More Information

- [ccNSO Costa Rica Meeting movie](#)
- [ccNSO YouTube channel](#)
- [ccNSO Flickr page](#)

### Staff Contact

[Gabiella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

**GNSO**

---

## Significant Progress Reported on Registrar Accreditation Agreement Negotiations

### At a Glance

*In Costa Rica, a [Status Report](#) [PDF, 117 KB] on the bilateral negotiations between ICANN staff and the registrar's negotiation team detailed significant progress in the bilateral negotiations to identify amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). Negotiations are focused on advancement of the twin goals of protecting registrants and ensuring greater security, and incorporate recommendations developed by law enforcement agencies and the broader Internet community.*

## Background

In 2009, the GNSO Council embarked on a collaborative process with ALAC regarding future amendments to the RAA. As part of this process, a joint GNSO/ALAC drafting team was formed (known as the RAA Drafting Team) to conduct further work related to proposals for improvements to the RAA. The RAA Drafting Team reviewed proposals from the law enforcement community, the Intellectual Property Constituency, as well as other stakeholders, seeking to enhance the RAA. The RAA Drafting Team published a [Final Report](#) in October 2010 that identified potential topics for additional RAA amendments, as well as a proposal for next steps for the GNSO Council to consider in determining whether to recommend a new form of RAA.

In Dakar (October 2011), the ICANN Board directed negotiations on the RAA to commence immediately, and called for proposed amendments to be provided for consideration at ICANN's meeting in Costa Rica in March 2012. The negotiations included the law enforcement and GNSO working group recommendations as well as other topics that would advance the twin goals of registrant protection and DNS stability. The ICANN Board also requested the creation of an Issue Report to undertake a GNSO policy development process (PDP) as quickly as possible to address remaining items suited for a PDP. The Registrars Stakeholder Group and ICANN are currently in active negotiations on the proposed amendments to the RAA.

## Recent Developments

Early last month, ICANN staff published a [Final Issue Report](#) [PDF, 542 KB] in response to the Board request to address the proposed amendments to the RAA. The Final Issue Report recommends that the GNSO Council commence the Board mandated policy development process (PDP) immediately upon the conclusion of the negotiations. The report is a required step before the commencement of a PDP by the GNSO Council on any remaining amendment topics that are unaddressed upon the conclusion of these negotiations.

In advance of the ICANN Public Meeting in Costa Rica, ICANN and the Registrar Negotiation Team prepared a [Summary](#) [PDF, 117 KB] of the negotiations on the RAA to inform the ICANN community of the status of the negotiations. After the Board directed ICANN and the Registrars to proceed into negotiations regarding [recommendations by law enforcement](#) and recommendations from the GNSO, negotiations proceeded at a brisk pace. Thirteen negotiation sessions were held prior to the Costa Rica Public Meeting. The Summary of Negotiations indicates that there are many topics where ICANN and the Registrar Negotiation Team are close to agreement on language, and even more topics where there is agreement in principle. Because of the comprehensive nature of the amendments, it is expected that all negotiated language will be posted as a unified document after further negotiation.

## More Information

- For more information on the staff recommendations, please review the [Final Issue Report](#) [PDF, 542 KB]
- The [announcement](#) for the [Summary](#) of Negotiations [PDF, 117 KB]
- [Information on the Costa Rica Session on the RAA Progress Report and WHOIS validation Workshop](#)
- The ICANN [RAA Community wiki](#) describing the current status of the negotiations
- [ICANN Board's Dakar resolution on the RAA](#)
- [Final Report on Improvements to the RAA](#) [PDF, 6.8 MB]

## Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## GNSO Recommends Additional Protections for Certain Names in New gTLD Program – Board Reacts

### At a Glance

*The GNSO Council recommended to the Board expansion of available protection for certain International Olympic Committee and Red Cross/Red Crescent names (“IOC/RCRC”) for implementation in the first round of new gTLD applications. The ICANN Board has determined to make no changes to the Applicant Guidebook at this time.*

### Recent Developments

After the Costa Rica Meeting, the GNSO Council held a special meeting to approve the GNSO Drafting Team’s recommendations to provide additional protections for certain IOC/RCRC names at the top-level that were developed in collaboration with the GAC. This special meeting was convened in order to enable the Board to approve them on an expedited basis for implementation during the initial application round scheduled to close on 12 April 2012.

The GNSO IOC/RCRC Drafting Team opened a public comment period on its proposal to extend protection of the IOC/RCRC names on 2 March 2012.

On 10 April, the ICANN Board acknowledged receipt of the GNSO's recommendations but chose not to make any changes to the Applicant Guidebook (see [Resolutions 2012.04.10.NG4 and NG5](#)).

## **Background**

In Singapore, the ICANN Board adopted Resolution 2011.06.20.01(b), providing for “incorporation of text [in the Applicant Guidebook] concerning protection for specific requested Red Cross and IOC names for the top-level only during the initial application round, until the GNSO and GAC develop policy advice based on the global public interest.”

ICANN staff implemented this Resolution in Section 2.2.1.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook, which places a temporary moratorium on new gTLD applicants from registering certain Red Cross/Red Crescent and International Olympic Committee names during the initial gTLD application round, by extending limited protection to identical matches of certain RCRC and IOC terms at the top-level only. These names are protected in the initial round of new gTLD applications until such time as the Board receives and adopts any policy advice from the GNSO Council.

Responding to the Board resolution, the GAC sent a proposal to the GNSO Council to provide permanent protection for certain RCRC/IOC names at both the top level and second level for new gTLDs. In response to the GAC proposal, the GNSO established a Drafting Team to evaluate various proposals for extending protection of the IOC/RCRC names.

The GNSO-adopted recommendations would have extended protection of certain IOC/RCRC names by establishing them as “modified reserved names,” which differs from the current temporary moratorium in that they could be delegated by their respective organizations. The GNSO Council also recommended that a string similarity review be conducted on these IOC/RCRC names, and that there be a mechanism to allow for delegation of a similar string under specific circumstances. These recommendations were intended by the GNSO Council to be implemented in the initial round of new gTLD applications at the top-level.

## **Next Steps**

The adopted GNSO Council resolution was transmitted to the Board for its consideration, and the Board acknowledged receipt of the recommendations on 10 April 2012. The Reply Period for the public comment forum on this issue closed on 14 April 2012.

## **More Information**

- [GNSO Council resolution](#)
- [Public Comment Forum](#)

- [ICANN Board resolution](#)
- [GAC letter concerning the protection of IOC/RC names](#) [PDF, 1.1 MB]
- [Questions and answers concerning protection of IOC/RC names](#)
- [Applicant Guidebook for the New GTLD Program](#)

## Staff Contact

[Brian Peck](#), Policy Director

---

## Advancing Outreach at ICANN

### At a Glance

*On 15 March 2012 at the ICANN meeting in San José, Costa Rica the Public Participation Committee hosted a [presentation on Advancing Outreach](#). In addition, the GNSO Council is considering how to conduct outreach in its Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups in response to the Board-approved [“Report of the Board Governance Committee GNSO Review Working Group on GNSO Improvements](#) [PDF, 193 KB].” This report, approved in 2008, tasked the GNSO with developing and implementing a targeted outreach program to explore the formation of new constituency groups and to increase participation in constituencies and the GNSO policy process. A GNSO Discussion Group has been formed to consider various approaches.*

### Recent Developments

ICANN staff has announced an Outreach Framework Model and will begin to use the model to provide an improved roadmap for the community budget request process. The GNSO Council has formed a Discussion Group to consider approaches to outreach.

### Background

ICANN staff presented to the GNSO and other community members an [Outreach Framework Model](#) [PDF, 725 KB]. This model was presented and discussed with the community in October 2011 at the ICANN meeting in Dakar, Senegal and more recently at the ICANN meeting in San José, Costa Rica during the Public Participation Committee forum on 15 March 2012. The model includes the development of an activities inventory to better coordinate all ICANN activities to eliminate redundancy, prioritize the most effective activities, and find the most effective home for outreach activities. ICANN staff will begin to use the model to provide an improved roadmap for the community budget request process.

In addition, the GNSO Council is considering outreach approaches as part of the

implementation of the GNSO Improvements Process. In 2008 the ICANN Board approved a comprehensive proposal to improve the effectiveness of the GNSO, including its policy activities, structure, operations and communications as detailed in the [“Report of the Board Governance Committee GNSO Review Working Group on GNSO Improvements”](#) [PDF, 193 KB].” The GNSO Council formed the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) which provided a report to the GNSO Council [“Recommendations to Develop a Global Outreach Program to Broaden Participation in the GNSO”](#) [PDF, 73 KB].” In 2011 the Council established an Outreach Task Force Charter Drafting Team to develop a [charter and timeline](#) to implement a GNSO outreach program. However, to date, the GNSO Council has not acted on that proposal. This delay reflects a number of community concerns about the scope of the planned Task Force, and about the potential interplay between various proposals that should be well coordinated and use limited resources most effectively. Most recently, the GNSO formed a Discussion Group to consider various approaches to outreach.

### More Information

- [Outreach Framework Model](#) [PDF, 725 KB]
- [Recommendations to Develop a Global Outreach Program to Broaden Participation in the GNSO](#) [PDF, 73 KB]
- [Outreach Task Force Draft Charter](#) [PDF, 142 KB]
- [Report of the Board Governance Committee GNSO Review Working Group on GNSO Improvements](#) [PDF, 193 KB]

### Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Policy Director

---

## GNSO Working Group Addresses ICANN Board Request for Consumer Metrics

### At a Glance

*The aim of the Consumer Choice, Trust & Competition (Consumer Metrics) Working Group is to provide the ICANN Board and community with suggested definitions for consumer, consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition and to propose metrics that might be used to gauge the effectiveness of the New gTLD Program. ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) calls for a review to be conducted one year following the first new gTLD delegations. In December, 2010, the ICANN Board asked for advice from the SOs and ACs on establishing these definitions and metrics. This effort will play a critical role in informing the*

*ICANN community about the extent to which gTLD expansion has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice within the Internet marketplace.*

## Recent Developments

The Consumer Metrics Working Group has produced a draft Advice Letter defining the terms “consumer,” “consumer trust,” “consumer choice” and “competition” at the request of the ICANN Board to all SOs and ACs. A public comment period was opened for community reaction. That comment period closed on 17 April. A reply comment period continues until 8 May.

## Background

The GNSO Council chartered a Consumer Metrics Working Group on 22 September 2011. The Working Group’s goal is to produce advice for consideration by the GNSO, ccNSO, GAC and ALAC, each of whom was asked for advice as part of the Board resolution discussed above. Each AC/SO may act independently on the Consumer Metrics Working Group's draft advice, and may endorse all, part, or none of the draft advice as it decides how to respond to the Board resolution. Ultimately, the purpose of this advice is to provide ICANN's Board with proposed definitions, measures, and targets that may be useful to the AoC Review Team that will convene one year after new gTLDs are launched.

One example of the proposed metrics being discussed include measures related to confidence in registrations and name resolutions, such as measuring the percentage of service availability for certain DNS and registration-related systems. Other examples are measures related to confidence that TLD operators are fulfilling promises and adhering to ICANN policies, such as measuring the percentage of availability for certain Registrar services, and measuring the quantity and relative frequency of breach notices, UDRP complaints and URS complaints.

## Next Steps

The WG will review the public comments after the reply comment period window closes and it will also consider feedback received at the [Costa Rica public session](#). It will then finalize the Advice letter for further action by each SO and AC.

## More Information

- [ICANN Board Resolution](#)
- [Working Group Charter](#) [PDF, 641 KB]
- [Public Comment Forum](#)
- [Draft Advice Letter](#) [PDF, 233 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Policy Director

---

# Council and Board Address Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy

## At a Glance

*The aim of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO Council is reviewing and considering revisions to this policy through a series of Working Groups. The IRTP Part B PDP Recommendations have been adopted by the ICANN Board and will now move forward to implementation. The IRTP Part C Policy Development Process is underway.*

## Recent Developments and Next Steps

**IRTP Part B:** In relation to those [recommendations](#) already adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board, formal notice was provided to Registrars about the changes to the IRTP and new Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) requirement on 29 February. The effective date for these [new revisions](#) and compliance with the new obligations is 1 June 2012.

The ICANN Board adopted at its meeting in Costa Rica the IRTP Part B recommendation concerning a new provision in the IRTP addressing when and how domains may be locked or unlocked. The main elements of the adopted modifications are:

- Registrar may only impose a lock that would prohibit transfer of the domain name if it includes in its registration agreement the terms and conditions for imposing such lock and obtains express consent from the Registered Name Holder.
- Registrar must remove the "Registrar Lock" status within five calendar days of the Registered Name Holder's initial request, if the Registrar does not provide facilities for the Registered Name Holder to remove the "Registrar Lock" status.

The last remaining IRTP Part B recommendation relates to standardizing and clarifying Whois status messages regarding Registrar Lock status. Currently, when a Whois lookup is conducted, different status codes may be associated with a domain name registration such as "clientTransferProhibited" or "clientUpdateProhibited". However, no further explanation is provided concerning what these status codes mean or how these can be changed. The recommendation under consideration aims to standardize and clarify Whois

status messages for end-users. Following adoption of the recommendation by the GNSO Council at its meeting on 16 February, a public comment forum was opened prior to Board consideration. The [public comment reply period](#) remains open until 15 April, following which the ICANN Board will consider the recommendation for approval. .

**IRTP Part C:** The IRTP Part C PDP will address the following three issues:

- "Change of Control" function, including an investigation of how this function is currently achieved, if there are any applicable models in the country-code name space that can be used as a best practice for the gTLD space, and any associated security concerns. The investigation should also include a review of locking procedures, as described in Reasons for Denial #8 and #9, with an aim to balance legitimate transfer activity and security.
- Whether provisions on time-limiting Forms Of Authorization (FOAs) should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out. For example, if a Gaining Registrar sends and receives an FOA back from a transfer contact, but the name is locked, the registrar may hold the FOA pending adjustment to the domain name status, during which time the registrant or other registration information may have changed.
- Whether the process can be streamlined by a requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs.

The WG held an [open meeting](#) at the ICANN Meeting in Costa Rica. In addition, the WG met with the ccNSO to [exchange views](#) on charter question A concerning "change of control."

## Background

The IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 with the objective to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars. As part of its implementation, it was decided to carry out a review of the policy in order to determine whether it was working as intended or whether there are any areas that would benefit from further clarification or improvement. As a result of this review, a number of issues were identified that were grouped together in five different policy development processes or PDPs, titled A to E, that are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

## More Information

IRTP Part C:

- [Final Issue Report IRTP Part C](#) [PDF, 643 KB]

IRTP Part B:

- [ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #8](#) [PDF, 295 KB]
- [ICANN Staff Proposal on IRTP Part B Recommendation #9, part 2](#) [PDF, 504 KB]
- [IRTP Part B Final Report](#) [PDF, 995 KB]
- *ICANN Start* podcast: [audio explanation of IRTP Part B](#) [MP3, 18 MB]

General Information:

- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 41 KB]

### Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## “Thick” Whois Policy Development Process Initiated But Not Starting Yet

### At a Glance

*At its meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process on “thick” Whois. However, considering the current workload of the GNSO community, the GNSO Council on 12 April resolved to delay the formation of a drafting team to develop a charter until December 2012.*

### Recent Developments

As recommended by the IRTP Part B Working Group, the GNSO Council resolved at its meeting in September 2011 to ask ICANN staff to prepare an Issue Report on the requirement of “thick” Whois for all incumbent gTLDs. Such an Issue Report and possible subsequent Policy Development Process should not only consider a possible requirement of “thick” Whois for all incumbent gTLDs in the context of IRTP, but should also consider any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur outside of IRTP that would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of thick Whois for all incumbent gTLDs would be desirable or not. Following the closing of the [public comment forum](#), ICANN staff submitted [the Final Issue Report](#) to the GNSO Council for consideration.

At its meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process on “thick” Whois. However, considering the current workload of the GNSO community, the GNSO Council on 12 April resolved to delay the formation of a drafting team to develop a charter until December 2012.

## Background

For gTLD registries, ICANN specifies Whois service requirements through the registry agreements and the RAA. Registries satisfy their Whois obligations using different services. The two common models are often characterized as “thin” and “thick” Whois registries. This distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are managed. One set of data is associated with the domain name, and a second set of data is associated with the registrant of the domain name. A “thin” registry only stores and manages the information associated with the domain name. This set includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in its Whois data store, and the URL for the registrar’s Whois service. With “thin” registries, Registrars manage the second set of data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own Whois services, as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA 3.3 for those domains they sponsor. COM and NET are examples of “thin” registries. “Thick” registries maintain and provide both sets of data (domain name and registrant) via Whois.

A Policy Development Process has been initiated to not only consider a possible requirement of “thick” Whois for all gTLDs in the context of Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, for which it is considered beneficial, but to also consider any other positive and/or negative effects that are likely to occur outside of IRTP that would need to be taken into account when deciding whether a requirement of “thick” Whois for all gTLDs would be desirable or not.

## More Information

‘Thick’ Whois:

- [Final Issue Report on ‘Thick’ Whois](#)

General Information:

- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 41 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## Call for Volunteers for “Domain Name Locking Subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP” Working Group

### At a Glance

*The GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process on the Locking of a Domain Name Subject to Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) Proceedings. Now that the Charter for a WG has been approved, a call for volunteers has been issued.*

### Recent Developments

At its meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council approved the charter for the PDP Working Group on locking of a domain name subject to UDRP Proceedings.

### Background

At its 15 December meeting, the [GNSO Council initiated a PDP](#) on the requirement to lock a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

A discussion on the requirements of locking a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings was initially conducted as part of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Part B PDP. As a result of that process, it was noted that “locking a domain name registration subject to a UDRP dispute should be a best practice.” However, the WG “noted that any changes to making this a requirement should be considered in the context of any potential UDRP review.” Subsequently, several community members called out this issue in their comments on the state of the UDRP [Issue Report](#) [PDF, 2.8 MB] published in October 2011, and as a result, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on this specific issue only. A sample of the community comments is below:

- “No requirement to lock names in period between filing complaint and commencement of proceedings.”
- “Need clarification of domain locking.”
- “Unclear what is meant by “Status Quo.”
- “No explanation of ‘Legal Lock’ mechanisms and when they go into effect or when they should be removed.”

### Next Steps

A [call for volunteers](#) to form the Working Group has been launched. Those interested in joining should contact the [GNSO Secretariat](#). The first meeting of the WG is expected to take place shortly. For further information, see the [UDRP web page](#).

## More Information

- [Final Issue Report](#) [PDF, 2.8 MB]
- [Webinar on the Current State of the UDRP](#) (archived)
- [Public comment on the Preliminary Issue Report](#)

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

# ASO

---

## Policy Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Address Blocks Submitted to ICANN Board for Ratification

### At a Glance



*Now that IANA has allocated all the addresses in IPv4, Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) have discussed a number of proposed global policies for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to IANA. All RIRs have adopted the new policy proposal, which has recently been forwarded to*

*ICANN for ratification.*

### Recent Developments

All five RIRs have adopted a proposal originated by APNIC on the allocation of recovered IPv4 address space. The Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council have reviewed the proposal and forwarded it on 13 March 2012 to the ICANN Board for ratification.

In this proposal, IANA would establish and administer a pool of returned address space to be allocated to all RIRs simultaneously in equal blocks of smaller size than the traditional /8. Pool size permitting, allocations would occur every six months.

### Next Steps

The proposal has been posted for public comments by ICANN. The ICANN Board has a 60-day window to either ratify the proposal or raise questions to the ASO (or do nothing, in which case the proposal is ratified by default). Once ratified, the policy will be implemented 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 unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) has been depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) is taking its place.

## More Information

- A [Background Report](#) for the third proposal is posted on the ICANN web site and includes a comparison between the proposals so far on this theme.
- [Posting](#) of the third proposal for public comments
- [Background Report](#) for the second proposal.

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director, Services Relations

# Joint Efforts

---

## Joint SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Publishes Final Report

### At a Glance

*On 6 March 2012 the Internationalized Data Working Group (IRD-WG) published its [Final Report](#) and submitted it to the GNSO Council and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) for consideration. At the request of the ICANN Board of Directors, the IRD-WG's Final Report analyzes the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalized registration data and provides several recommendations.*

### Background

On 26 June 2009, the ICANN Board approved a resolution (2009.06.26.18) requesting that the GNSO and SSAC, in consultation with staff, convene a working group to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data. This request reflected concerns that while standard formats are defined for domain labels, no standard format is required for elements of a domain name registration record (Registration Data), such as contact information, host names, sponsoring

registrar and domain name status. In November 2010, the IRD-WG produced an Interim Report requesting community input on several questions relating to possible models for internationalizing Domain Name Registration Data. On 3 October 2011 the IRD-WG posted a [draft Final Report](#) in the Public Forum for comment for 45 days. The IRD-WG analyzed the comments received in the forum and addressed them in its [Report of Public Comments](#) [PDF, 75 KB]. After considering the comments received, the Final Report published on 06 March 2012 is the IRD-WG's response to the Board request regarding the feasibility and suitability of introduction display specifications to deal with the internationalized registration data.

The Final Report contains the following recommendations:

1. ICANN staff should develop, in consultation with the community, a data model for domain registration data. The data model should specify the elements of the registration data, the data flow, and a formal data schema that incorporates the standards that the working group has agreed on for internationalizing various registration data elements. This data model should also include tagging information for language/scripts.
2. The GNSO council and the SSAC should request a common Issue Report on translation and transliteration of contact information. The Issue Report should consider whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script. It should also consider who should bear the burden and who is in the best position to address these issues. The Issue Report should consider policy questions raised in this document and should also recommend whether to start a policy development process (PDP).
3. ICANN staff should work with the community to identify a DNRD Access Protocol that meets the needs of internationalization, including but not limited to the work products resulting from recommendations 1 and 2, and the requirements enumerated in this report.

### **Recent Developments and Next Steps**

The IRD-WG has submitted its final report to the GNSO and the SSAC for review and approval. Once the Final Report is approved, the GNSO and the SSAC will jointly submit the Final Report to the ICANN Board.

### **More Information**

- [IRD-WG wiki](#)
- [ICANN Board Resolution 26 June 2009, "Display and Usage of Internationalized Registration Data"](#)
- [Final Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group](#) [PDF, 606 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Policy Director

# At-Large

---

## The At-Large Community Expands to 142 At-Large Structures

### At a Glance

*The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) recently certified four organizations as new At-Large Structures (ALSes): the Ecuadorian Association for Free Software, the Internet Society Trinidad and Tobago Chapter, the Internet Society Bahrain Chapter, the Internet Society Armenia Chapter. These four new ALSes expand the regional diversity of the At-Large community, which represents thousands of individual Internet end-users. With the addition of these new organizations, the number of accredited ALSes now totals 142.*

### Recent Developments

The ALAC has certified the Ecuadorian Association for Free Software, the Internet Society Trinidad and Tobago, the Internet Society Bahrain Chapter, the Internet Society Armenia Chapter as At-Large Structures ALSes. The certification process included due diligence carried out by ICANN staff and regional advice provided by the Latin American and Caribbean Islands Regional At-Large Organization (LACRALO) and the Asia Pacific Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO).

Following is a brief description of each new ALS.

**The Ecuadorian Association for Free Software (ASLE)** is located in Quito, Ecuador. Its mission includes the promotion and encouragement of the use of Free Software (as defined in its by-laws) in Ecuador, as well as to assist with public and private activities in favor of free software. This organization will be an ALS within LACRALO.

**The Internet Society Trinidad and Tobago (ISOCTT)** is located in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. ISOCTT serves the needs of any specific, cohesive community of interest and the local Internet community in the context of Internet evolution. It has a particular focus on education, Internet infrastructure development, Internet standards and experimentation, public policies and

regulatory co-ordination regarding Internet content and services, and Internet governance contributions. This organization will be an ALS within LACRALO.

**The Internet Society Armenia Chapter is located in Yerevan, Armenia.** The organization's objectives, among others, are to promote the development of media education, the educational system of Armenia and its integration with the international educational system as well as to promote the creation of efficient educational programs and technologies. This organization will be an ALS within APRALO.

**The Internet Society Bahrain Chapter (BIS)** is located in Manama, Kingdom of Bahrain, and its vision is promoting the kingdom of Bahrain to become a leading regional and international center for use and development of the Internet, e-content industry, information technology and communications. This organization will be an ALS within APRALO.

## Background

One of the strengths of the At-Large community is that it incorporates the views of a set of globally diverse, Internet end-user organizations, or ALSes, organized within five RALOs. The views of these grassroots organizations are collected through an internal, bottom-up, consensus-driven policy development process and find representation in the official documents of the ALAC.

## More Information

- [A complete list of certified and pending ALSes](#)
- [Statistical information on global ALS representation](#)
- [Global map of certified ALSes](#)
- [Information on how to join At-Large](#)
- [ICANN At-Large web site](#)

## Staff Contact

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

---

## Policy and Project Achievements Highlight At-Large in Costa Rica

### At a Glance

*At ICANN 43 in Costa Rica, 59 attendees from all five At-Large regions represented the At-Large community. These representatives included members of ALAC, officers of the five Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs), representatives of ALSes, including one representative from each of the LACRALO ALSes, At-Large liaisons, At-Large delegates to NomCom, At-Large representatives on the Whois and SSR of the DNS Review Teams, and representatives of the At-Large community.*

### Recent Developments

At-Large representatives participated in a record [33 meetings](#) including a series of LACRALO capacity building sessions as well as joint sessions with the Fellows as part of the LACRALO Costa Rica Events. These meetings resulted in numerous policy and process-related activities.

Among the many policy and process-related issues discussed during their meetings, there were several the Chair of ALAC highlighted in his Report to the Board:

#### **At-Large Statement on the Whois Policy Review Team Draft Report**

The ALAC voted to adopt a statement on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Draft Report. Two At-Large Briefing Sessions on WHOIS Policy and the WHOIS Policy Review Team Draft Report were held in February and March 2012 to increase understanding of the issue and the draft Report.

#### **ALAC Statement on the Reservation of Olympic and Red Cross Names in the gTLD Application Procedure**

The ALAC Statement on the Reservation of Olympic and Red Cross Names in the gTLD Application Procedure notes with concern the recent activities of the ICANN Board, its staff, and the GNSO regarding the reservation of domain names related to the Olympic and Red Cross movements. The ALAC specifically advises and requests the ICANN Board reconsider its directions regarding the Red Cross and Olympic names as being ultimately against the global public interest.

#### **Approved Process for the ALAC to Submit Public Comments on and File Possible Objections to New gTLD Applications**

The ALAC voted to adopt a proposal for the ALAC to submit public comments on and file possible objections to new gTLD applications.

### **Creation of At-Large Sub-Committee on Outreach**

The ALAC agreed to create an At-Large Sub-Committee on Outreach that will discuss the topic of outreach. This Sub-Committee will send a call for membership shortly requesting, at a minimum, one representative from each RALO. This WG will work with ICANN's Global Partnership team to identify areas where interaction can take place.

### **AFRALO/AfrICANN Statement of the ICANN African Community on the New gTLD Applicant Support Program**

The ALAC gave the highest compliments to the work of the African ICANN community (AfrICANN and AFRALO) in preparing their Statement of the ICANN African Community on the New gTLD Applicant Support Program.

### **ALAC/At-Large Improvements Project – Status Update and Next Steps**

The At-Large Improvements Implementation Taskforce submitted the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Project Taskforce submitted a Status Update report with an integral appendix to the members of the Board Structural Improvements Committee for discussion during the 43rd ICANN Meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica. The Status Update outlined the significant progress made by the At-Large Improvements Implementation Taskforce toward the implementation of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Recommendations. Specifically, the Status Update showed the current status of the ALAC/At-Large Recommendations as outlined in the Final Report of the ALAC Review Working Group on ALAC Improvements (9 June 2009) and further defined in the At-Large Improvements Implementation Project Plan (7 June 2010). The Update also provided the status of the series of Action Items aimed at implementing each of the Recommendations as developed by the four At-Large Improvements Working Teams between September 2010 and March 2011. As illustrated in the report, the At-Large Improvements Implementation Project is well on its way to completion with the majority of Recommendations and Action Items either fully or substantially completed. A final report will be prepared for submission to the SIC and the ICANN Board during the ICANN 44 Public Meeting in Prague.

#### **More Information**

- See the [ALAC Chair's Report](#) of the 43rd ICANN Meeting

#### **Staff Contact**

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

---

## ALAC Approved Many Policy Statements, Comments and Communications in 2012 to Date

### At a Glance

*ALAC is continuing its high rate of preparing statements in response to ICANN public comments periods, comments and communications in 2012. The three most recent ALAC statements are on the ICANN Board Conflicts of Interest Review, the Reservation of Olympic and Red Cross Names in the gTLD Application Procedure, and on the Whois Policy Team Review Team Draft Report. The ALAC is currently preparing several additional statements.*

### Recent Developments

The ALAC statements submitted since the start of 2012 are:

- [ALAC Statement on the ICANN Board Conflicts of Interest Review - Revised Conflicts of Interest Policy and Related Governance Documents](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Reservation of Olympic and Red Cross Names in the gTLD Application Procedure](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the WHOIS Policy Review Team Draft Report](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Framework for the FY 13 Budget](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Initial Report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the IDN Variant Issues Project Draft Integrated Issues Report](#)
- [At-Large Events Roadmap Communication](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Preliminary GNSO Issue Report on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement Amendments](#)
- [Comments on New gTLD Applicant Support Program - Financial Assistance](#)

### More Information

All ALAC statements may be viewed on the At-Large Correspondence page at: <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence>.

### Staff Contact

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

## SSAC

---

### Issues Active in the SSAC

- [SSAC Publishes Advisory on Single-Character IDNs and a Report on Dotless Domains](#)

## GAC

---

### Where to Find GAC Information

#### At a Glance

*ICANN receives input from governments through the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in conjunction with ICANN meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.*

#### Recent Developments

In March, the GAC met in San Jose, Costa Rica during the 43rd ICANN meeting. The [communiqué](#) has been posted.

During the San Jose meeting the GAC also announced progress on the implementation of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team's recommendations regarding GAC Advice. The full details can be found in the [GAC website announcement](#) [PDF, 34 KB].

#### More Information

- [GAC web site](#)

#### Staff Contact

[Jeannie Eilers](#), ICANN staff