



POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

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

Volume 12, Issue 7 – August 2012

Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

ccNSO

[Issues Active in the ccNSO](#)

GNSO

[Preliminary Issue Report Notes Lack of Abuse Provisions in Registry Agreements](#)

[Whois Proxy/Privacy Reveal & Relay Survey Not Feasible, Survey Shows](#)

ASO

[Issues Active in the ASO](#)

At-Large

[Board Thanks ALAC, Staff for Structural Review Completion](#)

[ALAC Adds Voice to Policy Discussion for Domain Name Transfer, New gTLD, and More](#)

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 is available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, visit the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "Policy Update" to subscribe. This service is free.

[ICANN Policy Update statement of purpose](#)

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

Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

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

Across ICANN

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

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

- [Preliminary Issue Report on Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse](#). Should a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions be created for all ICANN agreements? Comment period closes 15 August 2012.
- [Locking of a Domain Name Subject to Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy \(UDRP\) Proceedings](#). The Working Group is looking for public input in order to have a clear understanding of the exact nature and scope of issues encountered with the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP Proceedings. Comment period closes 15 August 2012.

- [Proposed Modifications to GNSO Operating Procedures](#). Should a new section be added on consent agenda procedures? Reply period extended to 20 August 2012.
- [Interisle Consulting Group Whois Proxy/Privacy Reveal & Relay Feasibility](#). This draft report summarizes the findings of a preliminary study to determine whether if enough respondents could be found to justify an extensive analytical study into communication relay and identity reveal requests. Reply period extended to 22 August 2012.
- [.name Registry Agreement Renewal](#). Verisign's proposed agreement for renewal of the 2007 .name Registry Agreement. Reply period closes 23 August 2012.
- [Security, Stability & Resiliency of the DNS Review Team \(SSR RT\) Final Report](#). The final report focusing on ICANN's management of its SSR functions describes areas where the organization is performing well, and areas where improvement is needed. Reply period closes 29 August 2012.
- [DRAFT Statement of ICANN's Role and Remit in Security, Stability and Resiliency of the Internet's Unique Identifier Systems](#). In response to a review team's findings, ICANN asks for feedback on a draft statement of its role and remit in relation to the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet's unique identifier systems. Reply period extended to 31 August 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

Issues Active in the ccNSO

- [ccNSO Activity Summary for July 2012](#)



Preliminary Issue Report Notes Lack of Abuse Provisions in Registry Agreements

At a Glance

At the request of the GNSO Council, ICANN staff reviewed 17 different gTLD registry and registry-registrar agreements to determine whether abuse provisions were included consistently across all. The findings are contained in a Preliminary Issue Report now available for Public Comment. The preliminary report is the first step toward a possible Policy Development Process (PDP) that, if initiated, would evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements, and if created, how such language would be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse.

Recent Developments and Next Steps

The GNSO Council asked ICANN staff to prepare an Issue Report on the topic of Uniformity of Contracts, as a required preliminary step before deciding whether to initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP). The Staff reviewed 17 different gTLD registry and registry-registrar agreements to determine whether abuse provisions were included consistently across all. The initial findings are contained in a [Preliminary Issue Report on Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse](#) [PDF, 683 KB]. Staff opened a public comment forum on 25 July 2012 and the Preliminary Issue Report was available for Public review and comment through August 15.

The primary objectives of the Preliminary Issue Report were to:

- Review existing ICANN agreements and other publicly available policies of registrations and determine existence of registration abuse policies.
- Describe how a PDP – if initiated, could be structured to analyze whether ICANN should adopt policies to address registration abuse.

In light of these objectives, the Preliminary Issue Report provided the following recommendations:

- The GNSO Council should consider whether or not to initiate a PDP as an approach to develop any policy.
- If a PDP is initiated, the Report suggests that the WG conduct further research:

- To understand if registration abuses are occurring that could be addressed more effectively if consistent registration abuse policies were established.
- To determine if and how (registration) abuse is dealt with in those registries (and registrars) that do not have in place any specific provisions or policies to address abuse.
- Identify how registration abuse provisions, where they exist, are implemented in practice and whether they are effective in addressing registration abuse.
- If the results of this research reveal that there is value in having uniform provisions to address registration abuse, the PDP WG should also consider a set of initial benchmarks for developing an initial baseline or framework of provisions to battle registration abuse, and define potential reporting requirements to track progress toward those goals.

A Final Issue Report will be published following the closing of the Public Comment Forum on this Preliminary Issue Report. After the delivery of the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council will review any public comments, deliberate, and decide whether to initiate a PDP on this topic.

More Information

- [Preliminary Issue Report on Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse](#) [PDF, 683 KB]
- [Preliminary Issue Report Public Comment Forum](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Info](#)

Staff Contact

[Rob Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

Whois Proxy/Privacy Reveal & Relay Survey Not Feasible, Survey Shows

At a Glance

Few people responded to the Whois Proxy/Privacy Reveal & Relay Feasibility Survey results, and the GNSO Council has requested community input on the draft report's conclusion that a full study will not be feasible.

Recent Developments

Begun in July 2011, this feasibility study was implemented to determine whether enough willing participants can be found to conduct a larger study measuring

proxy and privacy service responsiveness to registrant "identity reveal" requests. Independent consultant Interisle Consulting Group conducted the feasibility study.

A lack of responses to the feasibility study suggests that an extensive analytical study will not be practical. To ensure that the community has time to respond for or against this conclusion, the draft report supporting this conclusion has been open for Public Comment since 4 June 2012, and will close on 22 August 2012. In parallel with the Public Comment period on the draft report, the Working Group hosted two webinar sessions to brief the community on the background of this effort and to solicit input from experts on those results.

Interisle scheduled a briefing on Wednesday 15 August at 13.00 UTC and Wednesday 15 August at 20.00 UTC, summarizing the purpose of this effort and reviewing the work called for in the Study charter.

Background

Whois is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts and other critical information. The GNSO Council is proceeding with studies to provide current, reliable information for community discussions about Whois.

More Information

- [Public Comment Page on Draft Report](#)
- [GNSO-approved gTLD Whois Studies](#)

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director

ASO

Issues Active in the ASO

- [ICANN Board Ratifies Policy Proposal for Handling IPv4 Address Space Returned from the RIRs to IANA](#)



Board Thanks ALAC, Staff for Structural Review Completion

At a Glance

On 2 August, the ICANN Board unanimously resolved ([2012.08.02.04](#)) to thank the ALAC and its supporting staff for the completion of the first ALAC Structural Review, the ALAC Improvements Implementation Project. The Board also recognized the significant effort and dedication involved in the completion of this Review.

Recent Developments

In the [ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project Final Report](#), the ALAC confirmed that it completed the implementation steps called for in the [ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project Plan](#), dated 7 June 2010.

The Final Report of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project, sent to the Board Structural Improvements Committee for review on 14 June 2012, outlines the activities and accomplishments of the ALAC and At-Large in completing this project. Specifically, the report highlights the steps made by [At-Large Improvements Work Teams](#) and the [At-Large Improvements Implementation Taskforce](#) toward the full implementation of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Recommendations.

As illustrated in the table below, and more fully in the Appendix of the Final Report, the At-Large Improvements Implementation Project Taskforce has completed the implementation of the Recommendations and Action Items. This completion consists of concluding finite activities or allocating responsibility to bodies of the ALAC and At-Large community, including the ALAC Executive Committee, At-Large Working Groups and Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) and their individual At-Large Structures (ALSes), for activities requiring continuing monitoring and oversight.

ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation: Status of Recommendations

ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation: Status of Recommendations				
Recommendation	Status (% Completed)			
	25%	50%	75%	100%
Rec 1: ICANN Bylaws				
Rec 2: Board Member				
Rec 3: ALS-RALO-ALAC Structure				
Rec 4: ALS Education & Engagement				
Rec 5: Strategic & Operational Plans				
Rec 6: Cost Models				
Rec 7: Communication Tools				
Rec 8: Public Comment Period				https://community.icann.org/x/DYD7AQ
Rec 9: Translation Processes				
Rec 10: Home of Individual Internet Users				
Rec 11: Board Statement Regarding Rec. 10				
Rec 12: Input from Consumer Representatives				
Rec 13: Policy Advice Mechanisms				

Background of ALAC/At-Large Improvements Project

The goal of the ALAC/At-Large Improvements project was to review and improve both ALAC/At-Large participation in ICANN and ALS participation in At-Large. The At-Large Review Work Group made 13 recommendations in its report published in June 2009, identifying key areas of needed improvement, focusing on At-Large's organization, effectiveness, participation and relationship to other ICANN entities.

A detailed report of the implemented activities can be found in the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project: Final Report, [ratified by ALAC](#) on 8 June 2012.

More Information

- [ALAC Correspondence to the ICANN Board Chair on the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project - Final Report for Review by the SIC](#)

Staff Contact

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

ALAC Adds Voice to Policy Discussion for Domain Name Transfer, New gTLD, and More

At a Glance

During July, the ALAC contributed to ICANN policy discussions by adopting two statements and sending two pieces of correspondence. One statement addressed the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Policy Development Process Initial Report and the second addressed the Preliminary GNSO Issue Report on the Protection of International Names in New gTLDs. ALAC also sent correspondence endorsing the IPC's Statement on the .com Renewal and Thick Whois as well as to the ICANN Board Chair on the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project – Final Report.

Recent Developments

The ALAC statements submitted and correspondence sent in July are:

- [ALAC Correspondence to the ICANN Board Chair on the ALAC/At-Large Improvements Implementation Project - Final Report for Review by the SIC](#)
- [ALAC Correspondence Endorsing the IPC's Statement on the .com Renewal and Thick Whois](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Preliminary GNSO Issue Report on the Protection of International Organization Names in New gTLDs](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Policy Development Process Initial Report](#)

More Information

- All ALAC statements may be viewed on the [At-Large Correspondence page](#).

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.

More Information

- [GAC web site](#)

Staff Contact

[Jeannie Eilers](#), ICANN staff