



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

Volume 10, Issue 2 – February 2010

## **Across ICANN**

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

[Transitions](#)

## **ccNSO**

[Belize Joins ccNSO](#)

[ccNSO Prepares for Members Meeting in Nairobi](#)

[Other Issues Active in the ccNSO](#)

## **GNSO**

[Council Decides to Take On Vertical Integration](#)

[New gTLD Program: STI Recommendations on Trademark Protections Go to the Board](#)

[Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy WG Analyzes Complaints, Comments](#)

[Registration Abuse Policies Group Publishes Initial Report](#)

[Analysis Continues on Potential Studies of Whois](#)

[GNSO Improvements: Work Teams Progress; Council Refines New Procedures](#)

[Other Issues Active in the GNSO](#)

## ASO

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

[Three of Five RIRs Approve 2011 for Transition to 32-Bit ASN](#)

## Joint Efforts

[Issues Active in Combined Efforts](#)

## At-Large

[Comments Sought on Selecting an At-Large ICANN Board Member](#)

[AFRALO Publishes Outreach Brochure](#)

## SSAC

[Issues Active with the SSAC](#)

---

## Read *Policy Update* in Your Preferred Language

*ICANN Policy Update* is available in all six official languages of the United Nations: English (EN), Spanish (ES), French (FR), Arabic (AR), Chinese (Simplified -- zh-Hans), and Russian (RU). *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [website](#) and available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, simply go to the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "Policy Update" to subscribe. This service is free of charge.

### [ICANN Policy Update statement of purpose](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org).

## Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ASO</a>
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">ccNSO</a>
Generic Names Supporting Organization	<a href="#">GNSO</a>
At-Large Advisory Committee	<a href="#">ALAC</a>
Governmental Advisory Committee	<a href="#">GAC</a>

## Across ICANN

---

### Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

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

- [Proposed Process for the 2010 Selection of an ICANN At-Large Board Member](#). On 27 August 2009, the ICANN Board of Directors resolved, in principle, “to add one voting director appointed from the At-Large Community to the ICANN Board of Directors, and removing the present ALAC Liaison to the Board (...).” This paper outlines how the At-Large community proposes to select their new Board member. Comment by 6 March 2010.
- [Working Group Guidelines](#). As part of the GNSO Improvements Process, which aims to improve the structure and operations of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), a Work Team was tasked with developing a Working Group Model. This Working Group Model should become the focal point for policy development, and make it more inclusive and representative. Are these Guidelines complete? Comments accepted through 22 March 2010.
- [Registration Abuse Policies Initial Report](#). The GNSO Registration Abuse Policies Working Group has published its Initial Report, including concrete recommendations to address domain name registration abuse in gTLDs. Comment by 28 March 2010.
- [Proposed Strategic Initiatives for Improved DNS Security, Stability, and Resiliency](#). This paper presents the rationale, key features and projected costs of two strategic initiatives that ICANN believes are necessary to fulfill its obligations under its Bylaws, the 2009 Affirmation of Commitments, and the 2010-2013 ICANN Strategic Plan. Comment by 29 March 2010.
- [Global DNS-CERT Business Case](#). This paper describes the case for the creation of a Domain Name System-Computer Emergency Response Team devoted to both proactive and reactive measures related to DNS security, stability and resiliency. The paper includes a description of the operational concept, services analysis, and suggested governance and funding models. Comment by 29 March 2010.

## More Information

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

---

## Transitions

Denise Michel, ICANN Vice President of Policy, has accepted the new position of Advisor to the CEO, effective 15 February. David Olive assumes Denise's former role.

ICANN Chief Operating Officer Doug Brent commented, "Denise's new responsibility will draw on her outstanding work at ICANN over the last decade, which included helping to create what is now our global At-Large community, building an excellent ICANN Policy Staff, launching ICANN's independent reviews and restructuring initiatives, and personally shepherding some of ICANN's most important policy initiatives. Denise will help lay the ground work for ICANN's new accountability and transparency initiatives and provide Rod with strategic advice."

David Olive joins ICANN from Fujitsu, where he had a successful twenty-year career, and was General Manager and Chief Corporate Representative of Fujitsu's office in Washington, D.C. He advised Fujitsu on business planning, corporate and business development, and public policy issues affecting information technology, the Internet, electronic commerce, electronic government, telecommunications, and science and technology. Prior to his strong track record at Fujitsu, David actively participated in various technology-centric organizations, including as a member of the Commercial Board of Directors of TechAmerica, and as a member on the Board of Directors of the Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA) in Washington, D.C.

In announcing the transition, Doug Brent said, "I am really excited to be adding David to our team. He adds both significant strength to ICANN's management team and senior presence in our D.C. Office. Join me in congratulating Denise on her new role, and welcoming David to the ICANN team!"

---

## Belize Joins ccNSO

### At a Glance

*On 8 February, the country code Name Supporting Organization (ccNSO) accepted the membership application of Belize (.bz).*

### Background

Belize (.bz) is the third new member to join the ccNSO in 2010, bringing the membership total up to 103. Last month, Malaysia (.my) and Colombia (.co) joined.

### More Information

- Statistics on ccNSO membership growth [[PDF](#), 41 KB]
- [Alphabetical list of all ccNSO members](#)
- [Status of all member applications](#)

### Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## ccNSO Prepares for Members Meeting in Nairobi

### At a Glance

*The ccNSO will convene on a full agenda of topics in Nairobi, Kenya. Members will share tips on operating and marketing a country code top-level domain (ccTLD), and exchange views on topics such as wildcarding, data escrow, and incident response.*

### Recent Developments

The ccNSO has updated its [meetings agenda](#) and posted it on the ccNSO web site. A list of pre-registered ccNSO meetings participants is also available. Interested parties should keep an eye on the posted agenda, as some small adjustments may occur prior to the actual meeting.

### Background

ccNSO member sessions occur at every ICANN meeting. These sessions are open for non-member ccTLDs and all other interested parties to attend.

## More Information

- [ccNSO Meetings Agenda for Nairobi](#)
- [List of pre-registered ccNSO attendees](#)
- [To register for the meeting](#). (All ICANN communities register for meetings using this form. If you want your name to appear on the ccNSO list of members pre-registered for the meeting, be sure to specify on page 2 of the form that you will be attending the ccNSO meeting.)
- [List of all ccNSO meetings](#)

## Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

---

## Other Issues Active in the ccNSO

- [Delegation/Re-delegation of ccTLDs](#)
- [Proposed IDN Policies](#)
- [Wildcarding and Synthesized DNS Responses](#)

# GNSO

---

## Council Decides to Take On Vertical Integration

*GNSO begins “rapid” policy development process on cross-ownership between Registrars and Registries*

### At a Glance

*The GNSO Council has initiated a policy development process (PDP) on the issue of vertical integration between registrars and registries. A work team is being assembled from the community to explore whether policies should be adopted that allow or restrict vertical integration and cross-ownership between registrars and registries.*

### Background

ICANN has published successive versions of a Draft Applicant Guidebook, describing the implementation details for the upcoming opening of the market to

many new top-level domain (TLD) operators. An independent economist, retained by ICANN, suggests in the results of a study that the new gTLD program should include relaxed rules on integration and cross ownership between registries and registrars. (If the terms “registry” and “registrar” are unfamiliar to you, see the [ICANN glossary](#) for definitions.) Such relationships have previously been forbidden, referred to as “registry/registrar separation.”

The GNSO believes that opening up the market to many new TLD operators may call into question some of the assumptions on which the separation of registry and registrar functions is based. Economic research commissioned by ICANN Staff also suggests that changes in these assumptions might be justified. At the request of the GNSO Council, ICANN Staff prepared an Issues Report that provides analysis and identifies additional policy work that the GNSO could undertake on future changes in vertical integration and cross-ownership between gTLD registrars and registries.

After review of the Issues Report, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on the issue of vertical integration between registrars and registries. This PDP is expected to proceed quickly, with the work to be concluded by the end of April, 2010.

### More Information

- [New gTLD Program home page](#)
- [Draft Applicant Guidebook version 3](#)
- [The independent economist's findings](#) on vertical separation between registries and registrars
- Issues Report on Vertical Integration [[PDF](#), 244 KB]
- If you are interested in participating in the PDP, please consider joining the working group created to evaluate this issue. To do so, send an email to Glen de Saint Gery at [gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org](mailto:gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org).

### Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## New gTLD Program: STI Recommendations on Trademark Protections Go to the Board

### At a Glance

*The GNSO Council has responded to a Board request with a series of recommendations developed by the Special Trademark Issues (STI) drafting team. The team recommended creating a Trademark Clearinghouse and a*

*Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure to protect trademarks in new generic Top Level Domains (new gTLDs).*

## **Recent Developments**

The GNSO's new gTLD policy recommendations were approved by the Board, but did not specify how to protect trademarks in new gTLDs. Thus, ICANN Staff published a series of memoranda and proposals describing solutions for several new trademark protection mechanisms. The Staff based their work on recommendations from the Implementation Recommendation Team (IRT) and on public comments.

Late last year, the ICANN Board requested that the GNSO evaluate certain of these proposals on an expedited basis to determine whether they are consistent with the GNSO's policy recommendations. In response, the GNSO Council convened a select group of representatives, known as the Special Trademark Issues (STI) group, from each Stakeholder Group and Constituency to evaluate trademark protection solutions for the new gTLD Program. The STI group produced a series of recommendations for the creation of a Trademark Clearinghouse and a Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure. The GNSO Council has approved the recommendations and forwarded them to the ICANN Board.

## **Background**

The ICANN Board requested that the GNSO review and provide input on various implementation proposals for the protection of trademarks in the New GTLD program. These implementation proposals were based in part on the work of a group of trademark experts known as the Implementation Review Team (IRT), convened by the ICANN Board. The IRT recommendations met with controversy in the GNSO community. The GNSO convened the STI Group to evaluate the various proposals in an effort to produce alternatives that a broad range of stakeholder groups could support.

The STI Report emerged from this process, with two noteworthy proposals: 1) the creation of a trademark clearinghouse serving as a central database of trademark information to be used in launch of new gTLDs, and 2) the creation of a Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure designed to enable a rapid take-down of a domain name for clear-cut instances of trademark abuse in new TLDs. The GNSO approved the STI recommendations, then opened a public comment period to solicit feedback from the community.

## **Next Steps**

The Board, along with ICANN Staff, will review the GNSO's recommendations to assess how implementable they are in the new gTLD program. Prior to Nairobi, ICANN Staff will publish documents evaluating the public comments and recommending proposals to address the overarching issue of trademark protection.

## More Information

- About [trademark issues and rights protection mechanisms](#) in the New gTLD Program
- [The STI Report, with public comments](#)

## Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

# Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy WG Analyzes Complaints, Comments

## At a Glance

*The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) aims to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer their names from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another. The GNSO is reviewing and considering revisions to this policy.*

## Recent Developments

As requested to inform their deliberations, the IRTP Part B WG received further information from ICANN's compliance team on the rate and focus of complaints received in relation to IRTP issues. (You can download the raw data they received as an Excel spreadsheet; [XLS](#), 652 KB.)

The information provided is based on an analysis of 1,329 IRTP-related complaints received between July and November 2009. On the basis of that information, the group deduced the following ranking of what issues caused the most complaints:

1. Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) / [Auth-Info Code](#) (24%)
2. Reseller (24%)
3. Failure to unlock domain by registrar (15%)
4. Registrant does not understand transfer process / transfer denied (9%)

Last October, the Working Group solicited public comment on the issues that the group addresses. The group has now completed its review and analysis of the [comments received](#) and captured those discussions in an overview grid [[XLS](#), 36 KB]. The Working Group has now turned its attention to the Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statements it has received. In addition, a draft Initial Report has been prepared that the WG will review and complete with further details. For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace](#).

## Next Steps

The Working Group is now reviewing the Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statements it has received. For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B Working Group Workspace](#).

## Background

The IRTP Part B Working Group addresses five issues relating to domain name transfers, specified in their [Charter](#) and recounted in the [August 2009 issue](#) of *Policy Update*. The IRTP Part B Working Group has been meeting bi-weekly.

## More Information

- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [IRTP Part B Public comment period](#) (closed 5 October 2009)
- IRTP Part B Issues Report [[PDF](#), 256 KB]
- PDP Recommendations [[PDF](#), 124 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Policy Director

---

# Registration Abuse Policies Group Publishes Initial Report

## At a Glance

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

## Recent Developments

The Working Group has continued its weekly meetings, and succeeded in its objective of delivering an Initial Report for review at the ICANN meeting to be held in March 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya. The Initial Report is currently [available for public comment](#), and makes recommendations related to cybersquatting, Whois access problems, malicious use of domain names, deceptive and/or offensive domain names, and numerous related issues. You can download the paper from ICANN's web site [[PDF](#), 1.8 MB].

In producing the draft Initial Report, the Working Group discussed the proposed draft and used an on-line survey tool to assess the level of consensus on the different recommendations. The RAP Working Group plans to organize a public information and consultation session on the Initial Report in Nairobi.

## Background

The RAP Working Group addresses issues outlined in its charter, such as: defining the difference between registration abuse and domain name abuse; the effectiveness of existing registration abuse policies; and which areas, if any, would be suitable for GNSO policy development to address. The group has generated a document that provides working definitions of types and categories of abuse, and cites the primary target for each abuse type.

In addition, a Uniformity of Contracts sub-team formed, and meets regularly to review existing abuse provisions in registrar and registry agreements and to discuss questions related to the uniformity of contracts. The sub-team examines issues such as, would there be benefits to having more uniformity in contracts? How effective are existing provisions in dealing with registration abuse?

The [RAP Working Group held an open meeting](#) in Seoul, South Korea last October. There, it briefed the community on its activities and discussions to date, including updates from the different sub-teams on Uniformity of Contracts and Spam, Phishing, Malware.

Click [here](#) for further background.

## More Information

- Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Draft Initial Report [[PDF](#), 1.8 MB]
- [Public comment forum](#) on the draft Initial Report (open until 28 March)
- Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report, 29 October 2008 [[PDF](#), 400 KB] and [translation](#) of summary
- [Registration Abuse Policies Mexico City Workshop Transcript](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Workspace](#) (Wiki)

## Staff Contacts

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

---

## Analysis Continues on Potential Studies of Whois

### At a Glance

*Whois is the data repository containing registered domain names, registrant contacts and other critical information. Questions persist concerning the use and misuse of this important public resource. The GNSO Council continues its inquiries into the suitability of Whois as the Internet evolves. Whois has global*

*scale and critical importance, so adjustments to Whois must be handled with great care. Evaluating Whois will take years, but the process has begun.*

## Recent Developments

The first areas of Whois to be studied have been grouped into three broad categories:

- **Whois Misuse.** Potential Misuse studies focus on the extent to which public Whois information is used for harmful purposes. ICANN issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) in September 2009, asking any knowledgeable and qualified researchers to estimate the costs and feasibility of conducting these studies. Three responses were received and staff is preparing an analysis for GNSO Council and community consideration. Target for completed analysis: March 2010
- **Whois Registrant Identification.** This effort will examine the extent to which domain names registered by legal persons or for commercial purposes are not clearly represented in Whois data. An RFP has been issued, and vendors have responded. Staff is preparing an analysis of those responses for GNSO Council and community consideration. Target for completed analysis: March 2010
- **Whois Proxy and Privacy Services.** These studies will examine the extent to which privacy and proxy registration services are abused to: 1) obscure the source of illegal or harmful communication; and 2) delay source identification. Staff is defining the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this area of study. This effort has been delayed, but Staff is now targeting release of RFPs in the April 2010 timeframe.

Two more important categories of study are following behind these first three.

- **International display specifications.** In June 2009 at Sydney, the ICANN Board passed a resolution asking the GNSO and the SSAC to form a joint Working Group to look at the feasibility of introducing display specifications so that the increasing prevalence of non-ASCII registration data does not compromise the accuracy of Whois. (Editor's Note: In other words, Whois data has been primarily in English and other Western languages, but with internationalized domain names in Arabic, Chinese, and Russian expected later this year, more and more Whois entries will be entered in other character sets. Without standards, Whois could turn into an unreadable polyglot mess.) The Working Group is in the early stages of considering "What do we require from internationalized registration data?" The group will also address technical questions regarding how data elements might be "extensible" to accommodate users who would benefit from registration information displaying in "familiar" characters from local languages and scripts. The convening of this Working Group followed on the heels of a workshop on Internationalized Registration Data held in Seoul, where substantive discussion touched on how some ccTLD

operators have addressed the issue, and how best to address the concern in terms of standardization.

- **Whois service requirements.** The fifth important study area, separately requested by the GNSO in May 2009, would compile a comprehensive list of Whois service requirements, based on current policies and previous policy discussions. ICANN staff members are handling this issue; expect to see a first draft of this compilation some time around March 2010.

## Background

The GNSO Council specified study areas related to Whois, involving data misuse, use of non-ASCII character sets, proxy and privacy services, and the provision of inaccurate information. [Click here](#) for background details.

Staff intends to release study assessment information serially (as specific analyses on the individual study areas are complete). Staff is keeping the GNSO Council informed of progress, so that the GNSO can then consider next steps.

## More Information

- [GNSO Whois policy development page](#)
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)
- [Whois misuse RFP announcement](#)
- [Whois registrant identification RFP announcement](#)
- SSAC Reports  
<http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-documents.htm>
- ICANN Board Resolution regarding [display and usage of internationalized registration data](#), approved in Sydney, 26 June 2009
- Internationalized Data Registration Working Group Charter [[PDF](#), 112 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Liz Gasster](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## GNSO Improvements: Work Teams Progress; Council Refines New Procedures

### At a Glance

*Members of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) community are working to implement a comprehensive series of organizational changes designed to improve the effectiveness and accessibility of the organization. The GNSO Improvements fall into five main areas;*

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

To understand the GNSO's new structure and organization, please see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements webpage](#). For the reasons and history motivating the improvements, see the [Background page](#).

## Recent Developments

1. *Restructuring the GNSO Council.* The Council has now successfully conducted five formal meetings under its new framework. During its 28 January meeting, the Council approved a set of procedures to fill ICANN Board Seat #13. Those procedures were posted for [community review and comment](#), which closed 18 February 2010. Further modifications to the Council's operational rules and procedures are still under consideration (including matters regarding voting abstentions and Councilor statements of interest) and will likely be discussed by Council members during the Nairobi meeting.

2. *Revising the Policy Development Process (PDP).* This work team has continued its deliberations on stage IV of the revised PDP, Voting and Implementation; and will soon turn its attention to stage V, Policy Effectiveness and Compliance. The WT has developed a detailed timeline with the aim of presenting its proposals for the new PDP by the ICANN Meeting this June, in Brussels.

3. *Adopting a New Working Group Model.* The work team responsible for this effort has published its "Working Group Guidelines." The guidelines are available for [public comment](#) through 22 March 2010. In addition, a public information and consultation session on this topic is being planned for the ICANN meeting in Nairobi.

4. *Enhancing Constituencies.* The effort to create a level playing field for all the GNSO community's formal Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies continues in three substantial areas: development of consistent operational guidelines and best practices; re-confirmation of existing constituency bodies; and support for proposals for potential new constituencies.

5. *Improving Communications and Coordination with ICANN Structures.* The Communications work team is finalizing its latest report recommendations for the Council. Council members may vote on those ideas at the Nairobi Council meeting in early March. ICANN Staff is also laying the technical groundwork for implementing approved enhancements to the GNSO website.

*Consumers Constituency Petition Remains Under Consideration.* The proposal

for a new Consumers Constituency remains pending. A [Public Comment Forum](#) on the latest version of their proposal was open through 13 February.

*Existing GNSO Constituency “Reconfirmation” Efforts to Resume.* Last year, the ICANN Board approved the concept of reconfirming the charters and operational mechanisms of each Constituency every three years.

The initial Constituency reconfirmation process took a back seat as the Board focused on evaluation and approval of the new GNSO Stakeholder Group structures and on Bylaws changes necessary for seating the new GNSO Council. Now that the Board has resolved those issues, it set a timetable of March 2010 for formal resubmission of revised reconfirmation proposals by the existing GNSO Constituencies. Due to the need for constituencies to address other substantive policy priorities, this timetable will likely need to be stretched until the ICANN Brussels meeting this coming June.

*Participation Rules Expected.* The Constituency and Stakeholder Group Work Team is finalizing recommendations regarding a set of participation rules and operating procedures by which all constituencies and stakeholder groups should abide. When completed, those recommendations will be shared with the GNSO’s Operations Steering Committee and eventually passed on to the GNSO Council for review.

## **Next Steps**

The GNSO’s various Work Teams will continue to develop recommendations for implementing the GNSO restructuring goals approved by the Board. Existing GNSO Constituencies will continue their reconfirmation discussions and it is hoped that recommendations from the GNSO Constituency Operations Work Team will combine with that process. Formal dialogue on permanent CSG and NCSG charters will also likely begin soon. Absent specific action by the GNSO Council, the Charters of the GNSO Steering Committees are set to expire in March.

ICANN Staff has also fielded several queries about potential new GNSO Constituencies and is available to work with all interested parties on developing proposals. The Board may further discuss the proposal for a new Consumers Constituency at its March meeting in Nairobi.

## **More Information**

- [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)
- New Bylaws relevant to the New GNSO Council [[PDF](#), 160 KB]
- New GNSO Council Operating Procedures [[PDF](#), 108 KB]
- [PDP Team wiki](#)
- [Working Group Team wiki](#)

- [Communications Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Team wiki](#)

### Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## Other Issues Active in the GNSO

- [Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery](#)
- [Fast Flux Hosting](#)

# ASO

---

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

### At a Glance

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

### Recent Developments

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

### Next Steps

If the proposals are adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) will review the proposal texts, consolidate if appropriate, and then

forward the consolidated policy to the ICANN Board for ratification and subsequent implementation by IANA.

## Background

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

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

## More Information

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

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

---

## Three of Five RIRs Approve 2011 for Transition to 32-Bit ASN

### At a Glance

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

### Recent Developments

The proposal has been introduced and has passed final call in all RIRs (AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC and RIPE). It has been formally adopted in APNIC, ARIN and RIPE. Formal adoption in AfriNIC and LACNIC is imminent.

### Next Steps

When all RIRs have adopted the proposal, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council

(ASO AC) will review the proposal and then forward it to the ICANN Board for ratification and implementation by IANA.

## Background

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

## More Information

- [Background Report](#) (posted 4 December 2009)

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

# Joint Efforts

---

## Issues Active in Combined Efforts

- [ICANN definition of Geographic Regions](#)
- [Registrar Accreditation Agreement \(RAA\) amendments and registrant rights](#)
- [Internationalized Domain Names \(IDNs\)](#)

# At-Large

---

## Comments Sought on Selecting an At-Large ICANN Board Member

*Historic topic generates ALAC's first-ever public consultation*

### At a Glance

*On 5 February, 2010, the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), in collaboration with the At-Large Community, posted its first-ever public consultation by opening*

a 30 day [public comment](#) period on a proposal for how At-Large should select a voting member of the ICANN Board.

## Recent Developments

On August 27, 2009, the ICANN Board of Directors passed a [resolution](#) approving in principle the implementation of the Board Review WG recommendation “to add one voting director appointed from the At-Large Community to the ICANN Board of Directors, and removing the present ALAC Liaison to the Board...” The ALAC has never had voting representation on the Board before, and thus must come up with a fair and equitable way of periodically selecting their Board Member.

In order to develop a mechanism for the selection of the At-Large Board Member, ALAC prepared a White Paper which includes a review of At-Large community discussions to date, including debate points; the rationale for any recommendations made; a draft process timeline; specific issues and recommendations for community review and feedback. On 11 January, 2010, the White Paper was released for At-Large community review.

The historic first-ever ALAC call for public comments revolves around a preliminary version of the white paper, entitled “Call for Community Comment on the Proposed Process for the 2010 Selection of an ICANN At-Large Board Member.” [\[PDF, 240 KB\]](#) The 30-day public comment period is ongoing through 6 March 2010.

## Background

On 26 January 2010, the Board Review WG released its final report [\[PDF, 116K\]](#) about many aspects of how the ICANN Board interacts with the ICANN community. Regarding the issue of a voting director to be appointed by the At-Large Community, the report stipulates in part that ALAC and At-Large should develop a mechanism for the selection of their voting Board Director. That recommendation kicked-off the process that has resulted in the white paper currently under comment.

## Next Steps

The comments received from this public consultation will be analyzed so that a preliminary report can be given at the March ICANN meeting in Nairobi.

## More Information

- White Paper: ““Call for Community Comment on the Proposed Process for the 2010 Selection of an ICANN At-Large Board Member.” [\[PDF, 240 KB\]](#)
- [Public Comment Forum](#)
- Board Review Working Group Final Report [\[PDF, 116 KB\]](#)

## Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), At-Large Secretariat

---

## AFRALO Publishes Outreach Brochure

### At a Glance

*Members of the At-Large African Regional Organization (AFRALO) worked collaboratively to create a brochure, which they will use for outreach activities and information dissemination.*

### Recent Developments

Members of the At-Large African Regional Organization (AFRALO) created a brochure to help increase awareness of AFRALO within Africa. The AFRALO brochure, available in English, French and Arabic, describes the key issues members are working on, including internationalized domain names (IDNs), the introduction of new generic top level domains (gTLDs), Whois policy, and the future structure, accountability and transparency of ICANN. The brochure also provides information on the membership of AFRALO.

### Next Steps

The brochure will be used to facilitate outreach activities, and will be distributed at African regional meetings as well as such events as ICANN's 37<sup>th</sup> Meeting to be held in Nairobi, Kenya March 8-12, 2010.

### More Information

- [AFRALO Brochure in English](#)
- [AFRALO Brochure in French](#)

## Staff Contact

[Matthias Langenegger](#), At-Large Regional Affairs Manager

# SSAC

---

## Issues Active with the SSAC

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) is considering several security related issues, including the Report of the Root Scaling Study Team,

display and usage of Internationalized registration data (Whois data), and domain name history.

The SSAC has formed a Work Party to conduct further research into the prevalence of *orphaned records* in TLDs. Orphaned records are resource records that remain even though their parent domain name no longer exists. [For more, refer to slide 23 and forward in this presentation from the SSAC Public Meeting at the ICANN meeting at Seoul, South Korea in October 2009; [PDF](#), 1 MB.]

[SSAC](#) is also preparing to conduct a second survey of IPv6 capabilities in commercial firewalls, and will work with ICSA Laboratories to reach appropriate contacts among ICSA's members. The second survey will also solicit responses from firewall administrators. (The results will be compiled and analyzed separately from vendor responses).

These and other topics may be the addressed in future SSAC Reports or Advisories. See the [SSAC web site](#) for more information about SSAC activities.

### **Staff Contact**

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