



**POLICY UPDATE**

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

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

Volume 11, Issue 2 – February 2011

## **Across ICANN**

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

## **ccNSO**

[ccNSO Welcomes Three New Members](#)

## **GNSO**

[GNSO Improvements Move Briskly Ahead](#)

[IRTP \(Part B\) WG Reviews Complimentary and Contentious Comments, Starts on Final Report](#)

[RAP Recommendations Approved; GNSO Wants Report, Paper and Compliance Input](#)

[Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input](#)

[Fast Flux Recommendations Move to Implementation](#)

## **ASO**

[Global IPv4 Address Reclamation Pool and Allocation Plan Moves Forward with RIRs](#)

[Other Issues Active in the ASO](#)

## **Joint Efforts**

[Geographic Regions Review WG Considers Community Input for Final Report](#)

[New Charter to Inform Registrants of Their Domain Related Rights and Responsibilities](#)

[Other Issues Active as Joint Efforts](#)

## At-Large

[ALAC Submits Several Substantive Policy Development Statements](#)

[At-Large Work Teams to Complete Improvements Project Next Month](#)

## SSAC

[SSAC Appoints New Chair and Vice Chair](#)

---

## Read in Your Preferred Language

*ICANN Policy Update* is available in all six official languages of the United Nations. *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [website](#) and available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, visit the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "Policy Update" to subscribe. This service is free of charge.

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

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

## Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

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

- [Proposed Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies](#). To address concerns about the clarity and timing of the original New Constituency petitioning procedure, the SIC has completed development of a replacement "Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies." The proposed process significantly modifies the original procedure. The comment period for the new proposed process ends 4 March 2011.
- [Interim Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group](#). The IRD-WG Interim Report summarizes previous discussions, provides preliminary recommendations, and seeks input from the community on questions relating to internationalized registration data. Commentary has been extended to 14 March 2011.

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

## ccNSO

---

### ccNSO Welcomes Three New Members

#### At a Glance

*Three new ccTLDs have joined the ccNSO, representing Azerbaijan, Bulgaria and Moldova.*

#### Recent Developments

Three new ccTLDs — .AZ (Azerbaijan), .BG (Bulgaria) and .MD (Moldova) — joined the ccNSO recently. The ccNSO now includes 111 members, up from 100 at the end of 2009.

## Background

The ccNSO was established in 2003 as the body responsible for developing global policies relating to country code Top Level Domains and making recommendations on these to the ICANN Board. Since its creation, the ccNSO has provided a forum for country code Top Level Domain (ccTLD) managers to meet and discuss topical issues of concern to ccTLDs from a global perspective.

The ccNSO provides a platform to nurture consensus, technical cooperation and skill building among ccTLDs and facilitates the development of voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers. Membership in the ccNSO is open to all ccTLD managers responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain.

## More information

See the complete list of [ccNSO members](#).

## Staff contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

# GNSO

---

## GNSO Improvements Move Briskly Ahead

**Request for Input on New Constituency Recognition; Positive Comments for Not-for-Profit; and Toolkit Requests Due**

### 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.*

### Recent Developments

#### **SIC Seeks Input on Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies**

ICANN Board's Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) opened a 30-day public comment forum, from 2 February through 4 March 2011 on a proposed new "[Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies](#)" [PDF, 206 KB] including procedures, steps, forms, tools, and evaluation criteria to be used when a group applies to be a new GNSO Constituency.

The group developed the replacement process to address SIC concerns over clarity and timing. The proposed process significantly modifies the original procedure and is designed to accomplish four goals:

1. Prescribe a streamlined sequence of steps and objective, fair, and transparent evaluation criteria for a new GNSO Constituency proposal, with many opportunities for community input.
2. Delegate more authority to each GNSO Stakeholder Group in evaluating new Constituency proposals while maintaining the Board's oversight role.
3. Manage the entire process to a flexible, but specific and limited, timeframe.
4. Provide a partial set of criteria for use during the periodic review of the GNSO.

### **Background on New GNSO Constituencies**

The original process for petitioning to become approved as a new GNSO Constituency, acknowledged by the Board in October 2008, involved submission of (1) a "Notice of Intent to Form a New GNSO Constituency" (NOIF) followed by (2) a formal Petition/Charter.

To date, five prospective Constituency groups have submitted formal New GNSO Constituency petitions in accordance with the process; however, the Board has yet to approve any of those applications.

The Public [Forum Announcement](#) provides a broader discussion of the background leading to the Public Forum as well as a brief overview of the proposed process.

### **More Information on New GNSO Constituencies**

- [Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies \(including 3 Appendices\)](#) [PDF, 206 KB]
- [Process Flowchart](#) [PDF, 146 KB]
- [Application for Candidacy \(AFC\) as a New GNSO Constituency](#) [PDF, 165 KB]
- [Request for Recognition \(RFR\) as a New GNSO Constituency](#) [PDF, 261 KB]

### **GNSO Toolkit Services Request Checklists due 15 February 2011**

The GNSO Council has approved a set of community [recommendations](#) (a "Toolkit" menu of services) to assist eligible GNSO organizations with operations and policy development. The Staff circulated a checklist to GNSO Stakeholder

Group and Constituency leaders asking them to indicate specific Toolkit services they want to use in Fiscal Year 2011 (ending 30 June 2011) and FY12 (beginning 1 July 2011). Those checklists were due back to the GNSO Secretariat by 15 February 2011 and will be used by the Staff in resource planning and FY12 budget development efforts.

See [the implementation plan](#) for the delivery of specific Toolkit services — including general specifications, budget implications and availability information for each Toolkit menu service —and an outline of procedures for requesting, modifying and evaluating the various Toolkit services.

### **Comments Support NPOC's Petition and Charter**

The 60-day community public forum on the Not-for-Profit Organizations Constituency Formal Petition and Charter concluded on 30 January 2011. Of the 16 community submissions to the Public Comment Forum, 15 expressed unqualified support for the NPOC's petition to become a new GNSO Constituency within the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG).

See the [Staff Summary/Analysis](#) for a roundup of the comments submitted to the forum. Copies of the relevant charter and other up-to-date documents describing the proposal are on the [New Constituencies Process page](#), which is linked with the GNSO Improvements Information page.

### **No Comments Submitted to Public Forum for Permanent CSG Charter**

No community comments were submitted during a 53-day community public forum proceeding (see [forum description](#)) on a permanent charter for the GNSO's Commercial Stakeholder Group. The comment period closed on 23 January 2011.

### **GNSO Web Site Improvement Enters Next Phase**

The ICANN Staff is working on the new GNSO web site, based on improvements approved by the GNSO Council last year. ICANN's web team received the new site's design and code from its contractor, and verified that it works perfectly. Staff is now working on moving and creating content for the new site, using the designs debuted in Cartagena (see a copy of the presentation, including screen shots of web frame design pages, [here](#)). The redesigned site will feature more help for new GNSO visitors than the previous site. Review of the new site content will start soon. Meanwhile, a clickable demo of the site (using placeholder content) will be available at the ICANN Silicon Valley Public Meeting in San Francisco this March.

## Background

- To understand the GNSO's new structure and organization, see the discussion and diagrams on the [GNSO Improvements Information Web Page](#)
- For the reasons and history motivating the improvements, see the [Background page](#).
- For a quick review of implementation activities see the new "dashboard" pages: [Status page](#) and the [Timeline Page](#) connected to the GII webpage.

## More Information

- [PDP Work Team wiki](#)
- [Working Group Work Team wiki](#)
- [Constituency Operations Work Team wiki](#)

## Staff Contact

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

# IRTP (Part B) WG Reviews Complimentary and Contentious Comments, Starts on Final Report

## 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 established a series of five working groups (Parts A through E) to review and consider various revisions to this policy.*

## Recent Developments

Following the review of the public comments received on the [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 764 KB], the IRTP Part B Working Group is now finalizing its recommendations and report for publication.

## Next Steps

The WG expects to publish the proposed Final Report in time for the ICANN Silicon Valley Public Meeting in San Francisco in March and will post it for public comment prior to submitting it to the GNSO Council. The proposed recommendations in the Initial Report were changed substantially following a review of the public comments and continued deliberations. The WG also plans

to organize a session during the ICANN Silicon Valley Meeting during which it will present the proposed recommendations and allow for Community questions and discussion. For further information, please consult the [IRTP Part B WG Workspace](#).

## Background

The IRTP Part B PDP WG published its Initial Report last year, presenting several preliminary conclusions and recommendations for community input, including a proposed Expedited Transfer Reverse Policy (ETRP). The ETRP is a fast "reverse transfer" process to return a recently sold domain name to its original owner if it is hijacked, and is designed to correct fraudulent or erroneous transfers. It does not address or resolve disputes arising over domain control or use.

The IRTP Part B PDP is the second in a series of five PDPs addressing areas for improvement in the existing Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. The working group addresses five issues focusing on domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name, and lock status. For further details, refer to the group's [Charter](#).

## More Information

- [IRTP Part B PDP Initial Report](#) [PDF, 764 KB]
- [Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy](#) web page
- [IRTP Part B Status Report of Ongoing Progress](#) page
- [IRTP Part B Issues Report](#) [PDF, 256 KB]
- [PDP Recommendations](#) [PDF, 124 KB]
- [Summary and Analysis of Public Comments received](#)
- *ICANN Start* podcast: [audio explanation of IRTP Part B](#) [MP3, 18 MB]

## Staff Contacts

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

# RAP Recommendations Approved; GNSO Wants Report, Paper and Compliance Input

## At a Glance

*Registries and registrars lack uniformity when dealing with domain name registration abuse, and questions persist about what activities constitute "registration abuse." The GNSO Council launched the Registration Abuse*

*Policies (RAP) WG to examine registration abuse policies. After reviewing the RAP WG's proposed approach, the GNSO Council is moving ahead with several RAP recommendations.*

## Recent Developments & Next Steps

The Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Implementation Drafting Team (DT) developed a matrix categorizing the RAP WG [final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] recommendations in order of priority, expected complexity and required resources. In November 2010, the group submitted a [letter](#) [PDF, 184 KB] to the GNSO Council outlining a recommended approach for its consideration. The GNSO Council reviewed and discussed the proposed approach at its [working session in Cartagena](#) then decided at its meeting on 3 February 2011 to move ahead with a number of the RAP Recommendations, including.

- Request an Issue Report on the current state of the Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy (UDRP).
- Request a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registration of domain names.
- Move forward on two recommendations that will require input from ICANN Compliance:
  - Whois Access recommendation #2 requiring the ICANN Compliance Department to publish more data about Whois accessibility, at minimum, annually. This data should include a) the number of registrars that show a pattern of unreasonable restriction of access to their port 43 Whois servers, and b) the results of an annual audit of compliance with all contractual Whois access obligations.
  - Fake Renewal Notices recommendation #1, which suggests that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN's Contractual Compliance department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of Whois data.

The GNSO Council has instructed ICANN Policy Staff to “add the remaining RAP Recommendations to the GNSO Project List so that the GNSO Council can keep track of the remaining recommendations and address these as appropriate.”

## Background

The RAP WG [presented its final report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] and recommendations to the GNSO Council in June 2010. The GNSO Council then formed a group of volunteers, the Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Implementation Drafting Team (DT), to draft a proposed approach to implementing the report's recommendations. The RAP-DT remit can include the formation of groups to consider the report's recommendations and to consider how to deal with

recommendations that did not achieve unanimous consensus. See the web site for [further information](#).

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

### More Information

- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB]
- [Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report](#), 29 October 2008 [PDF, 400 KB] and [translation](#) of summary
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Charter](#)
- [Registration Abuse Policies WG Workspace](#) (Wiki)
- [Registration Abuse Policies Implementation Drafting Team Workspace](#) (Wiki)
- [RAP Implementation Drafting Team Letter to the GNSO Council](#) [PDF, 184 KB]

### Staff Contacts

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

---

## Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Final Report to Incorporate Broad Community Input

### At a Glance

*Should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether the current registrar policies regarding the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate.*

### Recent Developments

After completing its review of community comments on the initial [GNSO Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery \(PEDNR\)](#) report [PDF, 1 MB] and the [accompanying survey](#) [PDF, 948 KB], the Working Group is updating the report and developing specific recommendations. Nine community comments from nine individuals were submitted, including comments from representatives of the Registrars and Registries Groups, ALAC, and the Commercial and Business Users Constituencies. More than 400 survey responses were received (see [summary and analysis](#)).

The WG is discussing numerous proposals to change the expiration-related practices and will publish the proposed recommendations and Final Report for

the ICANN Silicon Valley Public Meeting in San Francisco in March. Following publication, a public comment forum will allow community input before submission to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

## Background

The PEDNR PDP WG published its Initial Report on 31 May 2010 – see the related community [public comment forum](#). In addition, a survey asked several specific questions about renewal and expiration practices.

For a history of the ICANN community's policy development activities related to Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery, please refer to the PEDNR [background page](#).

## More Information

- [PEDNR PDP Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1 MB]
- Details on [PEDNR Public Consultation Session in Brussels](#)
- [GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery](#) [PDF, 416 KB]
- [Translations](#) of the GNSO Issues Report on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery
- [WG presentation: Registrar Survey Final Results](#) [PDF, 948 KB]

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

# Fast Flux Recommendations Move to Implementation

## At a Glance

*The Fast Flux Hosting Working Group published its Final Report in August 2009, but did not make any recommendations for new consensus policy, nor changes to existing policy, but provided a number of recommendations for next steps. The GNSO Council adopted all of the recommendations made by the Fast Flux Hosting WG in their Final Report at its meeting on January 13.*

## Recent Developments

The GNSO Council reviewed and discussed the Fast Flux Hosting Final Report recommendations at its meeting on January 13 and adopted all six recommendations made in the Final Report. The recommendations and their proposed implementations are:

- Recommendation #1: To encourage ongoing discussions within the community regarding the development of best practices and/or Internet industry solutions to identify and mitigate the illicit uses of Fast Flux.
  - Implementation completed: The Registration Abuse Policies WG (RAP WG) Malicious Use of Domain Names Recommendation #1, has already recommended the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars. Additionally, registries already address the illicit use of domain names.
- Recommendation #2: The Registration Abuse Policy Working Group (RAP WG) should examine whether existing policy may empower Registries and Registrars, including consideration for adequate indemnification, to mitigate illicit uses of Fast Flux.
  - Implementation completed: addressed by the RAP WG in its [final report](#) [PDF, 1.73 MB]
- Recommendation #3: To encourage stakeholders and subject matter experts to analyze the feasibility of a Fast Flux Data Reporting System to collect data on the prevalence of illicit use - as a tool to inform future discussions.
  - No action recommended: The RAP WG Final Report and the Fast-Flux Working Group Final Report indicated that fast flux is generally a domain use issue and not a domain registration issue, falling outside the purview of the GNSO and ICANN.
- Recommendation #4: To encourage staff to examine the role that ICANN can play as a “best practices facilitator” within the community;
  - Proposed implementation: Integrate this recommendation into the RAP WG Recommendation on “[Meta Issue: Collection and Dissemination of Best Practices](#)” which recommends that the “GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices.”
- Recommendation #5: To consider the inclusion of other stakeholders within and outside the ICANN community for any future Fast Flux policy development efforts.
  - Proposed implementation: If the RAP WG’s Malicious Use of Domain Names Recommendation #1 is adopted by the Council, subsequent efforts will be open to participation from both within and outside the ICANN community.
- Recommendation #6: To ensure that successor PDPs on this subject address the charter definition issues identified in the Fast Flux Final Report. To form a Drafting Team to work with support staff on developing a plan with set of priorities and schedule that can be reviewed and

considered by the new Council as part of its work in developing the Council Policy Plan and Priorities for 2010.

- Proposed implementation: No action needed at this point, but should be included if any future PDPs are initiated on this subject. The Council deems the Drafting Team work to be completed in conjunction with the previously outlined implementation proposals.

## Background

Fast flux attacks *refer to techniques that cybercriminals use to evade detection by rapidly modifying IP addresses and/or name servers. Though fast flux is notorious as a technique used maliciously, it also has legitimate uses.*

Following an SSAC Advisory and an Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) on the issue in May 2008 to explore appropriate action. The Fast Flux Hosting Working Group published its Initial Report in January 2009, which discusses questions about fast flux hosting and the range of possible answers developed by Working Group members. The Working Group submitted its [Final Report](#) [PDF, 5.06 MB] providing answers to the questions posed by the GNSO Council. The report also includes a definition of fast flux attacks, to distinguish these from legitimate uses of fast flux, and fast flux metrics

For more details, see “[Background on Fast Flux Hosting](#).”

## More Information

- [Fast Flux Hosting Final Report](#)
- [SSAC Report 025 on Fast Flux Hosting](#), January 2008
- [Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting](#), corrected 31 March 2008 [PDF, 61.6 KB]
- Limited [translations of the Issues Report on Fast Flux Hosting](#)
- Limited [translations of the Executive Summary of the Initial Report on Fast Flux Hosting](#)
- [Fast Flux Public Comment Forum](#)
- [Fast Flux Workspace](#) (Wiki)

## Staff Contacts

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## Global IPv4 Address Reclamation Pool and Allocation Plan Moves Forward with RIRs

### At a Glance

*Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) are discussing a proposed global policy for handling IPv4 address space returned from the RIRs to Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA). Under the proposal, IANA would establish a Reclamation Pool of returned address space and, as the free pool of IANA IPv4 address space is depleted, allocate IPv4 address space from this Reclamation Pool to the RIRs in smaller blocks than previously.*

### Recent Developments

The proposal to establish a Reclamation Pool of returned IPv4 address spaces and allocate them in smaller blocks to the RIRs was discussed by all RIRs at their most recent meetings. American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) has adopted the proposal. It is in the discussion stage of the policy development processes in the other RIRs.

### Next Steps

When the proposal has been adopted by all RIRs, the Number Resource Organization Executive Committee (NRO EC) and the Address Supporting Organization Address Council (ASO AC) will review the proposal and forward the policy to the ICANN Board for ratification and 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 unique numbers (approximately 4.3 billion) is depleted and a 128-bit numbering system (IPv6) will need to take its place.

The proposed global policy replaces an earlier two-step proposal that did not garner global consensus. The Reclamation Pool will be declared active as soon as the first RIR exhausts its inventory of IPv4 address space, according to threshold criteria defined in the proposal. IANA will, once each quarter, allocate available address blocks from the Reclamation Pool evenly to all RIRs that are eligible for allocations at that time.

## More Information

- A [Background Report](#) is posted on the ICANN website - [Proposal for Recovered IPv4 Addresses](#)

## Staff Contact

[Olof Nordling](#), Director Services Relations

---

## Other Issues Active in the ASO

- [Transition to 32-bit ASNs](#)

## Joint Efforts

---

## Geographic Regions Review WG Considers Community Input for Final Report

### At a Glance

*The Geographic Regions Review Working Group is working to: identify how ICANN's Geographic Regions are used; determine whether the Geographic Regions framework meets the requirements of community members for geographic diversity; and consider making recommendations on the current and future uses and definitions of the ICANN Geographic Regions.*

### Recent Developments

The community-wide Geographic Regions Review Working Group posted its [Interim Report](#) for community review prior to the ICANN Cartagena public meeting. The Public Comment forum closed on 30 January and the comments received raised a number of issues that the Working Group will tackle as it considers what, if any, recommendations to make to the ICANN Board.

Several commenters encouraged the Working Group to take an active role in making recommendations to adjust the ICANN Geographic Region framework. One category of comments addressed the “scope” of the Working Group’s potential recommendations. A number of comments said the WG should not feel constrained to recommend adjustments to the geographic regions framework. A second category of comments focused on the types of adjustments the WG should recommend. See the [Staff Summary/Analysis](#) of the submitted comments for a complete list.

The Working Group also held a community workshop at the ICANN Cartagena public meeting. Community comments during that workshop were included in the Public Forum for the Interim Report. The Working Group hopes to hold a similar session at the ICANN Silicon Valley Public Meeting in San Francisco.

### **Next Steps**

The Working Group has begun drafting the Final Report to be published later this year.

### **Background**

The Interim Report focused on general principles, specific considerations and some of the critical issues that the Working Group plans to address in its Final Report document. It (1) offered a review of the underlying history, objectives and general principles of ICANN's Geographic Regions Framework; (2) raised a number of fundamental strategic questions for further community consideration; and (3) expanded on a number of specific matters identified in the Initial Report that are likely to be addressed in the group's Final Report.

[Background](#) on Geographic Regions Working Group.

### **More Information**

- ICANN Board Resolution [authorizing the Working Group](#)
- [Geographic Regions WG Charter](#)
- [Initial Report](#) published in July 2009
- [Announcement](#) of Interim Report availability
- Interim Report [Public Comment Forum](#)
- Interim Report in all six UN languages:
  - [العربية](#) [PDF, 325 KB]
  - [English](#) [PDF, 356 KB]
  - [Français](#) [PDF, 281 KB]
  - [Русский](#) [PDF, 380 KB]
  - [中文](#) [PDF, 275 KB]
  - [Español](#) [PDF, 206 KB]

### **Staff Contact**

[Robert Hoggarth](#), Senior Policy Director

---

# New Charter to Inform Registrants of Their Domain Related Rights and Responsibilities

## At a Glance

*The GNSO Council approved the creation of a Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Charter. Acting upon Recommendations from a Joint Community Effort, the approved Charter will serve as an informational resource for Registrants.*

## Background

In 2009, the GNSO Council embarked on a collaborative process with the At-Large Advisory Committee regarding the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). As part of this process, a joint GNSO/ALAC drafting team was formed (known as the RAA Drafting Team) to work on improvements to the RAA. The Drafting Team reviewed proposals from stakeholders wanting to enhance the RAA, including the law enforcement community, and Intellectual Property Constituency.

The Final Report to the GNSO Council included a proposal for a Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Charter, to help registrants understand their domain names rights and obligations. The Report also identified topics for proposed additional amendments to the RAA, as well as next steps for the GNSO Council to consider in determining whether to recommend a new form of RAA.

## Recent Developments

The GNSO Council approved the form of the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Charter, and recommended that ICANN consult with Registrars to finalize the Charter for posting. The Charter, when posted on a Registrar's website, will serve as an easy reference for registrants seeking to understand their domain-related rights and responsibilities. The GNSO Council is expected to vote soon on the next steps for producing a new RAA, based upon the recommendations in the Final Report.

## More Information

- [Final Report](#) [PDF 6.7 MB]
- [Non-Lawyers Guide to the RAA](#).

## Staff Contact

[Margie Milam](#), Senior Policy Counselor

---

## Other Issues Active as Joint Efforts

Increasingly, individual ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have pursued bilateral and multi-lateral discussions regarding matters of common or overlapping interest in recent years. Some of the current issues being discussed include:

- [Single-Character IDN TLDs Report Published for Discussion in Cartagena](#)
- [Internationalized Registration Data WG Releases Interim Report](#)

## At-Large

---

## ALAC Submits Several Substantive Policy Development Statements

### At a Glance

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) has started 2011 by focusing on policy development. This year, ALAC has already submitted five statements ranging from contributions to the [2011-2014 ICANN Strategic Plan](#) to comments on the Interim Report of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The ALAC statements include direct contributions from the five Regional At-Large Structures (RALOs) and their At-Large Structures (ALSes) — adding their global grassroots perspectives to the strength of the At-Large policy statements.

### Recent Developments

The ALAC statements submitted to date in 2011 are:

- [ALAC Statement on Accountability & Transparency Review Team Final Recommendations](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Interim Report of the Geographic Regions Working Group](#)
- [ALAC Statement Regarding the Current Situation in Egypt](#)
- [ALAC Statement on Draft 2011 – 2014 Strategic Plan](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Draft Final Report on Policy Aspects Regarding Introduction of Single Character IDN TLDs](#)

## More Information

The [At-Large Correspondence site](#) lists all ALAC statements.

## Staff Contact

[ICANN At-Large Staff](#)

---

# At-Large Work Teams to Complete Improvements Project Next Month

## At a Glance

Four At-Large Improvements Work Teams (WTs) have been implementing different aspects of the [13 recommendations](#) that compose the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)/At-Large Improvements project. These WTs are dedicated to:

- ICANN Bylaw changes reflecting ALAC's and At-Large's continuing mission (Work Team A)
- Enhancing ALS participation (WT B)
- ALAC's strategic, operational, and budgetary planning processes (WT C)
- ALAC/At-Large's policy development processes (WT D)

Following the Board's approval of the [ALAC/At-Large Improvements Project Plan](#) in August 2010, these WTs, including members from all five RALOs, began meeting in September 2010. Now, just six months later, the WTs are nearing the completion of their work. This is a major milestone in the evolution of both At-Large and the voice of individual Internet users.

The Improvements project is on schedule for completion at the end of March 2011.

## Recent Developments

The most visible success of the Improvements project was the seating of At-Large-selected Director, Sébastien Bachollet to a voting position on the ICANN Board.

In this final stretch of the Improvements project, the WTs have begun to translate their implementation plans into tangible proposals for the ALAC. They will present their proposals to the ALAC and At-Large Community during ICANN's Silicon Valley Public Meeting in San Francisco next month.

Highlights in the WTs' proposals include:

- Clarification within ICANN's Bylaws of At-Large's role as the ICANN home of individual Internet users.
- Creation of a technology task force from the community to assist ALSes in their use of collaboration and communication tools.
- Calls for more direct involvement of the RALOs and ALSes in ICANN's strategic and budgetary planning.
- Overhaul and clarification of the At-Large Policy Advice Development process, featuring more direct responsibility for the regions.

### More Information

The mission and progress of each Improvements WT is available on the main Confluence workspaces:

- [WT A Workspace](#)
- [WT B Workspace](#)
- [WT C Workspace](#)
- [WT D Workspace](#)

### Staff Contact

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

## SSAC

---

## SSAC Appoints New Chair and Vice Chair

### At a Glance

*Dr. Stephen Crocker, Chair of the SSAC, and Ray Plzak, Vice Chair resigned their positions in December 2010.*

### Recent Developments

In January, the SSAC elected Patrik Fältström as its new Chair and Dr. James Galvin as its Vice Chair. Mr. Fältström is currently a Distinguished Consulting Engineer with Cisco Systems in the Office of the CTO. Dr. Galvin is Afiliias' Director of Strategic Partnerships and Technical Standards.

The ICANN Board of Directors formally appointed Patrik Fältström as SSAC Chair and acknowledged the SSAC's choice of Dr. James Galvin as Vice Chair on 25 January 2011.

## Background

The ICANN Board of Directors appointed Dr. Crocker as Chair soon after the SSAC was formed in 2002. Plzak served as Vice Chair for many years. Dr. Crocker was appointed Vice Chair of the ICANN Board of Directors on 10 December 2010, at which point he stepped down as SSAC Chair.

## More information

- [Biographical details](#)
- [Resolutions](#)

## Staff Contact

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