



## POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

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

Volume 14, Issue 2 – February 2014 Issue

### Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

### ASO

[ASO Updates](#)

[NRO and RIR Updates](#)

### ccNSO

[ccNSO Travel Funding](#)

[IDN TLDs](#)

[Framework of Interpretation Working Group Interim Report Comments Closed](#)

## GNSO

[GNSO Data & Metrics for Policy Making Charter Approved by the GNSO Council – Call for WG Volunteers](#)

[Invitation to GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House Session](#)

[ICANN Board Adopts Thick Whois Policy Recommendations](#)

[Invitation to Join GNSP-SSR – A GNSO Sponsored Security, Stability, Resiliency \(SSR\) Mailing List](#)

[Board Acknowledges Receipt of GNSO Recommendations on Protections for the Identifiers of IGOs and INGOs in All gTLDs - Directs NGPC to Develop An Approach to Address GAC Advice](#)

## At-Large

[At-Large Board Director Slate of Candidates Selected by the BCEC – Next Steps](#)

[ATLAS II Preparations Continue](#)

[ALAC Submits Two Policy Advice Statements to Date in 2014](#)

[The At-Large Community Expands to 170- At-Large Structures](#)

## GAC

[Follow-Up To the GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué](#)

---

## 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 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](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

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

#### [Status Update from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services](#)

The Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG) has been working to envision a clean-slate approach to better meet global Internet community needs for domain name registration data with greater privacy, accuracy, and accountability. Comment period ends 28 February; no reply period posted.

#### [Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team \(ATRT 2\) Final Report & Recommendations.](#)

The ATRT2 Final Report and Recommendations were developed and submitted for public comment in October 2013. Comment period ends 21 February; reply period ends 15 March.

[Proposed Modifications to GNSO Operating Procedures to Address Resubmission of Motions and Working Group Self Assessment.](#) As part of its charter, the SCI is tasked to consider requests concerning issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to Working Group Guidelines that have been identified either by the GNSO Council or

a group chartered by the GNSO Council as needing discussion. Comment period ends 3 March; reply period ends 1 April.

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

The staff also populates a web page to help preview potential “upcoming” public comment opportunities. This page - ["Public Comments - Upcoming" page](#) – provides information about potential future public comment opportunities. The page is updated after every ICANN Public Meeting to help individuals and the community to set priorities and plan their future workloads.

## ASO

---

### ASO Update

#### At a Glance

*In recent meetings of the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), plans were made for several ASO Address Council (ASO AC) members to attend the ICANN Public Meeting in Singapore, and to plan their face-to-face meeting for the ICANN London meeting.*

#### Next Steps

The next ASO AC Monthly Teleconference is scheduled for 12:00UTC on 5 March.

#### More Information

- [aso.icann.org/](http://aso.icann.org/)

---

### NRO and RIR Updates

#### At a Glance

*This new section of the Policy Update will highlight recent policy developments in the NRO and the five Regional Internet Registries (when available).*

#### Background

The five RIRs (Afrinic, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, and RIPE NCC) provide Internet resource allocation and management, registration services, regional policy development activities, and technical services supporting the global operation of

the Internet. RIRs participate in the global Internet community independently, and jointly through the coordination of the NRO. Per a 2004 MoU with ICANN, the NRO fulfills the role, responsibilities, and functions of the ASO.

## Recent Developments

**NRO** | The NRO has highlighted that in September 2013, the IANA issued its last remaining full block (1024) of 2-byte AS numbers, with 512 numbers going to APNIC and 512 numbers going to RIPE NCC. Of the 65,536 total AS numbers in the 2-byte pool, just 496 remain. Further information about implications of this change can be found at: <http://www.nro.net/news/2-byte-asn-nearing-depletion>

**AFRINIC** | AFRINIC announced that AFRINIC - 20 will be held from 4 – 6 June 2014 in Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti, during the Africa Internet Summit (AIS) 2014. Details will be forthcoming on their website - [www.afrinic.net/](http://www.afrinic.net/).

**APNIC** | Local events have necessitated a move for the APNIC meeting concurrent with APRICOT. Originally scheduled for Bangkok, the meeting will now take place in Petaling Jaya, Malaysia, 18-28 February. Several new number resource proposals have been put forward. For further information see - <http://2014.apricot.net/>.

**ARIN** | ARIN is holding their Public Policy Consultation at the NANOG 60 meeting, and has opened their Customer Satisfaction Survey: <https://www.arin.net/announcements/2014/20140210.html>. They have opened registration for ARIN 33 taking place in Chicago, US 13-16 April. <http://www.cvent.com/events/ar-in-33-public-policy-and-members-meeting/event-summary-dfe506556a5e4095a79c382c047a2f6e.aspx>

**LACNIC** | LACNIC has announced that the "9th Network Security Event for Latin America and the Caribbean" will be held in Cancun, Mexico, within the framework of LACNIC's eighteenth annual meeting (LACNIC XXI). They have also opened their application process for financial assistance to attend LACNIC XXI: <http://www.lacnic.net/en/web/events/lacnic21-becas>

**RIPE NCC** | The RIPE NCC has updated their IPv4 Allocation Chart. This information is available at - <http://www.ripe.net/internet-coordination/ipv4-exhaustion/ipv4-available-pool-graph>.

## More Information

- [AfriNIC](#)
- [APNIC](#)
- [ARIN](#)
- [ASO](#)
- [LACNIC](#)
- [NRO](#)
- [RIPE NCC](#)

## Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director and Technical Analyst

[Carlos Reyes](#), Senior Policy Analyst

ccNSO

---

## ccNSO Travel Funding



### At a Glance

The application period has opened for ccNSO travel funding to the ICANN Public Meeting in London.

### Recent Developments

The ccNSO Travel Fund Committee is now accepting applications for ccNSO travel funding to the ICANN Public Meeting in London, 22 – 26 June 2014.

### Next Steps

The application period ends on 7 March at 12.00 UTC. All applications will then be reviewed and evaluated by the ccNSO Travel Fund Committee.

### Background

ccNSO travel funding is made available for those who actively contribute to the work of the ccNSO, in particular to its projects and meetings.

The travel funding covers an economy class ticket to the travel destination, the hotel costs for the time of the meeting and a per diem.

### More Information

- [Application Form](#)
- [Announcements](#)
- [General information on ccNSO Travel funding](#)
- [ccNSO Travel Funding Guidelines](#)

## Staff Contact

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

---

## IDN TLDs

### At a Glance

The ccNSO and GNSO have submitted a Final Report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs to the ICANN Board of Directors.

### Recent Developments

In a joint letter, the chairs of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils submitted the Final Report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs to the ICANN Board of Directors. The Final Report was adopted by both Councils in late 2013 (in November 2013 by the ccNSO Council and December 2013 by the GNSO Council). In the report actions are proposed to enhance the Universal Acceptance of the IDN TLDs.

### Background

The JIG (joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN WG) submitted its Final Report on Universal Acceptance to the ccNSO and GNSO Council for adoption early November 2013.

The issue of the Universal Acceptance of TLDs (Top-Level Domains) is not new. The introduction of new gTLDs, especially those that are longer than three characters exposed this Universal Acceptance issue at the time of the 2000 experimental expansion round, and was also experienced through the 2004 gTLD extension round. The introduction of IDN ccTLDs through the IDN ccTLD Fast Track in 2010 again raised the issue and made this into an issue of common interest between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

The JIG was created to discuss issues of common interest between the ccNSO and the GNSO on IDNs especially IDN TLDs. The JIG has identified three issues of common interest to date:

1. Single Character IDN TLDs
2. IDN TLD Variants
3. Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs

The JIG is a prime example of successful cross-community work.

### More Information

- [The Final Report of the JIG](#)
- [More information of the JIG, its charter and other reports](#)

### Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor.

---

# Framework of Interpretation Working Group Interim Report Comments Closed

## At a Glance

Public comment on Interim Report “Revocation” of ccTLDs has closed.

## Recent Developments

The extensive public comment period (from 28 October 2013 until 31 January 2014) on the ccNSO Framework of Interpretation Working Group (Fol WG) Interim Report on "revocation" has been closed and the Summary and analysis of the comments has been posted.

The Interim Report contains the interpretations of current policy and guidelines related to "Revocation", which is defined as re-delegations undertaken without the consent of the ccTLD manager. "Revocation" refers to the process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from a manager.

## Next Steps

After careful consideration of the input and comments received, the WG sees no need to modify its draft interpretations recommendations. However the WG members will continue discussion of its interpretations, including an intended discussion with the Governmental Advisory Committee.

The Working Group expects to formally publish its Final Report prior to the next ICANN Public Meeting in London (June 2014).

## Background

The Fol WG was created by the ccNSO Council following the recommendations of the Delegation and Re-delegation Working Group (DRD WG):

Recommendation 2: Delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs

*The DRD WG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertake the development of 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 interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

*The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the*

*Framework of Interpretation failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision-making, the ccNSO Council should then launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

The Final Report of the DRD WG identified the following issues pertaining to "Unconsented Redelegations":

*No procedure for re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator. RFC1591 nor ICP1 discuss the re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator. Instead both of these documents discuss the revocation of a delegation by IANA, for cause, followed by a re-delegation to a new operator. This is somewhat confusing given that in these types of situations the revocation has never caused a ccTLD to be removed from the root prior to being delegated to a new operator & thus trying to ensure continued resolution of the domains registered in the relevant ccTLD. This further illustrates some of the issues surrounding the re-delegation of ccTLDs without the consent of the incumbent operator.*

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 functions manager and the ICANN Board on interpretation of the current Policy Statements. Before send to the ICANN Board of Directors both the ccNSO and GAC need to adopt the Framework.

### **More Information**

- [The Public forum, including the Interim Report and summary and analysis of the comments received](#)
- [More information of the FoI Wg](#)

### **Staff Contact**

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

---

## **GNSO Data & Metrics for Policy Making Charter Approved by the GNSO Council - Call for WG Volunteers**

### **At a Glance**

*At its 23 January 2014 meeting, the GNSO Council approved the charter of a non-PDP working group for Data & Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM WG) that will explore opportunities regarding reporting and metrics recommendations that could better assist the GNSO policy-development process by enhancing fact-based decision-making, where applicable.*

*In preparation for the new WG, a Call for WG Volunteers has been announced.*

### **What This Team Will Do**

The DMPM WG will research and deliberate the issues identified in the [Final Issue Report](#) on Uniformity of Reporting and as defined in the Charter approved by the GNSO Council. Activities will include:

- establishing a baseline of current practices and capabilities to problem reporting
- evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process
- review existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process
- evaluate external data sources that may benefit the policy process such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed
- prepare preliminary recommendations and obtain community input

The expectation of the DMPM WG is to produce a Final Recommendations Report addressing all community input and then submit it to the GNSO Council for their consideration and next steps, if any.

### **How This Team Will Work**

ICANN WGs use transparent, open processes. The meetings of this DMPM WG will be recorded, and the recordings will be available to the public. The mailing list for the DMPM WG will be archived publicly and DMPM WG members are expected to submit Statements of Interest ([SOI](#)). The group will collaborate using a public workspace for draft materials and all final work products and milestones

will be documented on the [WG's project page](#). The DMPM WG is expected to follow the [GNSO Working Group Guidelines](#).

## How To Join

The GNSO Council invites interested parties to provide names of expected participants who can then be added to the DMPM WG mailing list. The DMPM WG will be open to anyone interested to join. Community members who wish to be invited to join the group should contact the [GNSO Secretariat](#) ([gnso.secretariat@icann.org](mailto:gnso.secretariat@icann.org)).

## Background

The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the Meta Issue: Uniformity of Reporting which it described as “need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports.” The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that “the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform problem-reporting and report-tracking processes.”

The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an [Issue Report](#) to further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to improve the policy development process. The report created by ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance. The GNSO Council subsequently adopted the recommendation to form this non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making. The GNSO resolution states:

Resolved,

The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required;

The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.

## More Information

- [DMPM - Charter](#)
- [GNSO DMPM WG Page](#)

## Staff Contact

[Berry Cobb](#), ICANN

---

# Invitation to GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House Sessions

## At a Glance

Following a successful GNSO WG Newcomer Open House session pilot session in December of last year, it was decided to continue with these sessions to allow for new GNSO WG participants to come together and ask any questions they may have about GNSO Working Groups, procedures and/or processes. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 6 March at 20.00 UTC.

## Next Steps

To allow for maximum participation in these calls, the proposed schedule is as follows:

Thursday 6 March at 20.00 UTC  
Thursday 3 April at 12.00 UTC  
Thursday 1 May at 20.00 UTC  
Thursday 5 June at 12.00 UTC  
Thursday 3 July at 20.00 UTC  
Thursday 7 August at 12.00 UTC  
Thursday 4 September at 20.00 UTC  
Thursday 2 October at 12.00 UTC  
Thursday 6 November at 20.00 UTC  
Thursday 4 December at 12.00 UTC

To convert to your local time zone, please see <http://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/converter.html>.

If you are interested to join the next meeting on 6 March or any of the future meetings, please let the GNSO Secretariat know ([gnso-secs@icann.org](mailto:gnso-secs@icann.org)) and they will send you the call details. If there are any specific questions you already have, or any overviews or introductions you think would be helpful (e.g. GNSO Policy Development Process or GNSO Working Group guidelines), please let us know in advance and we will prepare materials accordingly. Feel free to share this invitation with others that you think may be interested.

## Background

We know there is a lot of information to digest when you join a GNSO Working Group and would like to offer this opportunity to come together, talk and answer any questions you may have.

## Staff Contact

Marika Konings, Senior Policy Director

---

# ICANN Board Adopts Thick Whois Policy Recommendations

## At a Glance

*At its meeting on 7 February, the ICANN Board adopted the GNSO recommendations to require thick WHOIS for all gTLD Registries.*

## Recent Developments

Following the unanimous adoption by the GNSO Council of the Thick Whois PDP Policy Recommendation to require 'the provision of thick WHOIS services with a consistent labeling and display as per the model outlined in specification three of the 2013 RAA' for all gTLD registries, a public comment forum was opened to solicit input on the recommendation prior to ICANN Board consideration (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>). Four comments in support of the recommendation and its adoption by the ICANN Board were received.

Subsequently, the ICANN Board considered and adopted the GNSO Council recommendations at its meeting on 7 February 2014.

## Next Steps

The ICANN Board directed the President and CEO to develop and execute on an implementation plan for the Thick Whois Policy consistent with the guidance provided by the GNSO Council. The President and CEO was further directed to work with an Implementation Review Team, that the GNSO Council agreed to constitute following the adoption of the recommendations by the ICANN Board, in developing the implementation details for the policy, and to continue communication with the community on such work.

In relation to the implementation, the GNSO Council also recommended the following:

- As part of the implementation process, a legal review of law applicable to the transition of data from a thin to thick model that has not already been considered in the Expert Working Group memo be undertaken.

- Due consideration to be given to potential privacy issues that may arise from the discussions of the transition from thin to thick WHOIS, including, for example, guidance on how the long-standing contractual requirement that registrars use to give notice, and obtain consent, from each registrant for uses of any personally identifiable data submitted by the registrant should apply to registrations involved in the transition.
- Should any privacy issues emerge from these transition discussions that were not anticipated by the WG and which would require additional policy consideration, the Implementation Review Team is expected to notify the GNSO Council of these so that appropriate action can be taken.

## Background

Registries and registrars satisfy their WHOIS obligations using two different service models. These models are often characterized as "thin" and "thick" WHOIS registries, as they manage relevant datasets differently. 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. 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. .COM and .NET are examples of thin registries. Thick registries maintain and provide both sets of data (domain name and registrant) via WHOIS. .INFO and .BIZ are examples of thick registries.

In its Final Report on 30 May 2011 the IRTP B Working Group recommended that the GNSO seek an Issue Report on the requirement of thick WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs, which the GNSO Council then requested at its meeting on 22 September 2011. The PDP was subsequently initiated on 4 March 2012 and the Working Group had its inaugural session in November 2012.

The Working Group was tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the use of thick WHOIS by all gTLD registries. In its deliberations, the group analyzed the relevant issues laid out in its Charter, including: response consistency; stability; access to WHOIS data; impact on privacy and data protection; cost implications; synchronization / migration; authoritativeness; competition in registry services; existing WHOIS applications; data escrow, and registrar Port 43 WHOIS requirements (see section 5 of the Initial Report). The WG submitted its Final Report to the GNSO Council on 21 October 2013.

## More Information

- [Board Resolution](#)
- [GNSO Council Resolution](#)
- [Final Report](#) [PDF, 1.23 MB]
- [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1.2 MB]
- [Working Group Wiki Space](#)

## Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Policy Director

---

## Invitation to Join GNSO-SSR – A GNSO Sponsored Security, Stability, Resiliency (SSR) Mailing List

### At a Glance

Members of this group mailing list will informally review SSAC reports to determine whether they contain recommendations that might deserve broader consideration in the GNSO.

### Recent Developments

The primary work product of mail list members will be periodic informal suggestions of SSR-related topics to be considered by the GNSO Council. The form of that consideration may vary. Possibilities include:

- An Issue Report
- An alert to a currently-running working group or implementation review team
- Notifications to constituencies and stakeholder groups

List members expectations include:

- All work is expected to take place via the email list – no teleconferences are planned.
- The list is open to all members of the ICANN community – all AC's and SO's, staff, Board, etc.
- All mailing list participants must submit or update their [GNSO Statement of Interest](#) before they are subscribed to the list.
- ICANN will maintain open public email archives – and thus list members will not discuss private or confidential information.
- GNSO Councilor Mikey O'Connor has offered to initially organize and prompt list topics and discussions.

To join the mailing list please **RSVP** to [gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org](mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org)

### Background

Recommendations made by the SSAC sometimes are relevant to GNSO policy making, yet the mechanism for the GNSO to find out or act on them is not well

developed as the GNSO does not currently have an SSR-focused forum for this kind of cross-GNSO conversation.

The current process is for the SSAC to give advice to the Board, with the presumption that the Board will pass relevant issues along to the GNSO for consideration. This doesn't appear to be happening in all cases. Here are two examples:

- The SSAC produced an extensive report ([SAC007](#)) in 2005 that addressed the issue of domain-name hijacking. In 2011, six years later, members of the GNSO IRTP-B working group came across the following observation in that report and realized that it was a good idea:
  - *"Collect emergency contact information from registrants, registrars and resellers for parties who are suited to assist in responding to an urgent restoration of domain name incident. Define escalation processes (emergency procedures) that all parties agree can be instituted in events where emergency contacts are not available."*

It took six years for that very common-sense idea to find its way into Consensus Policy and probably another year or two to implement.

- The SSAC wrote a report ([SAC045](#)) in 2010 titled "Invalid Top Level Domain Queries at the Root Level of the DNS" which provided an early warning about the "name collisions" problem. Again, an opportunity to proactively research the issue at that time was missed.

### **Creating this new community discussion opportunity will benefit the ICANN community in several ways**

The mailing list will create opportunities for community members to begin considering SSAC recommendations in a more timely way and substantially reduce the possibility of:

- Negative impacts on SSR of the DNS – as a result of not considering or implementing SSAC recommendations, or building trust relationships in an SSR community of interest
- Increased implementation costs – as a result of delay in considering SSAC proposals that may bear on GNSO consensus policy
- Lower quality of implementation – as a result of not taking fullest advantage of the rigor of the multi-stakeholder analysis and PDP processes

In addition to addressing the problems listed above, the new mailing list will help the GNSO:

- Broaden the pool of SSR interested community members -- by identifying and engaging community members who have interest and skills in SSR of the DNS
- Build more effective trust relationships – by providing community members an opportunity to work together in a “low-key” setting.

### **Staff Contact**

[Glen de Saint Géry](#), GNSO Secretariat

---

## **Board Acknowledges Receipt of GNSO Recommendations on Protections for the Identifiers of IGOs and INGOs in All gTLDs - Directs NGPC to Develop An Approach to Address GAC Advice**

### **At a Glance**

At its meeting on 7 February 2014 the ICANN Board acknowledged receipt of the GNSO’s policy recommendations relating to top and second level protections for International Governmental Organization and International Non-Governmental Organization identifiers and directed its New gTLD Program Committee to consider the policy recommendations from the GNSO as it continues to actively develop an approach to respond to Government Advisory Committee (GAC) advice on IGO protections - including a proposal to address the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations for consideration by the Board at a subsequent meeting.

### **Recent Developments**

In November 2013, the GNSO Council unanimously approved all consensus recommendations developed by the PDP Working Group on Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs concerning protections at the top and second level for the names and limited acronyms of IGOs and INGOs in existing and new gTLDs, according to a specific limited list of identifiers and criteria. Following the adoption by the GNSO Council a public comment forum was opened prior to Board consideration of the recommendations (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/igo-ingo-recommendations-27nov13-en.htm>). In January 2014 the GNSO Council sent its recommendation report concerning the consensus recommendations to the ICANN Board for the Board’s consideration.

On 7 February the Board acknowledged receipt of the GNSO’s policy recommendations and directed its New gTLD Program Committee to consider the policy recommendations from the GNSO as it continues to actively develop an approach to respond to Government Advisory Committee advice on IGO

protections, including a proposal to address the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations for consideration by the Board at a subsequent meeting.

## Next Steps

The NGPC was directed by the ICANN Board to develop a comprehensive proposal to address GAC advice on IGO protections and the GNSO's recommendations for Board consideration at a subsequent Board meeting.

## Background

In October 2012 the GNSO Council approved the formation of a PDP WG to evaluate whether identifiers of IGOs and INGOs (including those pertaining to the Red Cross Movement and the International Olympic Committee) should be protected at the top and second levels in all gTLDs. The WG's Final Report was considered by the GNSO Council at its meeting in Buenos Aires in November 2013, at which the Council unanimously approved all the consensus recommendations made by the PDP WG.

The consensus recommendations covered the organizations seeking protection in four categories – the Red Cross; the IOC; IGOs and INGOs (other than the Red Cross and IOC). All identifiers recommended for protection were specified on a list of names and limited acronyms associated with these organizations. Protections ranged from reservation of certain limited organizational names at the top and second level in new gTLDs, to voluntary protection for other specified organizational names and limited acronyms through bulk entry into the Trademark Clearinghouse and use of its 90-days claims notification process.

In addition, the GNSO Council requested the preparation of an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, to consider whether curative protections of the UDRP and URS could be extended to IGOs and INGOs. That Issue Report is expected to be published for public comment at the end of February 2014.

Temporary protections for certain Red Cross, IOC and IGO identifiers in the New gTLD Program had previously been granted by the Board's New gTLD Program Committee, pending the development of policy advice from the GAC and the GNSO.

## More Information

- [Board Resolution](#)
- Web Page for the PDP WG: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo>
- GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/council-board-igo-ingo-21jan14-en.pdf>
- PDP WG Final Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>

## Staff Contact

[Mary Wong](#), Senior Policy Director

# At-Large

## At-Large Board Director Slate of Candidates Selected by the BCEC - Next Steps

*On 28 January, the At-Large Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) announced the names of the slate of candidates to fill Seat #15 of the ICANN Board. The following five candidates have passed the initial BCEC evaluation.*

| <b>List of Candidates on Slate</b><br><br>(in alphabetical order by family name) | <b>Country of Citizenship</b> | <b>Country of Residence</b> | <b>Public Information from EOI</b>  |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Rinalia Abdul Rahim  | Malaysia                      | Malaysia/Hong Kong          | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Candidate - Rinalia Abdul Rahim - Public Information on EOI</a> |
| Sébastien Bachollet  | France                        | France                      | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Candidate - Sébastien Bachollet - Public Information on EOI</a> |
| Alan Greenberg   | Canada                        | Canada                      | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Candidate -</a>   |

|                       |        |        |   |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|---|
|                       |        |        | <a href="#">Alan Greenberg - Public Information on EOI</a>  |
| Evan Leibovitch       | Canada | Canada | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Candidate - Evan Leibovitch - Public Information on EOI</a>       |
| Jean-Jacques Subrenat | France | France | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Candidate - Jean-Jacques Subrenat - Public Information on EOI</a> |

### Next Steps

The Regional At Large Organizations (RALOs) have been asked to consider whether any of the applicants who submitted Expressions of Interest but were not selected by the BCEC should be added to the final slate of candidates. In order to be added to the final slate, an applicant must be supported by three RALOs. The deadline for support from other RALOs for additional candidates is Friday, 21 February 2014.

| <b>List of Remaining Applicants</b><br><br>(in alphabetical order by family name) | <b>Country of Citizenship</b> | <b>Country of Residence</b> | <b>Public Information from EOI</b> |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|   |                               |                             |                                    |

|               |     |     |   |
|---------------|-----|-----|---|
| David Allnutt | USA | USA | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Applicant - David Allnutt - Public Information on EOI</a> |
| Bobbie Lloyd  | USA | USA | <a href="#">2014 At-Large Board Applicant - Bobbie Lloyd - Public Information on EOI</a>  |

The final slate of candidates will be announced on Sunday, 23 February 2014. The members of the ALAC and the RALO Chairs will begin voting in March 2014. The announcement of the successful candidate will be made no later than 15 April 2014.

**More Information**

[See the At-Large Board Member 2014 Workspace](#)

**Staff Contact**

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

---

## ATLAS II Preparations Continue

### At a Glance

*Planning for the Second At-Large Summit (ATLAS II) continues to make progress as the At-Large community shifts into deeper engagement on current end-user issues as well as preparation for the gathering in London this June, during the ICANN 50<sup>th</sup> Meeting. The theme of the ATLAS II is: "Global Internet: The User Perspective".*

### Recent Developments

A special Cross-RALO working group has been established to coordinate and organize an expanded At-Large Celebration for ATLAS II. This group had its first call last month to begin its work.

The Events Working Group has determined the topics for the breakout sessions: 1) multistakeholderism versus multilateralism: ICANN's role in the post-Brazil initiative and debate, 2) the future structure and governance of ICANN, 3) ICANN's Public Interest Commitment, 4) transparency and accountability at ICANN, and 5) At-Large engagement in ICANN.

The Public Relations Working Group has finalized its messaging statements for the Summit and is exploring potential tools and resources for disseminating information leading up to and at ATLAS II. To that end, a communications sub-Working Group has been established to oversee the creation of an ATLAS II webpage as well as the production of a regular newsletter.

Finally, the Sponsorship Working Group is moving ahead with securing funding for various social activities.

### Next Steps

This month, the ATLAS II Organizing Committee will begin to work more closely with ICANN staff on logistical details of the Summit. Moreover, ALSes will begin to engage actively in the preparatory work leading up to ATLAS II, including the development of a webpage and newsletter.

### Background

The first At-Large Summit was held in March 2009 at ICANN 34 in Mexico City. The ICANN Board of Directors approved ATLAS II in August 2013 to strengthen the bottom-up structure of the At-Large community by building capacity and awareness of the 170+ ALSes. Moreover, ATLAS II will further develop the At-Large community's engagement in ICANN.

## More Information

- [ATLAS II Working Group](#)

## Staff Contact

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

[Carlos Reyes](#), Senior Policy Analyst

---

# ALAC Submits Two Policy Advice Statements to Date in 2014

## At a Glance

*The ALAC continues its high rate of preparing Statements in response to ICANN Public Comments periods as well as comments and communications. Between early-January and early-February, the ALAC submitted two Policy Advice Statements. The ALAC is currently developing several additional Policy Advice Statements.*

## Recent Developments

The two ALAC Policy Advice Statements submitted between early-January and early-February are summarized below.

### [ALAC Statement on the Proposal for a Specification 13 to the ICANN Registry Agreement to Contractually Reflect Certain Limited Aspects of ".Brand" New gTLDs](#)

- The ALAC has no input on the details of Specification 13, but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point, when earlier decisions were made to not have categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic and other similar classes of gTLD.

### [ALAC Statement on ICANN's Draft Vision, Mission & Focus Areas for a Five-Year Strategic Plan](#)

- The At-Large Advisory Committee considers the submitted "ICANN Draft Vision, Mission, and Focus Areas for a Five Years Strategic Plan" a comprehensive document addressing all the aspects of a future strategic plan.
- The ALAC supports the ICANN vision as stipulated. Nevertheless, as the most important concern today is about the security of Internet and the trust in the Internet, the ALAC would prefer to include those aspects of trust and security in the paragraph describing the ICANN Vision in this way: "...to support a single, open, and globally interoperable Internet with a secure and trusted DNS". The same should be done in all focus areas paragraphs each time the unique and open Internet is mentioned.

- The ALAC recommends that it is necessary to add another bold point to the “Developing a world-class public responsibility framework” focus area section: “Engage and develop the End-Users community globally for full involvement in policy development and decision making processes.”
- The ALAC finds the other elements of the focus Areas well expressed and detailed. It appreciates this preliminary work to prepare for a future-oriented and concerted 5 years strategic plan and strongly supports that process.

### More Information

- [At-Large Policy Development page](#)

### Staff Contact

[Matt Ashtiani](#), Policy Specialist

---

## The At-Large Community Expands to 170 At-Large Structures

*The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is in the process of certifying three organizations as At-Large Structures (ALSes): ISOC Kenya, Age Numerique and Fundetic Bolivia.. These three new ALSes expand the regional diversity of the At-Large community, which represents thousands of individual Internet end-users. With the addition of these three new organizations, the number of accredited ALSes will now total 170.*

### Recent Developments

The ALAC is voting for the certification of ISOC Kenya, Age Numerique and Fundetic Bolivia as At-Large Structures (ALSes). The certification process included due diligence carried out by ICANN staff and regional advice provided by the African Regional At-Large Organization (AFRALO) and by the Latin American and Caribbean Islands Regional At-Large Organization (LACRALO).

Additional information on the new At-Large Structures:

**ISOC Kenya** is located in Nairobi, Kenya. The mission of ISOC Kenya includes, among others, to promote the open development, evolution, and use of the Internet for the benefit of all people throughout the world. This organization will be an ALS within AFRALO.

**Age Numerique** is located in Abidjan, Ivory Coast. Age Numerique is a place where people can exchange ideas, expert thinking, ideas and projects which help citizens and those with the power of decision to advance in the interest of all

within educational, scientific, cultural and social projects. This organization will be an ALS within AFRALO.

**Fundetic Bolivia** is located in La Paz, Bolivia. The Mission of Fundetic Bolivia is to promote and coordinate the relationships between the government and the Bolivian society through the management of ICT instruments within all areas and sectors. This organization will be an ALS within LACRALO.

## 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

Nathalie Peregrine, Policy staff support for At-Large

# GAC

---

## Follow-Up To the GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué

### At a Glance

*The GAC Communiqué delivered in Buenos Aires included some requests for clarifications related to new gTLDs as well as issues for further consideration by the GAC. The GAC is now focusing on these aspects, in cooperation with the New gTLD Programme Committee (NGPC) of the ICANN Board.*

### Recent Developments

GAC requests for clarifications include: how strings for closed gTLDs are identified by ICANN as being generic, whether the ICANN Board considers that existing PIC specifications fully implement GAC advice, and public policy

implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention. The NGPC is expected to provide such clarifications before the Singapore meeting. The GAC, in turn, has promised to revert to the NGPC regarding protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent national names, a topic that is now under consideration.

### **Next Steps**

GAC members will prepare their positions and exchange views for further deliberations and potential GAC advice to be issued at the ICANN Public Meeting in Singapore.

### **Background**

ICANN receives input from governments through the GAC. The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, 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 at ICANN Public Meetings to discuss issues with the ICANN Board, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss with the Board at other times, meeting face-to-face or by teleconference.

### **More Information**

- [GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué](#)
- [GAC website](#)
- [GAC Register of Advice](#)

### **Staff Contact**

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

[Jeannie Ellers](#), Manager, GAC Coordination

# # #